

Documents written by Edward Pickersgill, Michelle Landriault and their legal agents make up the whole of Part 18. These writings are reproduced because of their relevance to the anti-factional struggle in the Alive Production Collective, which broke into the open on August 18, 1978.

Readers will find our refutation of these specific documents presented in Part 19. Readers are advised that Parts 18 and 19 are best studied in conjunction with one another. We specifically encourage readers to use Part 18 as reference as they read our

refutation — check up on us, assure yourselves that we are not distorting positions, doctoring quotes, etc., so as to falsely enhance our own positions.

We have not edited the documents in Part 18. We have deleted specific references to people's names, to places and to other details that might be used to breach our organizational security, our members' personal security or the personal security of Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault. We have indicated such deletions by adding more general words in italicized paren-

thesis. Names are given standard references so the discussion regarding specific individuals can be followed. Deleted names have been assigned letters of the alphabet in the sequential order they occur in the documents — the first name mentioned was assigned the letter "A", the second was assigned the letter "B", the third became "C", etc. By this standard identification readers can follow the discussion of specific people from one document to the next and from Part 18 to Part 19, where the same standard references are used.

## PART EIGHTEEN

# Edward Pickersgill, Michelle Landriault and Their Legal Agents Speak For Themselves

### A Note to the Lu Hsun Unit of the Alive Production Collective

August 1, 1978

I have been giving some considerable thought to the future of this Collective in light of two main factors: A) the ongoing process which we have called our "Mini-Cultural Revolution"; and, B) the problems of growth in our work as related particularly to the GCWCRC.

It is quite obvious that the APC continues to be the driving force in those aspects of our work which proceed under the auspices of the GCWCRC. Also, organizational forms in place there are derived mainly from the experience of the APC rather than from experience of the GCWCRC itself. The main positive thrust of the GCWCRC work is the broadening of political work horizons, mainly for people not in the APC. We know that the APC is so structured as to be able to participate in a much wider frame than production and dissemination of Alive magazine, but non-members of the APC quite rightly do not have the same perception as we do. At the same time, these non-members of the APC, while appearing to have a wider frame of reference, do not in fact have a wide range at all. The GCWCRC, in fact, has a relatively narrow frame of reference, which can be characterized as "study" and investigation of the various aspects of establishing a commitment

to political work.

A substantial problem which we do face at the moment is resolution of the contradictions involved in moving a certain number of non-members of the APC forward to a more or less equal posture with APC members. I think that this problem can be solved. At the same time I think that we can solve certain problems of complacency in the APC itself, which have become rooted as a result of our defensive posture in relation to external attacks and other pressures over the past three years.

To re-spark the good aspects of our "mini-cultural revolution"; to aim further blows at complacency in the APC itself; and to solve the problem of moving a relatively large number of new people forward in the near future; I suggest that we consider re-forming the APC in the same way that we re-formed the GCWCRC in 1977, and that we consider merging the APC, PCC, HRC, GNS, CNS, GCWCRC into a new group to be called RED NORTH COLLECTIVE. (In practice, I would think, we will continue to make use of the forms of the APC, PCC, HRC, CNS, GNS, and GCWCRC wherever and whenever we see fit. Also, in practice, I think we should consider changing the name of the GCWCRC to something like Guelph Workers Front.)

All members and "close supporters" (such as in [group 1], [group 2] & [group 3]) would be given the opportunity to participate in the formation of the new Collective.

### The Letter Michelle Landriault Left For The Collective

By now you know that I have left.

It is not a last minute decision on my part. It (leaving) has been on my mind for some time now. I've tried to get up the courage to discuss it but found that I couldn't. What I needed was someone to talk to from whom I would get some amount of encouragement to stay and fight and some amount of straightening out. But all I can picture getting is a good dressing down or being told to get out in no uncertain terms. Both of these things scare me and neither would help. So, I've left on my own initiative.

Why have I left? Because I'm in over my head. Decisions are about to be made and I find that I can't figure out what my opinion is about them. I have no idea if they're sound suggestions or not. I simply don't know. A person in my position should be able to figure out some decent answer. I can't even figure out decent questions about them so as to reach some sort of clarity.

I'm not afraid of the everyday questions regarding finance, work

or politics (in general); I'll be faced with these no matter where I am. Concerning politics — they remain as much as possible what they were — I support anti-imperialist revolution. I can't simply shift my position in the group or say that I'll live down the street. It wouldn't and can't work that way. I've got to find what my level is on the political scale. The only way I can see is in a whole new set of circumstances — circumstances that the majority of people have to face. It's not that I have to prove that I can survive — I know I can and will. But mentally, am I still doing my own thinking or hanging onto coattails (*sic*) — I don't know. I've got to regain some of the experience of making good decisions and bad — I've got to experience my own mistakes and rectify them myself. Individualism, I know. And it is extreme but I have to get some of my individualism back — I've given up too much.

What am I going to do? I have to head, first of all, to relatives. There's no way around that — I'll get only as close as I need to, to get a base set up — mainly money. Then see where the best opportunity of survival is — this means a secure, safe place for the kids and I and a job. My only line to people who ask questions is that I am taking a year to think things over. No other answer or answers. I'll write once a month and if possible, knowing what

continued

payments you have to make see what I can contribute monthly. I'll also attempt to contribute to the writing — I haven't been doing well on that but I'll work at it. These are the only contacts I'll be carrying. Of course, whatever contact you will want to have with me is up to you.

It's always a shock when someone leaves. But in terms of the ongoing work you have managed without me now for some months. None of the work I have been involved in is in a state of having been individualized to the extent of being unknown to anyone.

Why have I chosen now? The house shell is practically finished. Also, leaving before (*comrade A*) arrives back will give you time to sort out what to tell her. I'm not being much help, I know. Things would be worse if I stayed I'm sure.

What have I done in order to leave? All my things are packed. I've taken what we'll need immediately, the rest is packed. When I am settled I'll be sure to let you know and make arrangements for shipping. I sorted out all my papers and I have left behind everything and anything to do with the collective. I have also taken \$400. (*sic*) from the PM account. You will consider this stealing and I suppose it is. I'll pay it back as soon as I can. As far as ownership of the house goes it will probably be best to leave things as they are — in my name. I certainly have no vicious ideas on that issue. It's yours to use — I've left plenty of signed cheques for mortgage payments. If you need more write to me. I'll send an address soon.

Concerning the boys, I'm willing to listen to what you have to say. I will be keeping them with me but if you're interested in visits let me know.

The last thing is that no one knew of my plans. (*Comrade B*) thinks I just got a go ahead on a farm trip. There's no reason for her to think otherwise.

There's not much more to say now.

Regards,

### The Letter Michelle Landriault Left For Edward Pickersgill

Ed —

The letter I wrote to the Collective is true and honest. I am scared — of myself and the role I should be actively playing within the Collective. That letter should suffice for the Collective. But I also have another role — one that has developed — for better or for worse — and that is as your partner or wife.

Obviously, I let you down some time ago. And now I'm letting you down again. In the past it was mainly an unconscious betrayal — I simply couldn't handle the question of sex. But it wasn't

because I wanted to see our relationship end. I just didn't know how to go about building our relationship.

When events were revealed to me last January, I was shaken. All I wanted to do was build our relationship — political, social & sexual — into something stronger and healthier. I've tried from within the Collective but it's not working. So, I'm stepping (running?!) outside the Collective to try and build something new. Something that doesn't have to include the sexual with you.

(*First three lines blackened out by Edward Pickersgill.*) I just can't handle it. I've tried to rationalize the whole thing but I can't from here. Nor can I walk up to you and say it's all over and continue to live & work here. I've got to get off to myself and regain some of my self-respect & confidence. I'm starting in a shameful manner, I know, but because my courage is pretty low.

(*The following two paragraphs — amounting to ten lines — blackened out by Edward Pickersgill.*)

I respect and love everyone here and hold no grudges. I hope (and will work) to make up for my leaving and 'theft' in the future.

You are (*two children's names*) father. They respect and love you and I'll do nothing to discourage that. As I said in my other letter — if visits are wanted I'm sure something can be worked out.

Thanks to you and everyone else for your good help and patience during my illnesses. I know it wasn't easy.

So you know — my parents know nothing of my plans and I expect little help from them. I will keep in touch. The car is at the train station.

Deepest Regards,

Michelle

(*Please turn over*)

One last thing — I have all my clothes packed. They are in the blue steamer trunk in the upstairs hall and my brown suitcase in the blue bedroom. Also my small red trunk has photos and personal papers — birth certificates, my school records & the boys and mementos from travels. You are welcome to go through it if you wish. I've sorted out all the papers & notes to do with collective business — they are on top of the red trunk. If you find anything else — keep it.

My wicker suitcase in the closet of the bedroom is mainly empty. This could be used for the boys' clothing. Their winter jackets can stay behind as they've outgrown them.

Then there's my quilt and the boys' quilts and my winter coat.

I'll send a delivery address and arrange pre-payment for shipping or COD. I realize this may be a lot to ask but I'm going to need everything there.

Again,

Regards,

### Report on Ed's Trip to See Michelle, August 16, 1978

August 17, 1978

Left Guelph in rental car about 10.15 a.m.; arrived (*place name deleted*) at about 4.00 p.m. Found Michelle and kids at (*friend's name deleted*) farm at about 4.20. I was able to speak with Michelle in and around the car in the (*place name deleted*) area for about three hours. Left (*place name deleted*) at about 8 p.m. and arrived in Guelph at about 2 a.m.

Michelle went from Guelph to (*place name deleted*) to (*place name deleted*) to (*place name deleted*) on Tuesday, August 15th. On arrival in (*place name deleted*) it was too late to make the train connection to (*place name deleted*), so she and the kids stayed the night in (*place name deleted*). (I believe they stayed with relatives of either [*friend's name deleted*] family or [*brother's name deleted*] girl-friend's family). On the morning of August 16 they moved on to (*place name deleted*). My arrival was not long after theirs. On arrival in (*place name deleted*) Michelle phoned Guelph and spoke to (*comrade C*) to give the information that they had arrived safely.

Michelle's father is in (*place name deleted*) this week. Her mother is travelling on her own (nobody knows exactly where).

(*Children's names deleted*) were happy to see me and not terribly surprised. The only question they had (both of them) was where the car came from. Michelle agreed immediately to speak with me and was not unfriendly. (*Brother's name deleted*) (her brother) arrived at (*friend's name deleted*) farm about five minutes after me and took care of the kids until shortly after eight. (He drove them around in his corvette and took them out to supper.)

On the morning of August 17 (today) I returned the car to the (*car rental company name deleted*) and phoned Michelle to let her know that I had arrived home safely. (I have been told by [*comrade C*] that Michelle phoned after 10 p.m. last evening to let people know that I was on my way back.)

That is a brief look at the form/perimeters of the trip. I will now take a look at other aspects of the trip.

First and foremost, the two phonecalls (*sic*) by Michelle are a positive thing and indicate that her position in relation to the Collective is positive in the main. That there are also negative aspects is, of course, proven by her leaving on Tuesday, the things in her document and the points which she raised in our discussions in (*place name deleted*).

Michelle has said that she needs time away in order to re-order her perspectives and place her relationship to our work on a more known and positive footing. I believe that she is sincere in this and I believe that the action she has taken is understandable and in the main acceptable. The way in which she stepped away to view her situation is, of course, not the best that we would hope for but it is, in practice, a well-established fact that Collective members have a perception that this is the only workable method of sorting out such major reviews of commitment to the work.

A major part of the contradiction which Michelle faces is the relationship of herself to the leading member of the Collective. This necessarily includes aspects of her relationship to work units, and the leadership unit. It has been pointed out in the past that Michelle has been treated more harshly by me than other people have been treated by me. This is a weakness and mistake in me not in Michelle. This weakness and mistake in me, coupled with Michelle's own weaknesses, has meant that it has not been possible for Michelle to achieve a long-term development and transformation satisfactory to her.

Because it is my treatment of Michelle which is the primary factor and Michelle's reception of that treatment which is the secondary factor, I must and do accept full responsibility for the fact that she has had to step aside in order to view her situation. That I have not intended to mistreat and abuse Michelle is very much a secondary matter. The fact is that I have abused and mistreated her; even treated her with a callousness which is unacceptable in progressive and revolutionary circles. That Michelle has lost perspective of the perimeters of her role and functions is largely due to my failure to deal with those perimeters in which we share common ground.

This is all very relevant to the Collective for I believe that it is the case that this same problem has a corrosive effect in the Collective. In leaving Michelle to her own resources entirely, I have played the full role of personal muse to many other Collective members — sorting out problems for other people to the detriment of Michelle and those other people. On the one hand I been (*sic*) callous towards Michelle and on the other hand I have robbed others of the productive experience of sorting out their own problems. This is not to say that I believe we should refrain from giving advice and guidance — it is to say that in presenting solutions and decisions on a regular basis I have contributed in a big way to the growth of complacency in the Collective.

I believe that the callousness shown towards Michelle by me and the verbal brutality is unacceptable and must be rooted out. This is much more than just a question of my relationship towards Michelle, it is a matter of the relationship between the leadership of the Collective and the members of the Collective. This is the case because of my influence on the perceptions and practice of the other leading member of the Collective. I believe that, while there is often good reason for anger at our mistakes and the influence of the bourgeoisie in our ranks, there is too much taking of "personal umbrage" in the leadership. Whatever amount of this there is must be actively opposed and combatted. No matter how tired we get we must always struggle to apply methods of explanation and persuasion in a friendly, non-sarcastic, non-personalized fashion. We must struggle to educate each other and struggle against our impatience which leads to name-calling and labelling.

As with all things, the relationship which I have with Michelle is a unity of opposites. Two of these opposites can be characterized as "callousness and mushiness". This was pointed out to me in passing during my talk with Michelle yesterday. I knew it was true before it was said but my consciousness of it was not high enough. This very fact was evident in my response to Michelle's leaving (to feel sorry for myself, shed tears from time to time, and generally behave in a non-analytical way). It was also evident in my talk with Michelle. I was, at times, quite sorrowful about the whole situation. I did fight this and speak with Michelle about this. I criticized myself for it then and I do so now. It is unforgiveable to impose such "mushiness" on a comrade.

In the main I did manage to stick to the point and put forward a

clear picture of the best road to take in the future. As I indicated to some other comrades prior to going to see Michelle, I put forward the position that Michelle and the kids should return to this place and carry on with the work at hand. In that, I proposed that Michelle and I start from a new point to build a married life within the perimeters of the Collective work. In essence, I proposed marriage again. In specific form, I proposed that Michelle and I move into a common room on the top floor of (*street address deleted*) and that the kids, (*children's names deleted*), move into an adjoining room.

Michelle's response was that she would consider this very seriously and would let me know by phone call on next Monday evening at about 9 p.m. A time and day when activity on the ten-party phone line would be at a minimum.

This was only a part of her response in our discussion. The main part was that she has full intention to return to this work in the future. Her thinking had been that the way to do this was to separate and establish a new, and far less-personal relation with me, prior to such a return. This, she said, resulted from her perception that I was not interested in having such a personal relationship with her. Again, that such a fear of the leadership exists in practice, must be seen to be mainly a weakness in the leadership and only secondarily as a weakness in the member concerned.

In closing this initial report, I would like to indicate that there is no perceptible danger to our security in Michelle's present activity. That is, no danger which we would not face as a result of any trip away from home by members of the Collective and their children. Michelle's family, except for (*brother's name deleted*), do not know that she is at the farm. (*Brother's name deleted*) knows only that she felt a need to have a holiday. My visit will have been explained as "he was passing through the area and dropped by". In examining her potential patterns in relation to my proposal, Michelle indicated that if she accepts the proposal she will stay at the farm until the weekend of August 26th has ended. That is the weekend of the Bainzite meeting in town. She also indicated that the plans to have a camping trip on that weekend (involving [*comrade B*], [*children's names deleted*] and the [*friend's name deleted*] kids, should proceed as planned). That weekend we are committed to looking after (*children's names deleted*) as (*friend's names deleted*) are committed to attending a wedding.

There is much that needs to be examined yet, of course, and I will attempt to do my part in that analysis. Much of my future documents on this matter will centre on the ideas presented in my document to the Lu Hsun Unit, dated August 1, 1978 and dealing with the need to re-organize and move forward now that we are firmly established in this area.

### A Note Regarding Some Realignments of Rooms

August 17, 1978

I have spoken to (*comrade D*) and (*comrade E*) regarding changing their rooms around. (*Comrade E*) has been aware that he is headed over to (*street address deleted*) at some point and is quite willing to move today or tomorrow. (*Comrade D*) is aware that the proposal by me to Michelle necessitates that she no longer share a room with Michelle. She has agreed to move today or tomorrow into the room at (*street address deleted*) being vacated by (*comrade E*). The only thing of (*comrade E's*) which will not move is the infamous chest of drawers. That will now be used by (*comrade D*).

I will move forward in the immediate future (today and tomorrow) in setting up a room for Michelle and myself and a room for (*children's names deleted*). It would be good to have this done quickly for a number of reasons. First, so that we can get on with the magazine this weekend. Second, so that it is done before (*children's names deleted*) return. Third, so that the re-form of perimeters is set for Ed and Michelle and (*children's names deleted*) prior to the decision on when they return.

There was some discussion between (*comrade F*) and Ed regarding

the possibility of moving (*comrades G and H*) down to (*street address deleted*) — however that room is too small for two adults; the old relations with (*comrade A*) may prove disruptive; being with (*comrade B*) appears to be having a stabilizing effect on (*comrade G*); and (*comrades G and H's*) patterns are probably the least potentially in contradiction with (*comrade B and comrade F*) in the mid and late evenings.

So, in my opinion, the movement of (*comrade E*) was already begun and the movement of (*comrade D*) in concert with that will minimize the disruption and provide a balanced situation with the least possible energy drain.

## Can We Overcome Complacency In Our Ranks And Break Out of Our Isolation?

August 18, 1978

There is a growing sense of complacency in our ranks. This is the case whether we look at the APC, the GCWCRC or any of the assorted designations such as PCC, HRC, GNS, CNS. This does not mean that complacency is the main trend in our work or our organizational structures. However, it must be seen that if we decline to look at this problem then it might well be a fact that complacency is a main trend (or close to a main trend) in our work and our organizational structures.

Complacency (or "going through the motions" & "letting other people decide") is a thing which comes up slowly and with a grinding-down pattern which is "hard to trace". Complacency comes, in part, from too much impatience in the leadership/membership and/or too much patience in the membership/leadership. It is one of those corrosives which, when it has taken root, tends to intensify its own bad effects. That is, when complacency has set in in the membership (for example) this tends to exasperate the leadership into more and more impatience or more and more patience — until the balance between patience and impatience is totally out of sync.

We have spoken before about the need for a correct balance between patience and impatience in our work. Complacency can be said to be the overwhelming dominance of "patience" and the overwhelming subordination of impatience. Complacency is the enemy of revolutionary patience — that combination of patience and impatience which is essential to our work.

Whether we can overcome complacency in our ranks remains to be seen, but it can be said now that we *must* overcome complacency if we are to continue to develop as a revolutionary organization and to carry forward to new heights our anti-imperialist, revolutionary cultural and political work.

Moving into our new and consolidated "base" a bit over a year ago was a good thing. However, that good thing is in great danger of turning into its opposite. The close proximity of work and other aspects of life make it easier to achieve our basic program (in terms of form anyway) and easy to get decisions and guidance and general clarity on specific contradictions. The move which we have accomplished contains definite dangers of isolation and tendencies towards communalism and "in-grown" attitudes.

Certainly it can be seen that our move has enabled us to become far less isolated internationally. Various groups have been assisted by our work and are responding favourably to that assistance. We have to decide whether we are going to be an "assistant-revolutionary organization" or a revolutionary organization. In-grown and isolated we will be able to assist others in other places for quite a long time, but eventually our failure to tackle local and national contradictions will dictate that our assistance to others will never rise above that of "support group" and "sideline pamphleteers".

I have indicated that I think we should examine the possibility of "starting from scratch" by forming a new Collective. I don't think we should rush into this but nor do I think that we should dawdle along looking at the scenery and "having our own thoughts about the world". There is too much to be done to place our collective

energies entirely in the service of rooting out every detail of our individual and collective histories. We have done large amounts of work on this in the last year. The time has come, in my view, to move on.

We have seen a certain development in the past year, but if we are not vigorous we will see that progress dissipate in the midst of general complacency.

It is my view that the APC, PCC, HRC, GNS, CNS, GCWCRC organisms are in drastic need of revitalization and re-organization. It is my view that our new reality (the accomplished move of our resources into one area) demands new organizational forms which have the capacity to grow rather than to regress (due to complacency and isolation).

It is my view that we should examine the possibility of consolidating all of our political organisms into one new organism to be called the Red North Collective.

It is my view that our various social units and community houses should be organized into a new thing to be based on a progressive application of the "co-operative" movement — to be called something like: Guelph People's Co-operative.

It is my view that a new mass and popular organization should be launched which will be called something like: Guelph People's Front.

With these three organisms in existence we will not need any of the present forms (APC, PCC, HRC, GNS, CNS, GCWCRC). In bringing these three organisms into existence we will be able to actively combat complacency and break out of whatever degree of isolation affects us adversely. There can be and should be no *a priori* attitudes towards such a transformation. There should be no one person in any present organism who must automatically and mechanically transfer into any given, or all given, new organisms. That is, membership in the APC should not necessarily dictate membership in the RNC. And, non-membership in the APC should not necessarily dictate exclusion from membership in the RNC.

If these ideas seem to some people to be finalized and therefore "acceptable" or "unacceptable" as presented, then that is a mistake. These are the germs of ideas and they require solid analysis. This can be either relatively short in time or relatively long in time. Whichever is the case (and it can vary from individual to individual) it is important that everyone walk forward on their own strength, so to speak. This should be the opportunity for each of us to set out on a new long march, or not. In the presentation of three organisms (the RNC, the co-op, and the mass level front) there is ample possibility for alignment by each person at a level acceptable to each person's reality (experience and consciousness).

Down with all sacred cows! Struggle to overcome complacency! Transform our Mini-Cultural Revolution into a new Long March!

## An Initial Response to Document by (*Comrade F*) "Getting a point out on the table"

August 18, 1978

The basic thrust of information contained in (*comrade F's*) document/report on a conversation with (*comrade B*), is indeed true. This has indeed been a matter which has weighed heavily on Michelle and under the pressure of which she has finally been forced to take the action of recent days.

I think that a couple of points can be clarified and that then other people should have the opportunity to speak their minds. Naturally I have points to make on this whole question but they will have to wait for another document and other discussions.

As stated almost a year ago, my sexual relations with (*comrade I*) began in the summer of 1975 during the time that I was driving Bains around here and there. It is my recollection that sexual relations with (*comrade D*) began only after we had all moved to (*street name deleted*). Discussions on the question of sex had been initiated by me with (*comrade D*) as early as the time in (*place name deleted*) when Michelle and (*comrade D*) and the kids and I were living there in late summer and early Fall of 1975. This was not then a question of sex-

ual relations between (*comrade D*) and me but rather discussion of sexual needs and interests that (*comrade D*) might have in setting up such relations with someone at that time.

While I was down talking to Michelle a couple of days ago she did in fact tell me that (*comrade D*) had kept a diary in which this information could be seen. Last evening I asked (*comrade D*) if I could see this diary and she showed it to me. I had seen it earlier in the day in order to check out Michelle's information. When I originally looked at the diary I discovered that the diary was of the calendar type, two small pages containing a number of squares indicating the days of the month. The information concerning sexual relations is inscribed in a "code" consisting of a small triangle in the left hand bottom corner (according to Michelle). (*Comrade D*) told me that that triangle had no meaning. In discussion with her (*comrade D*) I pointed out that her diary, even though quite cryptic and mainly dealing with things such as when she washed her hair, did contain a continuum of activities. I pointed out that this was a crutch and a substitute for struggle and indicated an attempt to recollect her identity since some time prior to 1972 (the earliest period at which she began to keep such a diary).

The upshot of this was that I pointed out that whether the triangle in the bottom left hand corner meant or did not mean what Michelle said was not important. That was her perception of the thing, and I pointed out to (*comrade D*) that that was what I believed it to mean also. I pointed out to (*comrade D*) that this was not a good kind of document for her to maintain. That her "journal" should consist in documents and discussions related to the struggles which the Collective faces. I advised her to get rid of the diaries as part of shedding excess baggage. To the best of my knowledge she did this.

In final comment, I have had sexual relations with the three women stated in (*comrade F's*) document and I shoulder full blame for this. If people are interested in further comment from me on this I will be most happy to make such comment.

### Regarding the Question of (*Comrade D*) & Ed

August 18, 1978

Sexual relations between me and (*comrade D*) have definitely occurred and have been traumatic for both of us to a certain degree. In this case, however, it is a fact that most of the serious disruption took place among, at the time, Michelle and (*comrade I*). Now of course, the discussion will involve other members of the Collective.

In the discussion with (*comrade D*) recently, on the question of terminating these activities for a second and final time, (*comrade D*) has expressed regret at the harm this has done to Michelle. I have known for a long time that (*comrade D*) has what is often described as an "open mind" towards sex which is actually, in essence, an attitude resulting from bourgeois cultural aggression (*sic*) on youth. This is a matter which she is going to have to address in some fashion in order to be able to move forward as an anti-imperialist cultural worker.

For myself, I believe that my moving into sexual relationships with (*comrade D*) after my experiences with (*comrade I*) and during the ongoing attempts to sort out my relationship with Michelle, is a classic example of the corrosive effect of the bourgeois pornographic culture. Once the perimeters are gone and the moral standards abandoned there is no level to which an individual cannot sink.

It is with a sense of relief that this matter has been made known for it is a fact that I have not known how to straighten out this whole mess. My attempts to straighten it out have not met with anything other than temporary success. Because there was no real change the bad and corrosive things spread out again.

I discussed with Michelle, on the 16th, the mistake in not organizing to have (*comrade D*) move to another sleeping place when this matter originally came to a head. The line in the Collective that certain social relations (of the sexual kind mainly) were the affair of those concerned made it impossible to deal with this matter in an open way without bringing up a wider variety of individuals' sexual concerns. The ways in which I attempted to sort out my personal

and degenerating life obviously did not work and, arguably, could not work within the framework and norms accepted by the Collective.

Now that this matter has been made Collective business I feel much more able to tackle the contradictions as they appear in Michelle's stepping-aside to get a grip on her relationship to anti-imperialist work and also on the contradictions in society, and within the Collective, which are seen to be "sacred cows" and "untouchable subjects".

I know that (*comrade D*) believes that I have not abused her and in the sense that she enjoys sex she is correct. However, in the real sense, in essence, I have abused her in the same way as the other two comrades with whom I have had these relations. For that I shoulder full blame and commit myself to further attempts to root this degeneracy out of myself and the Collective and ultimately, our society.

### Stories Exchanged Behind Each Others' Backs Lead to Conspiracy and Not to the Positive and Progressive Resolution of Contradictions

August 18, 1978

As I have stated in another document, it is with a sense of relief that I greet the making public of the facts surrounding (*comrade D*) and me. It should be known that the facts presented are slightly garbled and in some places, slightly inaccurate. These inaccuracies however do not detract from the essence of my errors. Even if I had had sex with (*comrade D*) only once it would be a serious error. It should be known that I have not had sex with (*comrade D*) on anything resembling a schedule of twice a week for over a year.

Michelle and (*comrade B*) had a discussion in which the situation of (*comrade D*) and Ed was discussed. I do not fault Michelle for initiating that for I have made myself very difficult for her to talk to, that is obvious. Nor do I fault (*comrade B*) for listening and giving whatever advice was given. I think it would be good, however, to examine the way in which (*comrade F*) has "waited to see if Ed would face the facts". Ed did in fact, prior to going to see Michelle and since returning, encourage people to speak what was on their minds. It is not more important for Ed to absolve himself than it is for (*comrade F*) to wage a vigorous struggle against degeneracy and in support of Michelle. (*Comrade F*) was obviously troubled over the information which he had, to such an extent that he wrote his document in an unusual form, hand-written, and in an unusual place (*street address deleted*). He did so after I had made a point of approaching him and suggesting that if there were any points in my current documents on which he thought I should amplify then he should let me know.

Again, speaking for myself, although the matters at hand are major and somewhat hard to face, I am not scared by them and will not let anything stand in the way of resolving them in a way which is positive and leads to fruitful involvement in class struggle. The contradictions which Michelle and I have faced in the past three years are not the first and nor are they going to be the last.

I contend, for the record, that this is a matter of contradictions among the people — even though of a serious and deep-going nature. That being the case there is no reason for hesitancy and morbidity in tackling the questions at hand. This contradiction comes up from the degeneracy of the bourgeois society, but it has been placed at the attention of the Collective by the leading proponent in the Collective that these matters are not to be dealt with outside of the ranks of those directly concerned.

It is a fact that (*comrade F*) has had extensive discussions with (*comrade B*) over an extended period of time in order to assure (*comrade B*) that he is not and will not follow the same pattern as Ed and have sexual relations with anyone other than (*comrade B*). This was not coupled with an ongoing attempt to root out in Ed the contradictions which were obviously present and which led to the situation with (*comrade I*) which was made known at the beginning of this year, some eight or nine months ago. (*Comrade B*) told Michelle

about these discussions and Michelle told Ed. The main thrust appeared to be that (*comrade F*) felt a need to ensure that (*comrade B*) would not be concerned about his activities — particularly with those women with whom he was working who are not members of the Collective. Specifically mentioned, among these, was (*supporter's name deleted*). The attitude of "letting sleeping dogs lie" and "hoping for the best" from Ed obviously did nothing good for it did not give the opportunity to seriously confront the contradictions at hand. This is a serious error in leadership on (*comrade F's*) part and is rooted in bad attitudes towards leadership, towards revolutionary work and towards which comrades one assists and which comrades one stands aside from. It is a serious example of the thing which other, ordinary, members of the Collective have been criticized for time and time again — avoiding struggle in the hope that things will sort themselves out and the world will unfold as it should.

For (*comrade F*) to carry on an active program of contrasting himself to Ed was not a good thing and will continue to be a bad thing as long as it exists. It will exist as long as it is not rooted out. It is the other side of the coin to that thing identified in many past stages of the Collective's history — holding Ed up as the perfect master capable of all good and incapable of error or weakness. That, in itself, did not cause the contradictions which are being made known by (*comrade F*) at this time, but it certainly did nothing to resolve those contradictions, and can be seen to have an undermining effect on Michelle's capacity to "face Ed rather than run from Ed".

Stories exchanged behind each others' backs definitely lead to conspiracies and to an incapacity to face facts, resolve contradictions and cure sicknesses. Michelle and (*comrade B*) and (*comrade F*) and myself are definitely not the only ones who engage in these conspiratorial activities. It is for various people to decide to what degree and to what effect such conspiracies of silence go on, for they involve individuals who exchange stories and ideas behind everyone else's back — those who do not speak up but have a variety of ideas about what is correct and what is incorrect.

Courage is not defined by the method in which we face the known, it is defined by the way in which we face the unknown. In that, I have been guilty of cowardice in failing to face the consequences of my sexual life. It has been cowardly for me to fall on my face in a degenerating and intensifying quantity of sexual partners. It has been cowardly of me to accept that I have not known how to stop the situation without either hurting the individuals concerned or destroying the work of the Collective.

I do not think that my life is to be characterized as cowardly though. In some part I have been and undoubtedly will continue to be cowardly. But in other (*sic*) part I remain proud of my anti-imperialist cultural work and my contributions to assisting my comrades and people outside the Collective. Others must judge that question for themselves about me and about themselves. That has been true in the past, is true on this question, and will remain true in the future.

### Regarding (*Comrade F's*) Comment on My Document "Stories Exchanged Behind Each Others' Backs Lead to Conspiracy and Not to the Positive and Progressive Resolution of Contradictions"

(*Comrade F*) has said to me verbally, after putting up his note, that he thinks this note (my document) is very low level. On reading his note I would like to point out that I did not mean to indicate that he has had or has considered having sexual relations with (*supporter's name deleted*). That is not and was not my point. My point was and is that these stories are already in circulation. I have not initiated them. Michelle told me on the 16th that (*comrade B*) has informed her of the point mentioned in my document. The other name which Michelle used was that of (*second supporter's name deleted*). At the time I told Michelle that this last name must have come up from discussions which (*comrade F*) and I have had about our thinking that (*second*

*supporter's name deleted*) is making herself available for such activity and must be guarded against. I did not have that discussion with either Michelle or (*comrade B*) and so can only repeat that it appears to me that such names were mentioned between (*comrade F*) and (*comrade B*) in some context. My contention is that these discussions took place within the framework of (*comrade F's*) assuring (*comrade B*) that he was not and would not be following the same path as Ed. I believe that (*comrade F*) has misread my document and is reacting in a spontaneous fashion by accusing me of producing low-level documents. I look forward to his upcoming documents and I will strive, as he has verbally advised me, to keep my documents at a high-level.

### A Final Note For the Day

August 18, 1978

I have begun a process of making copies for my reference, of various documents and notes which are being placed on the wall at this time. It is my intent to show such a set of views and comments as is possible to Michelle on my next trip to see her at her parents' farm. That should be on or shortly after this coming Monday. In this way Michelle will be given the opportunity to participate in these struggles if she wishes and is able. At the same time, and secondarily, she will be able to consider placing in the "record" any clarifications of points on which she has been quoted by either me or others.

For this and other reasons (gone over in quite a detailed way during the course of the mini-cultural revolution) it would be good and helpful if people placed comments and views on separate pieces of paper than the ones placed on the wall. This will make record-keeping more logical and understandable. This is in keeping with the line of standing on one's own feet and not propping one's ideas against those of someone else in order to avoid struggle when the struggle is taking place.

As I have said in another document, I consider the matter which (*comrade F*) has brought up to be one of contradictions among the people. I recognize that is (*sic*) difficult for people to handle the current content of the struggle we face but I seriously continue to look on all members of the APC as my comrades and worthy of treatment with the best possible comradely patterns which I can muster. I urge others to make up their minds (or at least struggle to do so) on whether there is agreement that this is a case of contradictions among the people. I do not look for anyone to smile on or countenance the errors which I have committed and will struggle to oppose any such tendencies which I perceive. However, in this as in other times and struggles, I decline to accept blame for errors, which have not been committed, under the smokescreen that this error determines my entire social being.

Those who feel that I have betrayed them as individuals will act in such a way that I have become an enemy worthy only of suspicion and, ultimately, contempt. Those who feel I have betrayed the Collective will wage, hopefully, an open and knowable struggle against my bad lines. Those who feel that I have committed a serious error, or serious errors, will attempt to assist me to root that out and transform myself. All in all, unless I am seen to be irretrievable and unchangeable, and in the enemy camp, then there should be a campaign to identify the problems which the Collective members have with my practice, circle the bad and cauterize it in the flames of class struggle.

Anything less than this will lead to an air of suspicion and lack of trust in anything to do with me. If there is nothing trustworthy about me and if I am a rotten and despicable character then that should be identified and I should be cast aside. When faced with easy problems it is easy to carry a correct line and project a progressive air. It is in the heat of real class struggle — the struggle between fundamentally opposed class interests — that our strengths and our consciousness of how to struggle are really tested.

Let August 19th Signal a New and Intensely Progressive Assault on Bad Lines in the Leadership! Bombard the Collective Head-

quarters! Down With All Sacred Cows! Struggle to Overcome Complacency! Transform Our Mini-Cultural Revolution Into a New Long March!

## Response to "(Comrade C's) First Statement — Aug. 19/78"

August 19, 1978

First of all it is not good to take the position that "If hasty judgements are made as a result of (comrade F's) document I don't think this is a bad thing." Such hasty judgements will never be a good thing. They can, however, vary in degree of badness. Further, discussion can assist to sort inaccuracies (*sic*) out but discussion does not, in itself, necessarily sort out inaccuracies (*sic*). Class struggle will sort out inaccuracies (*sic*). Discussion is one of the means by which contradictions among the people are sorted out.

I agree that the reluctance on my part to confront the situation outlined in (comrade F's) document is reflected in the reluctance to put forward the situation for Collective knowledge. I will go further than that. It has been my view for some considerable time that the situation could not be resolved satisfactorily and completely without such a complete cleansing of the wound. In the presence of Collective norms governing social/sexual relations there was only the possibility of temporary or partial solutions — unless there was a willingness on the part of some concerned to confront the Collective with information/criticism/self-criticisms in direct opposition to the line that these kinds of things are the affair of those concerned and nobody else.

I am sincere in my criticism and self-criticism of the errors committed by me in this matter and have been unfolding a series of specific criticisms and self-criticisms. I am committed to seeing through to the end, the necessary process leading to transformation.

It should be understood that setting my own house in order before launching attacks on other related bad lines is not possible. It is, in my view, part and parcel of setting my own house in order to exactly attack related bad lines. One of the problems in the past has been the attitude that Ed can (or cannot) explain this one! In this case the time for launching this struggle was not determined by me. It has not been launched in a way that can be described as "progressive". It has been launched in a way that promotes morbidity and lack of enthusiasm and a "sour taste in the mouth". I will do a separate document or documents on this and related points.

The 3-in-1 committee to which (comrade C's) document refers was initiated by me, and that is the main part of my participation in it. As far as I know the conclusion reached in that committee consisted of an agreement by the three people concerned to refrain from sexual relations with me.

I am quite willing to do my best to "tell all", but it would be good first to determine whether or not there are others who are interested in hearing all. I believe, as said above, that I am conducting the initial stages of a thorough-going self-criticism. I encourage, now, as in my other documents on this and other matters, criticism of my practice, including my practice of self-criticism in this matter.

## A Couple of Points Arising From (Comrade F's) "Point of Clarification" Dated August 18, 1978, 9:30 p.m.

August 19, 1978

There is an apparent contradiction between what (comrade F) has said about my reference to (supporter's name deleted) and what I have said Michelle said to me regarding this point. When I made the point I did not stoop to innuendo or slander because I made the point knowing full well that (comrade B) and Michelle are quite capable of clarifying this matter in their own way and would doubtless do so if

needed. I will thus reiterate the point and make it more specific so that if it is a baseless thing it can be so exposed and abandoned (*sic*).

Specifically, Michelle said to me, in the course of discussions regarding sexual relations and the known patterns of interest in having sexual relations that: (comrade B) told Michelle that (comrade F) was concerned because (supporter's name deleted) had broached the subject of sexual relations with him. (Comrade B) then went on to tell Michelle that (comrade F) had assured her that he was not open to such activity and would not be in the future.

As mentioned in my other document responding to this "Point of Clarification" by (comrade F), Michelle also included the name of "(second supporter's name deleted)" in this report on her conversation with (comrade B). Also as mentioned I clarified that immediately with Michelle as being a point I believed to have risen from discussions which (comrade F) and I have had on our perception of (second supporter's name deleted) making herself available. On the question of (supporter's name deleted) I could only and did only say to Michelle that this one was news to me.

I would like, additionally, to address the question which (comrade F) has raised about my informing him of peoples' perception of the relationship between him and (supporter's name deleted). I did this following a discussion which (comrade F) and (supporter's name deleted) had on the front porch, in hushed tones, in the presence of one of the (friend's name deleted) and, later in the presence of (supporter's name deleted). This took place in the late evening after a day of work on the construction at (street address deleted). (Comrade F) informed me that the discussion which he had was (*sic*) (supporter's name deleted) had to do with the work in which she is involved and I believe this to be the case. I knew this to be the case at the time the discussion took place.

I pointed out to (comrade F) that other people did not have a perception of his working and political relationship with (supporter's name deleted) and thus could have no concept of the content of their discussion, nor any understanding of the need to hold such a discussion in hushed tones. I further pointed out, though perhaps not so concisely as I am doing here, that in the absence of such a perception, other people would likely only be able to perceive the existence of a "social/sexual" relationship, which would in turn threaten their perception of (comrade F's) relationship with (comrade B).

The people, then, to whom I was drawing (comrade F's) attention were the other people in the neighbourhood at the time, and not specifically to members of the Collective. In the light of present struggles it can be seen that more communication should have and should take place on the question of contradictions inherent in men organizing women in the present society and at the present stage of our developing consciousness. To take moralistic stances and ride on high horses about ones (*sic*) own purity will not further the struggle.

## Some Thoughts Regarding Accusations Which (Comrade F) Has Levelled at Me Verbally in the Presence of Other Comrades at the Lunch Table

August 19, 1978

(Comrade F) has said that I am conducting a smokescreen campaign on the question of (supporter's name deleted), to obscure the attention of comrades from my own errors and to switch attention onto him. He has accused me of using the tactics of a Nazi propagandist — repeating a lie enough times in the hope that it will be perceived as the truth. He has said that I know how to get under his skin and upset him and that I am doing a good job of putting one over on the comrades of the Collective. He has pointed out that I am the best writer in the Collective and am quite capable of conducting a writing campaign to confuse issues and divert attention from my own errors.

I regret this attitude by (comrade F) and will work hard to make sure that it does not get away unchallenged. It is the case that such name-calling, pleading for support against a "superior" writer, and

top-of-the-lungs shouting is not the way to carry out struggle among the people. If (*comrade F*) is taking the position that I am not one of the people then I most strongly disagree and will continue to attempt to wage this struggle with a calm but enthusiastic state of mind and in an intense and orderly fashion.

My comrades should pay attention to what is in my documents. I cannot take responsibility for perceptions of others at things seen to be implied in my documents. If there are questions along such lines I will attempt to clarify my words and my views further.

### Response to Two Documents by (*Comrade J*) Asking Questions of Me

August 19, 1978

First, the question of your visit to (*comrade I*) in (*place name deleted*). I recollect that it was me who initiated the idea that you should attempt to contact (*comrade I*) during your passage through (*place name deleted*). There were a number of reasons for this which were discussed at the time. First, of course, was the fact that it was you who was passing through (*place name deleted*) and it was in (*place name deleted*) that (*comrade I*) was residing. This meant that the operation was possible, without too much disruption. Second, you had served on a committee of discussion with (*comrade I*) prior to her last departure and it was agreed that this would enable you to pick up threads of discussion of relevance to (*comrade I's*) situation. Third, as a member of the Lu Hsun Unit it was seen that you were responsible enough to make such a contact with (*comrade I*). Fourth, you were asked if you felt able to carry such an assignment and responded that you thought that you were capable of the assignment.

I don't think you were "told" to visit (*comrade I*). Nor do I recollect that the decision was made only by you and I. I will leave it to you to clarify who all was involved in that decision making process.

Regarding the matter of the conspiracy of silence surrounding my relations with Michelle, (*comrade I*) and (*comrade D*) I have contempt for my actions in that whole matter. At the time I was aware that your visit to (*comrade I*), if such could be set up, might well result in your becoming aware of (*comrade I's*) knowledge of the situation. I resolved at the time, as in earlier situations, that this was a matter in which I should not stand in the way of (*comrade I's*) opportunity to speak her mind.

The answer to the questions: "Why was I treated with utter contempt by you? Why was (*comrade I*) treated with utter contempt by you? Why was the Collective treated with utter contempt by you?" is quite straight forward. My line and practice in this matter has been entirely wrong and essentially contemptible. I do not, however, feel that I have acted with utter [*Edward Pickersgill's emphasis*] contempt in the sense that "utter" means "Realized or developed to the last degree; absolute; total — & being or done without conditions or qualifications; final; absolute."

Second, the point about rating (*comrade I*), (*comrade D*) and Michelle on their sexual performance is one which arises from discussions which I had with them in the meeting to set up a discussion group consisting of the three of them. There is a context in which this was said and out of context it clearly raises bogey-men and visions of contemptible character on my part. I did not, then, make the "rating" in the three-in-one committee for I had put to the three that they should take the opportunity to examine the problem without me present to hamper them. In the initial discussion I summed up, or attempted to sum up, some of the concerns which had been discussed prior to the matter coming to a head. That is, with them individually. One of the things which I pointed out was that each and every one of us is troubled by and affected by the bourgeois cultural aggression on the question of sexuality. There is a troubled attitude, generally internalized in the individual about whether or not we are frigid or over-sexed etc. This matter had been and has been discussed in that and other circles in the Collective, mainly involving women comrades (but also, I believe, involving [*comrade J*] in at least one 3-in-1 committee). I said then

that according to bourgeois norms (or at least norms promoted by the bourgeoisie) this was the way in which the three of them would be "rated". I then, and I cannot now say how well I conducted this point, went on to clarify that this method of rating by the bourgeoisie had to do with degree of sexual activity, interest and initiation of the process. I did not then, or now, say that I agree with such a schedule.

In all honesty I did not offer that forward as my own "rating", although it can probably be said that my practice then and since does not warrant a defense on this point. I was attempting to make it possible for these three women to engage in open discussion about the matter at hand. In hindsight, it does not appear that that was a very good point to make unless I was going to remain in those discussions and make sure that the point be examined correctly.

If there are further questions on this or other matters I will do my best to answer them.

### Response to (*Comrade C's*) Document "Let's Stop Beating Around the Bush and Get to the Political Question At Hand!"

August 19, 1978

I am in agreement with most of the points put forward in this document. I have effectively been responsible for creating a conspiracy in the Collective. This is factionalism. It is inexcusable. I have no excuse but I have much criticism to make of this matter.

There are a couple of points on which I think (*comrade C*) should take a second look. The Collective has not "broken up" before. Individuals have certainly left the Collective. You must care about the break up or potential break up of the Collective in order to raise your and other people's consciousness of the contradictions which we all face in this society — the things we must strengthen and the things we must guard against (*sic*). I think that it would be well (*sic*) for an examination to be made of the fact that in the overwhelming majority of cases of individuals leaving the Collective this same question has been either at the centre or hovering close to the centre of the struggle.

On the question of the 3 in 1 being down to 1 in 1 — I contend that this is not the case. The Collective has not moved to formalize the expulsion of (*comrade I*) from the Collective or to accept that her actions constitute an acknowledged and, for the time being, permanent quitting of the Collective. Also, in Michelle's case, I do not see sufficient evidence to indicate that she has actually yet quit the Collective. I do see evidence of her intent to return to the fray and actively combat this error and the mistaken ideas surrounding this whole matter.

I agree that my leadership is in question. But then I also contend that my leadership should have been more in question throughout the history of the Collective.

### Further to Exchange With (*Comrade C*) Regarding - Stopping Beating Around the Bush

August 19, 1978

I did not intend to treat your document lightly. I agree that the political question at hand is that I have been engaging for a rather lengthy period of time in a social practice (degenerate sexual relations) unnecessary and unbecoming a leading comrade and which must inevitably have influenced my practice and leadership negatively. To have taken such liberties with women comrades and to have abused them in that theft, is definitely unacceptable behaviour and outside the norms which we collectively uphold. The whole affair did come from, to some extent, a laissez-faire attitude, and was prolonged by the continued existence of that same attitude. This is a matter of liberalism and of double standards. The activity did go on for too long and it is good that it has been exposed now by Michelle's departure and by (*comrade B's*) resolution that she should pass this information on to (*comrade F*). It is a secondary question,



certainly, to address the question of "trauma" and attempts to avoid "trauma" — but it (*sic*) something which comrades should bear in mind if they wish to assist (*comrade D*) to come to grips with her ideas and practice in this same area. I agree with your sentiment that the only way to stop is to stop, but it is apparent in all of our practice that this is easier said than done. That this is true does not and should not detract from the necessity to tackle the struggle at hand, whether easy or hard, but attention must be paid to which is which.

I know that a door-to-door campaign such as you have described would bring an overwhelming majority of opposition to my practice in this regard. It would be wrong however to take the position that the masses to whom you refer have an advanced consciousness on this matter. They, too, are overwhelmed by the ideas and views of the bourgeois society and the Trotskyite vermin who serve it.

In re-reading your document I see that I did in fact misread your reference to the "1 and 3" committee and the "1 and 1" remaining. These are probably quite good descriptions of the faction concerned.

I will attempt, in a separate document to expand on my views expressed in the sentences beginning "You must care ..." and ending "... centre of struggle."

You are wrong in your contention that the Collective broke up in 1975. It was certainly badly damaged, and it certainly came very close to breaking up but it did hold together in sufficient numbers and with sufficient unity to dictate that it existed through 1975. If you have an explanation for your contention I would be glad to see it, but that might well be off subject at this point.

### Further Clarification of Some Points Made in My Document of Today in "Response to (*Comrade C's*) First Statement"

August 19, 1978

In my document to (*comrade C*) I said: "In this case the time for launching this struggle was not determined by me. It has not been launched in a way that can be described as 'progressive'. It has been launched in a way that promotes morbidity and lack of enthusiasm and a 'sour taste in the mouth'."

It is my view that (*comrade F's*) document and his presentation of it reflect a degree of panic at coming into possession of "hot potato" information, and that he has proceeded in a way which is rooted in his own fear of social/sexual relations and his own history of dogmatism and insularity on this question.

(*Comrade F*) held his information for two days (16th to 18th) because, he says, "I didn't report earlier because I hoped that Michelle leaving and Ed's visit to Michelle would give rise to some addressing of the content of (*comrade B*) and Michelle's conversation." If (*comrade F*) wanted Ed to address this matter (which I do not doubt) why did he not approach me and say: "I think it would be good if you addressed the question of your relationship to (*comrade D*)? Or some such initiation. In the absence of any motion on my part to deal with that matter then (*comrade F*) would have been justified in taking further action. To sit relatively silently and watch for "good behaviour" by others is not the act of a revolutionary and nor is it an act of comradeship. It is the act of a panic-stricken person who feels that their existence has been betrayed by the actions of another person. It is the act of one who has institutionalized in the Collective a posture of dogmatism and insularity on matters of husband and wife relations. It is a direct result of the agreement on which (*comrade F*) and (*comrade B*) returned to membership in the Collective after their year away.

Further, once (*comrade F*) had decided to launch this document, why did he only show a copy of his document to me and not to (*comrade D*) prior to posting it on the wall? This is an example of the double standards in relationships to fellow members of the leadership, on the one hand, and to ordinary members of the Collective on the other. That (*comrade F*) did not consider in

practice the sledge-hammer effect on (*comrade D*) when she walked into the room with other comrades and was confronted with this document is an example of the kind of misleadership and contempt for comrades which is rooted in the leadership of this Collective and on which point struggles have been waged in the past.

Each and every member of the Collective, other than Ed, was given the same sledge-hammer treatment as (*comrade F*) dropped his "hot potato". This is not a progressive style of work and nor is it in the interests of building unity out of criticism/self criticism. This is the case independent of my future in working relationships with my comrades of the Alive Production Collective.

In my view, then, this matter should have been broached first with me (and perhaps with (*comrade D*)) for initiation of struggle. Next, it should have been taken to the Lu Hsun Unit for determination of the course of launching the struggle. Then, and only then, if the process had not moved forward, (*comrade F*) should have broached the subject with the members of the Collective by a direct wall poster. However, even here, preparation should have been done among the members of the Collective so that they not be sent reeling by an unexpected "sledge-hammer" blow. These are the ways of democratic-centralism in action. They are not easy, that is for sure, but they must be gone through, in a step-wise fashion if there is to be scientific analysis and correct criticism/self criticism leading to transformation and increased unity.

For (*comrade F*) and others to take the position in theory and/or in practice that comrades should have "insularity" in their social/sexual relations has been acceptable in the Collective. To turn around now and say that others should live by norms not accepted by oneself is hypocritical and should be rooted out as fully as the contradictions in me in these matters should be rooted out.

I agree with those who now say that this matter should be fully exposed and made a part of the known experience of the Collective, whether or not that process ends for me by expulsion from the Collective. That concerns me but does not petrify me into motionless (*sic*). I am certain that I am capable of transformation on this and other points. I am equally certain that I know of no other group of people other than my comrades of the Alive Production Collective who can assist me in this process as well as my comrades of the Alive Production Collective.

### A Question I Would Like to Ask of (*Comrade H*) or Others

August 19, 1978

In (*comrade H's*) document "Some of my opinions on the present situation" it is said that: "At that time, as part of our investigation into whether there was widespread promiscuity in the Collective, it was asked whether any other 'secret' sexual relationships were in effect which would support the idea of widespread promiscuity. The answer all round was NO."

I would appreciate it if someone could offer the details of this point for I have no recollection of this question being asked — nor any recollection of answering such a question. If there is a situation in which something short of an allround "no" was given then I may well be able to grasp why people (some people) have been saying that I have lied. Again to the best of my knowledge I have not ever been asked, prior to this last couple of days, a question as indicated in (*comrade H's*) document, and have certainly not answered such a question.

### After a Brief Conversation With (*Comrade B*)

August 19, 1978

I have had a brief conversation with (*comrade B*) since her return and have received some further clarification on the question of Michelle's comment regarding (*supporter's name deleted*). I believe what (*comrade B*) says to be true and look forward to her document on this question, which she has said she hopes to put up by this evening.

I have given some thought to the point made at lunchtime concerning my capacity as a writer. There is not too much that I can do to undo that capacity in the brief time during which this struggle has been waged. My writing in external documents and my writing in internal documents is always waged with the best possible strength that I can muster. If people are seeing massive mistakes or minor mistakes in my current writing activities then they should welcome that and use that against my bad lines and my mistakes, both serious and not so serious.

Many times we have been accused of not making the political points clear in *Alive* but carrying, instead, an anecdotal style. Many times we have been praised for this same thing. I support the calls which are being issued for us to get to the political questions at hand but I am afraid that I must do so in the best way I can, and that is in the same style as struggles waged in the history of the Production Collective.

I have, in the past, been guilty in the Collective, of resorting to shouting and name-calling in order to assist in winning struggles. In the main it has been agreed in the quiter (*sic*) moments of the struggle that the points made in loud fashion were basically correct. I have been troubled by this tendency for some time now and have been waging an active campaign to correct that method which I am convinced is wrong and leads only to passivity among members of the Collective. I urge (*comrade F*) to do the same. It is incorrect to shout at comrades, brow beat them and call them names. I have done this and I oppose it in myself.

There are many members of the Collective who are currently of the view that my documents represent a serious attempt to switch the burden of the present struggle off my own mistakes and onto the back of (*comrade F*), the other leading member of the Collective's leading element. I am broaching the points which I am broaching because I think that they must be broached and examined. Although I have committed a major error I do not carry the full responsibility for it. The bourgeois society in which we live and work carries some of that burden, surely. Also, I contend that others in the Collective must step forward to take up their share of the burden — of both the general political wrong ideas and the specific one which is occupying our attention at this time.

As in the past I draw my comrades' attention to the fact that we must oppose the effects of the Bainzites and like scum in our own ranks. Or is it possible that I am the only one on whom they and others like them have had lasting effect?

Let me remind all my comrades of an event in the early stages of our mini-cultural revolution. When I issued my original document on the question of (*comrade I*) I did so a bit carelessly. I left the impression that the sexual relations with (*comrade I*) might well have started during the course of the mini-cultural revolution. In my second document I clarified this and was quite specific about how and when those relations started back in the summer of 1975. On the release of my second document there was a line given and, ultimately in practice, supported by me that that made some kind of a difference. It became, in essence, not so serious because it had been going on for longer than first appeared to be the case. I contend that this line did much to relieve the pressure to fully deal with the situation at hand then and permitted that situation, ultimately, to continue for some time afterwards.

For better or for worse, Collective members then were satisfied to let the matter lapse and to leave it up to the people concerned to sort out. That Collective members did not know the full extent of the matter is not a rationale for letting the matter slide in the hope that it would go away. Is three worse than two? Only in quantity, not in substance or in "quality". It is my view that the current outrage should have been launched in the January-February period and would have been if the line had not been given that: "At first I thought it had begun during the mini-cultural revolution."

I will now make yet another self-critical point. What I have done is wrong and should be thoroughly opposed and rooted out. That I knew it was wrong when I was doing it makes it doubly mistaken — it doubles the error. To make mistakes in ignorance is one thing —

and should not be supported. To make mistakes knowing full well that what is being done is wrong is a very bad mistake. For this I should be doubly criticized. I agree that comrades should not permit themselves to be diverted from their criticism of my errors. The question that comrades must answer, however, is who is responsible for any diversions which have taken place. Is it me for writing extensively and as well as I am able, or is it (*comrade F*) for making a stand in defense of his good name prior to the known arrival home of (*comrade B*) who could clarify the question of gossip about (*comrade F*) and (*supporter's name deleted*).

I criticize (*comrade F*) for his stand in defense of his own good name and point out that his good name is in existence because of his social practice and not because of his words about same. At the same time I criticize myself for leading, over many years, the tendency to make stands in defense of one's good name and to shout and engage in name-calling whenever I found myself unable to clearly put over a position which I knew to be true.

I disagree with those who say that the errors I have made can be fully identified and rooted out independent of those who have stood beside me over the years. More than anyone else in the Collective (*comrade F*) must share the burden of incorrect leadership. But, again, he is not alone in this. Although at times of subjectivity, I must admit that I have preened myself and made much to myself of my contribution to our history, I have not been alone in contributing to either our successes or our failures, our correct ideas or or (*sic*) incorrect ideas.

My criticism/self-criticism campaign will and must continue to deal with my errors but it must not be permitted to become a religious self-confession in which I blame myself for every sin under the sun in order to spare myself from the wrath of the priest. Let the wrath of my comrades come down in full weight but let it not come down, unchallenged, where it is actually being used as an excuse to cover up one's own errors. While I am in the "centre stage" and while the full examination of my leadership and my entire social-practice is underway let it be held up firmly that the process is one of "criticism/self-criticism" as some of my comrades have been pointing out to me.

No matter what names I am called nor what wrong bad things are attributed to me I will not seek for the easy way out of silence and non-participation.

### Response to (*Comrade J's*) Document "Clarification of the Circumstances Surrounding My Visiting (*Comrade I*) in (*Place Name Deleted*)"

August 19, 1978

This is a good solid document. It goes to the nitty-gritty of the matter and draws a correct conclusion about my behaviour related to (*comrade J's*) trip to see (*comrade I*). My view of that trip was obviously entirely clouded by my involvement in the situation and weighed down with my own interests. The circumstances as indicated do indeed demonstrate that I have acted with utter (*Edward Pickersgill's emphasis*) contempt for (*comrade J*), (*comrade I*) and the Collective in this matter, as in others, the details of which are unfolding in a sound way this afternoon.

I welcome this as an indication in practice that the shock, the initial shock, is wearing off, and my comrades are beginning to achieve success in getting to the roots of my errors. It is important to realize that these things in (*comrade J's*) document are not roots, but rather are the surface reflections of the real roots of my errors. A continuing struggle will undoubtedly uncover more and more reflections of my acting with utter (*Edward Pickersgill's emphasis*) contempt for my comrades. My participation in those continuing struggles will determine the degree to which these things are rooted out in me as an individual. Independent of my participation, my comrades of the *Alive Production Collective* should gain valuable new experience and consciousness in these and related (*sic*) matters which will assist in rooting similar contradictions out of

many different individuals and situations.

It is very good to get another perspective on my actions regarding (*comrade J's*) visit to (*comrade I*) and also on his involvement in discussion with (*comrade I*) prior to her leaving for (*place name deleted*).

That I could have sent (*comrade J*), or participated in sending (*comrade J*) on such a dangerous mission scares me not a little bit. I will use that to approach my errors with a more serious intent than it appears I have done so far. In conclusion, I adopt (*comrade J's*) document as my own and will attempt to expand upon it in a useful fashion to the Collective.

### Re. (*Comrade C's*) Reply to Ed's Question Arising From (*Comrade H's*) Note

August 19, 1978

This clarification is welcomed. I do indeed bear the responsibility for any lies which were told as a direct or indirect result of my line that this matter should not be talked about outside the circle of those concerned.

More important perhaps, is the indication, which again I had forgotten, that I suppressed (*comrade J*) at the very moment at which the further involvement by me in sexual degeneracy might well, and quite likely, would have been uncovered and exposed. This is further evidence that I have treated my comrades with *utter* [Edward Pickersgill's emphasis] contempt in practice. This is indeed evidence of selective memory. If my comrades continue to pursue this undoubtedly further evidence will be built up.

As this process continues to unfold I can well see that the earlier comments concerning my documents contain a lot of validity. That I have succumbed to a severe case of selective memory is becoming

### Regarding (*Comrade C's*) August 20 Document Continuing the Exchange Re. Beating Around the Bush

August 20, 1978

It is quite important to have an understanding that the Collective has not broken up in either 1975 or at any other time to date. It is equally important to raise our consciousness of the stresses and pressures which have been exerted on the Collective, internal and external, during its history, some of which have taken the Collective close to termination and/or break-up. Mistakes which individuals have made and mistakes which the Collective has made are impossible to analyze accurately without a gauging (*sic*) of the actual situation in which those mistakes were made. A progressive analysis, a revolutionary analysis, thus is often somewhat tedious and grinding on those involved. Jumping to conclusions and abandoning of comrades in such struggles to grasp reality are very much a part of our experience in the past and will doubtless continue to play a part in our practice for some time to come.

As Chairman Mao has indicated, the logic and practice of the people is try, fail, try, (*sic*) again, fail again until success is achieved. The 3-in-1 committee which was established involving Michelle, (*comrade I*) and (*comrade D*) was indeed, as you point out, one attempt and it did fail. It was not the only attempt, by any means, to sort out the mess which had come up, and to date all attempts have essentially failed. This does not mean that the attempts have ended. In point of fact a new and practical attempt is presently underway and is being considered by Michelle. The fact that (*comrade D*) has moved to another Collective house is also a part of this attempt. I hold more hope for this attempt than for previous attempts because it does much to place the situation, potentially, in a framework where practice can be seen and words can be placed in their correct perspective. By this I mean that the whole situation has resulted in a massive air mistrust (*sic*) and that that very mistrust has played a role in the continuing conspiracy.

I am asked to explain my views on the sentence: "The only possible excuse that you could utter is that you did this for the

more evident. I will attempt to participate in bringing up new evidence on the charges of my treating my comrades with *utter* [Edward Pickersgill's emphasis] contempt. I encourage my comrades not to wait for me to achieve success. Now that the ball is rolling push harder.

In the meantime I will struggle to avoid drawing attention to errors other than my own because the evidence is mounting that this activity is indeed a smokescreen in essence. The nature of my errors makes all others within the Collective pale by comparison. I believe that I have been headed towards unleashing a "moralistic, historical recounting of events and sad situations which so-called justify errors for which there is no justification".

Press on! Dare to struggle, dare to win! You are on the correct track!

### An Untitled Self-Denigration By Edward Pickersgill

August 19, 1978

(Early Evening)

I have responded to the exposure of my social & political errors like a running dog! I have taken on the defensive posture of that little insect with a hard shell, which resembles an armadillo. I have rolled up tight and emitted a series of yelps and protestations designed to create "understanding" & "compassion". This is an obvious fact! Rather than concentrating on my mistakes, which I am capable of doing, I have attempted to snow my comrades under with words, words & more words. There should be a continuing & thorough investigation into the question of the seriousness of my errors and the possibility of my re-education, if any such possibility can be perceived in one who has acted so foully.

benefit of the collective (*sic*) and did not want to see it break up." This sentence from the original document on "Stop Beating Around the Bush" comes up in the context of the conspiracy of silence and the factionalism involved. Concern for the existence of the Collective was a definite part in my attitude that this problem should be kept within the ranks of those directly involved. It was not the only part, and it was not a major part. I have never been committed to the continued existence of the Collective or the Magazine, come what may and no matter what. I have been aware for quite a long time that we must always be open to the possibility of an organizational development resulting from new and higher level political consciousness. That is, despite a fairly strong reluctance on our part in practice, we must face the responsibility to move forward into the posture of being acknowledged Communist revolutionaries — Marxist-Leninists. We are not the first to face the contradictions inherent in living a communist lifestyle (from each according to ability, to each according to need), while at the same time declining to acknowledge that that very practice determines that we are already communists.

No matter whether there were "noble" reasons at the time for the decision to attempt to resolve the sexual problem amongst the four involved, those reasons do not hold as "noble" at this point and will not in the future. The perception of "correctness" at the time was wrong and so it must be seen as an "incorrect position". An incorrect position cannot be noble no matter what motivation existed and no matter what factors governed the taking of the incorrect position.

The question which was being discussed at that time was not whether or not it was correct for one man to have simultaneous sexual relations with three women. This question was raised and was unanimously opposed among the four of us. This question, obviously has not been asked nor answered during the current exchange and struggle. While it may now seem to be a technical question, and of small interest, there was not ever a time when I was having sexual relations with three women at once, or even during the same periods. It is a question of sexual relations with two women during the same period and involving a different

woman other than Michelle at different times.

That this is an unworkable and indefensible situation is determined by the fact that my original self-centred attempts to resolve the sexual aspects of my relationship with Michelle through taking up with a second woman (*sic*). This did not meet with success since my incorrect lines were present in the new sexual relationship. Not seeing the root cause of the failure in my second sexual relationship I terminated same thinking that the dominant aspect of that failure was someplace other than in my own incorrect line. On terminating that relationship with (*comrade I*), I left myself open to and moved into a similar relationship with (*comrade D*) (as stated elsewhere) in the summer of 1977. Again the situation proved to be unworkable and did not solve the contradictions in which I was involved. My solution, at that time, was to terminate the relationship with all three women. That this was not struggled through but simply imposed from above by me meant that the situation at hand was not solved and was simply lying festering, waiting for the conditions to arise in which I would again succumb to my base emotions.

It was shortly after the events of early December, in which I physically abused (*comrade I*), and after the mini-cultural revolution was just begun that (*comrade I*) and I again engaged in sexual activity. It was in the course of this short-lived encounter that she became pregnant. Her pregnancy was not suspected until sometime in January or known until the early part of February. It was on being informed by (*comrade I*) that she thought she was pregnant that I first informed Michelle and (*comrade D*) and (*comrade I*) of that fact that, at one time or another during the previous years, I had had sexual relations with all three of them. This was my first attempt to broaden the base of the people considering the problem at hand.

I did not go to other members of the Collective or to other members of the leadership because I lacked trust in their views on these matters and on their solutions to contradictions inherent in these matters. I attempted over time to gauge (*sic*) the capacity of Collective members to deal with this matter and made the judgement, for myself, that other members of the Collective were not capable of dealing with this matter without some great amount of prior struggle on a variety of points. My judgement in this may very well be a thousand miles off base. Today, given the current practice of most of the Collective members, I would make and do make a different judgement. Whether this is because of the strengthening of the Collective during this year or is simply a different perspective by me on a strength which existed in January of this year, I am not certain. I am sure that other Collective members will be addressing this matter themselves.

When I agree that this activity should have been stopped a long time ago but this is easier said than done, it is a fact. It is easier said than done. The difference between this fact and a sophistic use of the same words to excuse myself may be quite finely drawn. However, essential to a sophistic argument is the consciousness of a lie built into the argument. That is "Sophistry is fallacious reasoning or disputation" — "Fallacious is a thing which is deceptive or misleading. Containing or involving a fallacy. (*sic*) & "Fallacy is an erroneous or misleading notion."

In so far as all that is the case I have been involved in sophistry for quite an extended period of time, leaving misleading notions on the question of my practice, my strengths and weaknesses, all over the place. Thus I can be described quite accurately as a Sophist in this whole matter of sexual relations both with those with whom I was directly involved and with the Collective as a whole.

However, the statement that to stop my sophistry is easier said than done is not a sophist statement. That is my view because it is my view that I am determined to root out this serious error and to move on to higher levels of political consciousness and contributions. If I do not then it will be accurate to say that I continue to be, among other things, a sophist.

It is correct for all Collective members to doubt my words and to mistrust my practice. It is my practice which will determine my intent and capacity to change, not my words. My words will regain

credibility based only on my transformed practice. That is why I intend to wage a concerted attempt to transform myself in practice and not just in words.

When I mentioned the effect of the Bainzites and other scum in our ranks I was referring to (*sic*) the Collective and not specifically to the masses. I know that the Bainzites have little influence or effect among the masses but their class brothers do have massive effect among the masses (negative and positive). By negative and positive here I mean that there is a great recoiling away from communist ideas by the masses because of the historic effects of revisionism (including the bananas of the various Trot sects). I mean also that in many circles the revisionists and social-democrats hold great sway and control over the only existing organizations and institutions of the working masses. In this way these scum have positive effect (direct effect) on the masses and negative effect (indirect cause of passivity) on the masses. Of course from our point of view the above mentioned positive effect is a negative thing for revolutionary change, and the negative effect is a potentially positive thing if we can demarcate ourselves from these scum and educate the masses about the real revolutionary alternatives.

My reference, then, was actually back to an article which was published in *Alive*, during 1976 I think, warning us to watch for and guard against the effects of Baizite (*sic*) Cleftism in our own ranks. It is my view that then and still, too passing an attention has been paid to this. My situation is one point of reference in this matter. The situations of each of Michelle, (*comrade D*) and (*comrade I*) are a second, third and fourth point of reference in this matter. The faction of Me (*sic*), Michelle, (*comrade D*) and (*comrade I*) is a fifth point. Michelle, (*comrade D*'s) and (*comrade I*'s) situation presents a sixth point. Michelle & (*comrade D*) a 7th. Michelle & (*comrade I*) an 8th. (*Comrade D*) & (*comrade I*) a 9th etc. etc. There are many many more points of reference to which we must pay attention and in paying attention to them we must sort out their varying degrees (*sic*) of importance (correctness and incorrectness) and learn from them.

There has come up, among the members of the Collective, a concern that an incorrect verdict has been taken against (*comrade I*). I do not agree with this. Even though it has been said that her relationship to the Collective has been determined in practice and to say otherwise is "academic" I continue to contend that the Collective has demonstrated weakness and errors in not formalizing a Collective posture on (*comrade I*'s) relationship (*sic*). The actual known posture is that (*comrade I*) was given the option of getting back in touch with the Collective after her baby was born. Presenting these weaknesses and errors in a (*sic*) analytical alignment with the serious errors I have committed will indeed make them pale by comparison. However, my serious errors do not eliminate these other errors, nor do they excuse them. The degree to which my practice has affected these other and Collective errors, if understood and dealt with, will strengthen the Collective and undermine, if not eliminate, tendencies to employee mentality and reliance on a "perfect master". These tendencies have been real and continue to be real in the Collective. If these tendencies are not fully grasped and rooted out then this Collective will definitely fail in its tasks and responsibilities to the anti-imperialist revolution.

Again, when I said that stopping this error is easier said than done, I did not intend to be understood as saying it is an impossible thing to stop. It is entirely possible to stop in practice. That is being attempted and in my view will be accomplished. The theory of the thing, however, will take longer and be harder to root out. This, too, however, is possible, and will be attempted and will meet with success.

Regarding points in two further documents by (*comrade C*) I continue to appreciate his and other comrades (*sic*) pursuit of this matter. My responses to documents from various individual comrades are partially direct responses but are mainly documents to all the comrades who are reading them. When I said: "Press on! Dare to struggle, dare to win! You are on the correct track!" I was not speaking to an individual but to the Collective and the various individuals in the Collective.

## Re. (Comrade G's) Document of August 19

August 20, 1978

(Comrade J) has pointed out that I have failed to respond to this document and has further pointed out that this is an important document which sums up many of the political issues arising out of the current struggle.

I did not mean to ignore this document by (comrade G) and criticize myself for letting this amount of time pass by without responding. This is not the only document to which I have failed to respond. I believe that the other person whom I have ignored in this current struggle is (comrade D). She has three documents on the wall and I have responded to none of these. I will do so and also to (comrade J's) latest document. If there are others that I have missed or miss in the future I look forward to hearing about this in no uncertain terms. It will be good to pay attention to any developing trends on my part to miss certain kinds of points or documents.

I agree with (comrade G's) document and with the applicability of the quotation from Chairman Mao. In the light of (comrade F's) document and the enormity of the error on my part which he had suddenly and surprisingly been loaded with it is fundamentally true that my criticisms of (comrade F) were incorrect and used as a smokescreen to divert attention from my own errors. This despicable performance will live on my record for all time and can only be outweighed by a better performance, not eliminated from my history ever in any way or form. My attempt to howl that my error is in any way similar to any theory or practice by (comrade F) was and is and will always be despicable. That that was not my conscious intent is not important for my conscious intentions in this whole matter have proved to be rife with error and mistaken analysis — leading to extremely unscientific methods of resolving contradictions at hand — which have in turn led to placing comrades in very bad and even, personally dangerous situations.

I most fervently agree that this is not simply a matter of sexual degeneracy and mistaken ideas in one field. There are undoubtedly many other areas in which my hesitancy to struggle has manifested itself and retarded the growth of the Collective and the fruitful motion of the Collective's work.

I join (comrade J) and (comrade G) and the other comrades who have so stated their agreement, in adopting (comrade G's) document as my own and I will do my best to reverse my appalling behaviour and reinstate myself as a positive member of the anti-imperialist revolutionary ranks.

### Response to (Comrade J's) Document of August 20th Titled: "Re. Ed's Response to (Comrade J's) Document 'Clarification of the Circumstances Surrounding My Visiting (Comrade I) in (Place Name Deleted)'"

August 20, 1978

Given the things which you and others have pointed out and given the facts of the situation it is quite understandable that you are thoroughly unconvinced of my sincerity. The only way that I can, if ever, reinstate my trustworthiness is in social practice — not in words. I realize that at this time words are required of me and I will continue to do my best to make them clear and truthful. At the same time I reiterate that it is only my social practice which will prove my worth and my capacity to transform myself.

On your three points, then, I will deal with points one and two in practice by addressing the question of (comrade G's) document and by addressing the question, specifically, of my abysmal treatment of my comrade, (comrade F). The first point has already been dealt with and the second will be dealt with immediately following this document.

Regarding your third point:

I think it is good that you know that there is no degree at the end of this struggle. No "Bachelor of Investigation". However, I think that you are missing a point of value here. There is experience to be

gained and there is a new level to be achieved through the struggle. There is a new degree of consciousness. Perhaps you would be well to consider that in this struggle as in other struggle, you can achieve a higher and higher level of competence as a People's Investigator. I do not mean to make light of your point. I take it seriously. Your very membership in the Lu Hsun Unit must be seen as a reflection of achieving a degree of consciousness and positive practice worthy of title and respected in its conferrance (sic).

On the other aspect of your point three, that which deals with my willingness to lead [Edward Pickersgill's emphasis] in exposing the roots of my errors, I also agree and will work hard to lead in this. That you and others have been working collectively in this matter, under (comrade F's) leadership is a good and apparent thing. Obviously, despite all of my wishing and longing to play a leading role in this matter in the past couple of days and, believe it or not, in the past months and years, this has not been translated into a willingness. For if there was a willingness then successes would be within reach. I believe that my "willingness" is being established in reality. Your verdicts on this, and the verdicts of my other comrades, will be based on my proof of this in practice and not by my words.

### Criticism of My Treatment of My Comrade (F) During the Last Days, Months and Years

August 20, 1978

When (comrade F) showed me the document which he had written on the question of Michelle's departure and on the question of my sexual relations with (comrade D), I panicked and began an immediate campaign to blame the speaker in order to ignore his words. (Comrade F) has never done anything to me or to anyone else to warrant the way in which I responded to his document. The litany of my errors and abuses of this comrade would doubtless have been longer than it has been if he and my other comrades had not rallied to oppose my practice. I know that the comrades of the Collective have not "rallied to one leader in order to stand against the other". The developing struggle and the care with which it has been unfolding has, in the main, been of the highest level and has stuck to the point at issue with courage and proud determination. I have not been the moving force in this good behaviour I have been the opponent of it. I am working to change in this but am quite willing to accept that even now I cannot be said to have changed. Only my practice can define that change or lack of change and only in the course of time will such practice become identifiable and traceable. Traces of it, if any, at this time are obviously too minute to draw conclusions. What is in my head is in my head and nowhere (sic) else yet in this matter of change.

What can comrades see in my practice at this time? Shame! I am ashamed of the way I have acted. I am ashamed of the way in which I have held back from struggle in these past days, months and years. I am ashamed of my behaviour in not trusting my comrades to sort out, or assist in sorting out, my mistaken ideas and practices as you have trusted me to assist in sorting out your mistaken ideas and practice. By placing myself above and beyond the scope of known methods of solving problems I have brought disgrace on myself, on my comrades and on this Collective. Thus I have done far worse than endanger some comrades and mislead all comrades, I have endangered and failed to lead in the anti-imperialist revolutionary ranks. Because I have had mistaken ideas on sexual/social relations and because I have not trusted my comrades I have failed to take up the challenges of external organizing, have played the role of a great god who can go into a situation with (comrade F) and give great words of wisdom from on high. I have permitted (comrade F) to do the donkey work in external work and then I have paraded as his better. I have actively participated in the creation of this illusion and I am ashamed of it in the full measure of the word as put forward by (comrade E) in one of his documents.

I was surprised, at first, by the intensity of the class hatred which

was evident in (*comrade F*) towards my errors, including my error in not dealing with my errors. The compounding of mistakes is a well-known tendency among liberals, sophists and other cowards in general. Such despicable behaviour deserves the most forthright presentation of class hatred. We do not deal, in this revolution, with people's so-called "good intentions" we deal with facts. On the basis of the facts (*comrade F*) put forward his document of Clarification. On the basis of facts he fervently and ruthlessly opposed my dispicable (*sic*) behaviour. I believe that he would have done so whether or not my smokescreen had been directed at him. I do not question his motivation and I condemn my attempts to characterize his class hatred for my line and my errors as a "defense of his good name". That slander by me was just a further attempt to deflect burden (*sic*) of the struggle away from (*sic*) and place it on anyone else at all. My comrades should understand that it is almost by sheer coincidence that I did not then start to bring everybody into the smoke. This is proved by my later practice and documents in which I believe that I have imputed blame on anyone I could think of, ignored certain documents, and sat by myself for long periods of time trying to figure out how to carry on the struggle — all quite independent of my comrades.

My treatment of (*comrade F*) in response to his document is a direct result of my practice involving him and others over the months and years. It did not suddenly spring into existence when he showed me and then posted his document. Without a shadow of a doubt, thorough investigation will show that my attitude of contempt for (*comrade F*) goes back a long time and is rooted in the class oppression and its effects on me from a very early time. That (*comrade F*) has risen above this in this struggle is clear and it is something of which the Collective can be proud and will be proud.

I agree with (*comrade F's*) characterization of my practice as that of a Nazi propagandist. I do not believe that I am a Nazi but I now realize that that was not what was said. Caught in a massive lie I immediately took up further lies. I began to echo rumours and slanders which I had essentially been responsible for in the first place. It is my practice which has given rise to the perception that (*comrade F*) and others are capable of or subject to the social degeneracy and political mistakes which I have institutionalized in the Collective. In attempting to ignore this and eventually to cover this up I have participated in the spreading of the most gross "big lie".

There is an essential difference between the way I have faced the contradictions in social/sexual relations and the way in which my comrades have done so. I have abandoned the struggle to resolve these contradictions within the actual organism and have created other organisms within which, essentially, I could have my own way and essentially, avoid the struggle which all of the other couples in the Collective have faced and continue to face. There is no similarity between what I have done and what my other comrades have done, as I have so rottenly implied in other documents.

When (*comrade F*) originally and forthrightly accused me of acting as a Nazi propagandist I did not face the fact of what he was saying nor the justness of his words. I, classically, and completely, focussed on the point that he had shouted. What a despicable act by me! I continued my self-righteous rejection of (*comrade F's*) just accusation for some time afterwards and this is reflected in my acts and in my documents. I have failed to deal with my treatment of (*comrade F*) in a direct and principled way because I have been unable to face the fact that I have acted as a Nazi propagandist. Distaste with the words has deflected me from the fact that that has been my practice. I confront them, the words, and it, the fact, now. I have acted as a Nazi propagandist and that is a signal of the depths to which social degeneracy is capable of dragging any one of us. For all my words and struggles in the past, then, let it be known that I have proven most roundly and completely the truth in the Collective's line that flight from struggle leads to any depth and will lead to the ultimate depth of social degeneracy — which is not the personal bad acts (affecting oneself and some other individual participant) but

tars with the same brush those who have fought against and succeeded in resisting the bourgeois cultural and political aggression whose end point is Nazi culture and Nazi society.

I salute (*comrade F's*) opposition to my line and my errors. I salute the opposition he has led against me! I salute my other comrades who have joined (*comrade F*) in this struggle and accepted his leadership! I salute the Collective and its strength!

I criticize now and will criticize for the rest of my life, my behaviour in practice and my theories which have guided that practice in this whole matter which has broken loose. Like a festering boil first pierced the mess is intolerable and the stench is unbearable. That it has been pierced for the Collective I am certain and I look forward to an increased quality of contribution to the anti-imperialist revolution by the Collective in whatever form it is determined motion should proceed. That it has been pierced in me by the Collective under (*comrade F's*) steady hand is also certain to me. My practice now and in the future will permit others to make up their minds about this.

At this stage I do not have a good grasp of what should be done about me. I am sure that this is a question which weighs heavily on the Collective.

This criticism of my treatment of (*comrade F*) can and should be added to. I will attempt to do this but I could do with further advice from my comrades in this continuing struggle.

### Further Evidence of the Effect of My Abdication of Leadership And Its Bad Effect In Our Anti-Imperialist Cultural Work

August 20, 1978

One of the contradictions which is associated with the gross errors I have have (*sic*) committed in social/sexual relationships, is the thing identified as Bob Harris. In all things there is a unity of opposites. Chains! is a thing and Bob Harris is the thing mainly responsible for producing it. There are unities of opposites in each of Chains and its author. That subject can be examined at length elsewhere by myself and by others. However, my abdication of leadership has had noticeable and now identifiable effect on the progress of the writing of Chains.

As the development of the novel has approached closer and closer the point at which the social relations of the characters must be developed in a deeper way than a mere literary presentation of their public practice, the chapters have come more and more slowly. This has happened to the point where the novel has effectively ground to a halt. That this has happened has been variously been (*sic*) blamed on the author being overworked, the ideas somehow being hard to come to grips with, etc. etc.

It is obvious now to anyone in the Collective who cares to look that the reason Chains has ground to a halt lies squarely and simply in the fact that its author has ground to a halt in the face of the very social and political problems which have come close to destroying him and those around him.

I take the grinding to a halt of Chains as some small evidence that I have not been willing to forge ahead and consciously mislead my comrades and people in wider circles who are somewhat fanatical followers of Chains. At the same time I must bear full responsibility for setting up a climate and a readership for which I have been unable to deliver the goods — due to my own personal cowardice and my own involvement in the very lifestyle which the characters in Chains (the heroes of the story that is) oppose with every fibre of their being.

The current struggle, if it is continued, will lead, among other things and places, to a continued successful development of Chains. The current struggle, if I fail in my part, should probably lead to the early conclusion of Chains with a chapter in which the meeting which is currently underway gives rise to an intent to struggle onward and face the challenges of the new day. This is an acceptable literary device, and people will remember it from the

story by Bulosan which we published in *Alive* and under the *Tabloid Books* logo.

In the current struggle, then, I offer this. My abdication of leadership and my falling into the depths of degeneracy have led to the brink of the death of *Chains!* as an educative tool and a revolutionary piece of literature. In this struggle I commit myself to such resolution and such transformation that will benefit the readers of *Chains* and the readers of future works by characters such as Bob Harris. Let, for what it is worth to insiders, it be known that I consider Bob Harris to be another in the long line of comrades for whom I have shown utter contempt.

### Some Thoughts Arising From Three Documents By (*Comrade D*)

August 20, 1978

These are the last documents for me to approach to date. They are dated one on the 18th and two on the 19th. I think that there is an obvious reason why I have failed to respond to these documents. They come from a comrade whom I have obviously felt was not a threat to my bad lines during the initial stages of the current struggle.

When (*comrade F*) correctly accused me of Nazi propagandist tactics it was (*comrade D*) who rose to my defense, or attempted to do so. Given the kind of misleadership to which (*comrade D*) has been subjected by me and the abuse which she has been subjected to by me there was no way that she could immediately grasp that what (*comrade F*) was saying was true.

(*Comrade F*) recognized, when he launched this struggle, that it would be a struggle potentially quite different than any others in the Collective history. He said that he expected there would be a struggle of some magnitude but had no expectation that I would launch such a despicable and slick diversionary campaign. He correctly, and obviously quite promptly, recognized that I was not headed for criticism but was headed for rationalization and justification.

He was correct when he identified me as the best writer in the Collective and he was correct when he analyzed that this meant trouble, **BIG TROUBLE!** [*Edward Pickersgill's emphasis*] This is precisely the problem which we have faced in the past and currently in confronting other cultural workers in the world (*sic*) who are in direct and indirect service of the bourgeoisie ... they are good and slick. They were not born that way, but nor were they, at least not all of them, born into the enemy camp. An uneducated and illiterate cultural worker is not of much use to the bourgeois nor of much threat in cultural work to progressive and revolutionary cultural workers. An educated, conscious, highly competent cultural worker is of great use to the bourgeoisie (particularly one who has a name and a reputation in the progressive circles). (*Comrade F*) and the Collective were faced with the incontrovertible fact that if I was not ruthlessly opposed I would turn out to be not just an internal problem of great magnitude but also a great problem for the anti-imperialist revolutionary forces in general, and, to some degree or another, throughout the world. The crisis was upon the Collective and the opposition had to be firm and unmerciful. No superficial identification of my errors could be permitted — either my errors of sexuality or, more importantly, my errors of political opportunism and turning like a piranha on my comrades.

(*Comrade F*) showed great revolutionary grasp of strategy and tactics by identifying the danger to the Collective inherent in the situation of my turning my writing skills loose against the Collective. This was not a concern about some future act on my part, it was a real concern about my practice at the time. It was correct for (*comrade F*) to accuse me of Nazi propaganda tactics for that is what was happening. It was also correct for him to identify his weakness in the struggle given that "Ed knows him" and "knows how to get under his skin". This was exemplified at the time by the way in which he was driven to anger expressed at a time when that was not his intent. That is, his anger was sparked by me.

He received support in this from one of his comrades who warned him not to play into Ed's hands.

It is a correct Marxist-Leninist strategem (*sic*) to withdraw from a battle a battle (*sic*) in which one is badly outnumbered or outgunned and to begin a campaign (*sic*) of nipping at the enemy's heels. (*Comrade F*) displayed in practice, an excellent grasp of this. I reacted as an enemy of truth, of my comrades, of the Collective and of the Revolution. (*Comrade F*), in turn, correctly identified the danger of my force and led a campaign to educate the Collective while at the same time attack my bad lines. Nothing has been said in that campaign to impune (*sic*) my character where that was not deserved. The struggle by the Collective has been waged well and correctly. The struggle by me has been waged incorrectly and with the desperation of a dog that has fallen in the water and doesn't like being beaten further.

In this case it is not for my comrades to stop beating this dog who has fallen in the water. It is for me to stop being a dog!

In one of (*comrade D's*) documents she says: "I disagree with the line that someone who has made an error, even a serious error, automatically surrenders their right and responsibility to criticize errors in others." This is a wrong position to take. In this case, and in others in the world which are of such serious nature, the maker of the serious error must forfeit the right to criticize errors in others and must re-earn that right through sufficient self-criticism and transformed practice to re-establish trustworthy relations within which such criticism falls on fruitful soil. Who wants to know about my "criticisms" of errors in others when my own errors are so immense as to colour my entire view of the world in a wrong way. I don't! You shouldn't. The emphasis must be on my self-criticism, on my transformation from dog into revolutionary man.

In another document, (*comrade D*) says: "There was nothing so dramatic as an oath of secrecy." It is a fact that I initiated the discussions at that time and that I was instrumental in promoting the idea that this matter could and should be settled by the four people directly concerned. It is also a fact that at that time any suggestion which I made would be taken as a correct line. It is in essence, a fact, that what existed was an "oath of secrecy" which was part and parcel of a "conspiracy of secrecy". My lack of responsibility in that matter and occasion is proved graphically by the way in which I set the boundaries of the committee and then departed to carry on with so-called more important work. What I did was institutionalize a faction which I had built up over a period of more than two years and through the misuse of my position in the Collective, ensure that no real solution could be found to the problems at hand. My practice predetermined the failure of the committee. My abdication of responsibility then continued from similar abdication in the months and years prior to that time and echoes hollowly down to this day.

### Whatever Happened to John Burnley? I Slit His Throat and Cut Him Off At the Knees

August 20, 1978

Is it possible to be a social degenerate and effectively attack the social-degenerates of Bainzite Cleftism? No! Obviously not. How can we know this other than in theory or in sentiment? Just take a look at the sad case of John Burnley!

John Burnley originally wrote a short story in which the leader of Bainzite Cleftism was upheld as a revolutionary. Following our recognition of the real nature of the Bainzites and our split from them we launched a concerted and protracted attack on the Bainzites led in print by John Burnley. For a long time that attack waged (*sic*) and was successful but then a point was reached wherein we must move forward for the majority of points had been made and remade sufficiently for us (*sic*) set that rotten organism of Bainzite Cleftism aside from our main focus and begin full struggle with the various questions from which the Bainzites had diverted us. Did John Burnley survive the transition? It would appear not!

He has ebbed out of sight. Why, because my social practice has effectively slit his throat and cut him off at the knees.

His voice and his footsteps forward could not be effective unless I split with my own rotten social degeneracy and drastically split with the effects of Bainzite Cleftism and its predecessors on my own practice. It should be noted that the one task which John Burnley failed to take up was a criticism of THE SHOE [Edward Pickersgill's emphasis]. Why? Now we can see that to do so would launch an internal struggle in that thing of which John Burnley is a part. It must, if it were done, lead to theoretical struggle with the question of vanguard politics and revolutionary leadership.

John Burnley approaches death at the same point as Bob Harris! The very same point. Identify the wrong but fail in developing its opposite! Both John Burnley and Bob Harris have been hamstrung (crippled and disabled) by my unwillingness and incapacity to change myself.

For one person to be responsible for such an utter contempt for John Burnley and Bob Harris is akin to becoming Jack the Ripper or some other Hitlerite murderer.

The effect of my errors, then, has not just been one of social degeneracy. It has not just been a question of me and some of my women comrades. It has been a series of errors involving women and men, real and pseudonymed. It has let the Bainzites off lightly and it has damaged the Collectives (*sic*) capacity to organize new people. It has done real and deep damage to individuals that can be seen. It has done real and deep damage to revolution and the development of revolution in places we and (*sic*) may not ever know. How many people have been caught up in the words of Burnley and Harris and then gone passive as I slit those two and cut them off at the knees? These are crimes for which I will always be held responsible and which will always be on my record! I will not forget them. I do not want anyone to forget them. My comrades will never forget them nor ease their vigilance against my errors and my weaknesses. Let the situation never return when my words are viewed with a casual attitude and with complacency.

### And Then There's the Mysterious Question of Whatever Happened To the Editor of Alive Magazine — One "Edward Pickersgill"?

August 20, 1978

At this stage I think it would be good to examine the case of the third member of the writing trio of Burnley, Harris and Pickersgill. My social degeneracy and political errors has (*sic*) certainly turned my own name into a "pseudonym" in essence. I have not been able to speak in my own voice because I have been severely alienated from my own body, from my own thinking processes. The fact that I have not been able to speak out in my own voice can be attributed to the fact that I have been living in fear of discovery in my social degeneracy. How could I possibly be free-wheeling and articulate when at any moment a voice might ring out from the crowd: "Shutup (*sic*) you degenerate! Who in the hell are you to talk about what's good and bad in the world?"

The "conspiracy of silence" then, one can see, extends further than it at first appears. First I lost my own voice, then I lost the Burnley voice and finally I lost the Harris voice. Strike one, strike two, strike three you're out and exposed!

This loss of my own voice (essentially the same throat slitting and knee cutting process as identified with Burnley and Harris) has had a very bad effect. The editor of Alive has been mystified and placed on a plateau. From time to time words are written and passed off as a speech or portions of a speech by the editor of Alive Magazine. This happening really only when the Collective members are so impressed with what is being said (that is not meant sarcastically) that they adopt them as their own and agree to or urge the words forward as if they were their own.

The mysterious disappearance of the editor of Alive Magazine from the pages of Alive Magazine and elsewhere is directly

attributable to the same social degeneracy and political errors which are so correctly under ruthless fire today by the Collective. Thus we can and should add the disappearance of the editor of Alive Magazine to the list of victims of Edward Pickersgill, social degenerate and political opportunist (*sic*). This is another crime in the long list for which I must pay and which must never be erased from my record.

### Copy of My Letter to Michelle Made at Her Suggestion for Presentation to Others Involved

Tuesday, August 22, 1978

Michelle,

I know you and love you as a gentle and caring woman of strengths and weaknesses. I know also that you are a woman of both courage and fears, and that overwhelmingly your life as I have known it has been one mainly of courage. The degree of one's courage is measured in and defined by the way one's fears are faced. In that, it is not now a question of your fears rising to dominance over your courage — rather, against overwhelming odds of silence, insularity and dogmatic, xenophobic programs, you have stepped aside to the only real place from which you can view the whole situation. Though there are weaknesses evident, as you have indicated, your posture is not [Edward Pickersgill's emphasis] hypocritical. If anything, to have remained in the other situation would have been hypocritical — growing more and more so with the passage of time. To try to confront the complex contradictions there would have been most difficult and messy — resulting, among other things, in a potentially, and quite likely, devastating situation for (*children's names deleted*). The insularity, silence, and xenophobia has had its effect on us all, and its influence on your own consciousness and reasoning capacity could have led to anything at all. Not ready and unprepared for taking a good shot at the struggle you did a well-considered thing in setting out to start from scratch. You have begun to do the thing which I am speaking about doing. In that you are a full step ahead of me. I want, need, to come back alongside you, to stand shoulder to shoulder again and to start from scratch with you again. This time we have, will have, a wealth more experience and a profoundly raised consciousness on the need for building known and responsible unity in practice.

It is said that the logic of the bourgeoisie is try, fail, try again, fail again till their doom. It is also said that the logic of the people is try, fail, try again, fail again until victory and success is won. In some things I have proved myself to be a fast and good learner. In other things I have proved to be slow and reluctant. I feel very strongly that I have learned a very important lesson in this thing which has happened to us and in the thing which is happening still, in Guelph. I don't mean this superficially. The lesson that I have learned is this: when one has contempt for oneself and one's own history then that must be accompanied by a contemptuous treatment of the things one really and truly loves. I have treated you contemptibly and placed you in untenable circumstances more and more as I have been raised as a model to follow. My every act of contemptible behaviour has been designed, I believe now, to drive you away from me. I have needed you to love me and to work with me but I have not been able to believe that you could possibly love me nor willingly work with me.

In losing my bearings, my perspectives, my roots — in becoming more and more alienated from my own being — I have permitted myself to develop an extremely one-sided and singularly bad idea of myself. This has exasperated a situation which already existed from various struggles lost, poorly waged, long before the Collective came into existence. A tremendous shock has been administered to my system in the past week. That shock has been of two parts. First, you left in the way that I had come to expect and dread that you must. Second, I have been turned on by the Collective members in a most complete way, in which, initially at least, I have been painted all black or overwhelmingly black (rotten). I know that this will most likely change again and that in



that change is a great danger that the complacency will again grow strong.

You have not acted mechanically in your current action and nor have you been caught up in playing some dogmatically perceived role from some melodrama, whether home-grown or perceived in a book from China, or some other locale where socialism is already established. The opportunity is obviously there and you are, equally obviously rejecting it. For that I salute you and my respect for you is deepened even more.

I do not see my own "starting from scratch" as being identical to yours — although we have many common points of reference. Thus I agree that I must return to Guelph for at least some period, or periods, of time. You have advised me to get rid of my accumulation of papers and associated encumbrances. I agree that this is essential. You have advised me that I must conduct struggle in Guelph as best can be done for the things which I, we, believe in. I agree with this also and I hope that you will continue to advise me for your advice is needed and appreciated. I need to do the things you have pointed to and will do my best to accomplish them.

But I need two other things as well. I need to restructure my life so its insularity and complacency is broken down and I need to start to rebuild our relationship, our marriage, and our parenthood. I cannot permit a re-establishing of a complacent attitude towards my leadership in the Collective or whatever grows out of the Collective. At the same time I cannot hog your life or restrict your growth — for that is a very different thing than the kind of unity we should have. Can both of these be accomplished? Yes. If we set our sights and pay attention to the whole situation.

Many couples are faced with the situation in which, for one reason or another, the husband works away from home and comes home as frequently and as regularly as possible. For me to spend 3½-4 days a week in Guelph over the next six months or so and a "three day weekend" at home with you and the kids would not be an

unusual situation in the real world. It would mean that I could have a hand in things in Guelph to see if they acknowledge the thing you have said — that they and the work need me for a while yet. It would mean that our marriage could move forward at a pace which would not overwhelm you and in a framework from which, after an agreed upon period of time, we could rearrange things in the world if we saw fit. By that I mean that we could live together in full married life closer to the place of work we both want to do — whether that be Guelph or some other place.

I know that one of the arguments against such a plan is the travel but I believe that to be very secondary. Others, in Canada and elsewhere, face this and live with it. It is a thing which can be overcome.

An important thing in any situation, and certainly in this one, is to have a general plan, pattern or line. However, it is also essential to have a specific plan or application within which and through which the general thing has a good chance to achieve success. I think that the specific plan, offered above, and mentioned to you this afternoon, is workable and will help in the regaining of perspectives for all of us.

My deepest and warmest love,  
Edward  
xxx

### On the Question of Whether I Should Absent Myself From Guelph For Some Period of Time

Wednesday, August 23, 1978

It has been suggested that I should stay out of Guelph for a period of some two weeks from last Monday — except for some possible brief occasions. This is put forward in the framework of other people needing to take some period of time similar to that to engage in discussions around the question of basis of unity and level of

### The Difference Between Conspiracy and Strategy

Written by Michelle Landriault  
Wednesday, August 23, 1978

(Comrade I's) position in the APC is not academic — on the one hand she states she will not have anything to do with the work in Guelph; on the other hand she sent \$40.00 for a subscription and she agreed to see (comrade J). The statement and the actions are contradictory thus continuing (comrade I's) blatant ongoing contradictions of several years. Beginning or ending membership cannot be treated academically.

(Comrade J's) position of having been sent out to (place name deleted) with only half the story contains some elements of truth. However (comrade J) is one of the many APC members who did not do thorough investigation into that whole situation. (Comrade J) — when did you come and speak to me? When did you have pointed discussion with (comrade I) on her 'liaison' with Edward Pickersgill? You complacently accepted the situation as did many others.

Edward Pickersgill is not a Nazi. Edward Pickersgill has contradictions to deal with on all 3 levels of developing relationships — political, social and sexual. Every person — as individuals or as partners in couple relationships — has received his assistance in sorting out problems on all [Michelle Landriault's emphasis] 3 levels. He has needed your assistance and if people had been using their 5 senses actively through the years and particularly through the mini-cultural revolution the situation which has occurred (sic) could have been avoided. But everyone remained complacent towards the leadership. To the extent that criticism of the leadership was initiated by the leadership and not by the ordinary members. Edward Pickersgill made many statements during the mini-cultural revolution regarding his relationship with (comrade I). None of you picked up on them or investigated them. How can this be allowed with a leading member? How is it that his marriage, his family can be treated so

complacently? And yet your own personal relationships consume so much precious time!

A reference has been made in one of the documents to my "sorrows". If this line is allowed to develop, I will soon become likened to an 'avenging angel'. This is incorrect. I have lost faith in much of my integrity over the past year. It is this integrity, courage and self-confidence that I am setting out to rebuild. I am not wallowing in sorrow or self-pity. Nor am I here to wreak vengeance. Both (comrade I) and (comrade D) knew what they were doing — they accepted their actions for better or for worse. It is for them to decide how to continue, I can't decide for them. What I am doing is for myself and the kids as I feel responsible (sic) for them and to them.

Edward Pickersgill as an ordinary member of the collective and as a leading member in the collective has every right to question things that he sees may interfere, or be a detriment to the APC. He also has the right to praise things which are good for the APC. These rights are not his exclusively. In the collective situation they are inherent rights belonging to everyone. The fact that these rights are not exercised are (sic) not his fault. He has shown leadership; he has shown daring in taking up initiative in struggling alongside members of the APC. His example was there to be followed. It was not taken up. I suggest strongly that discussion on the political level on how such relationships as have taken place could have been allowed to take place begin. It is a fact — they were allowed to happen. All of you were present during these relationships. How could the wool be pulled down over your eyes for so long? My answer is complacency. What is your answer?

Edward Pickersgill's two documents presented in writing are good. He is willing to rectify his errors. You should be working alongside him to assist him and also to rectify your errors. Fight the complacency thoroughly.

unity — and related matters. (*Place name deleted*) has been suggested as a place in which I could stay. It has also been put that I should not be around Guelph on or about this coming weekend because of the event scheduled for Saturday.

There are perceived precedents for this in those occasions when one Collective member has been sent on three or four occasions to a similar situation. The perception that this is an applicable precedent is wrong. In all of those occasions the program was put forward to combat a complete unwillingness to struggle. There, it was not even a question of the quality of struggle/communication, it was a question of no "quantity".

There are struggles in which I have to participate in Guelph and in (*place name deleted*). These include the struggle to sort out the questions and problems in Michelle and my (*sic*) relationship, but they also include other struggles such as the struggles against insularity, dogmatism, xenophobia and complacency.

For this reason I intend to remain operational in Guelph, working out of (*street address deleted*), and to prepare conditions for Michelle and the kids getting established in the best possible way in (*place name deleted*). I have economic and political responsibilities in both places in a very specific sense — as well as wider political responsibilities. I will work hard at shouldering these responsibilities in both aspects of doing and talking/thinking, but the emphasis is going to be on the doing.

I have one more trip to make to see Michelle and the kids prior to settling into a protracted situation. When she and the kids move into an apartment in (*place name deleted*), on or around September 1, I have to take down some more stuff to make the apartment and life tenable. This is not a lot of stuff, includes (*sic*) no furniture. Also in the next few days I have to forward some money to Michelle's new bank account in (*place name deleted*).

The initial agreement which Michelle and I have for my time spent in (*place name deleted*) is twice a month for three days or so — not the weekly pattern I suggested in my letter to her of yesterday. This, not more than every second week pattern, will hold for at least the first two months. One of the things I will be working hard at in Guelph is the maintenance of the house (*street address deleted*) and the typesetting business. From that I will be able to participate in guaranteeing, as much as possible in this society, that these things will still be solid in that period after the current "school year" — which is one of the reference points for a possible return to Guelph of Michelle and the kids.

## For Michelle Re. 1 A.M. Thursday August 24, 1978

Saturday, August 26, 1978  
(*place name deleted*) 5 p.m.

I was due to pass through Guelph on Thursday. The people there were expecting me. I had phoned & spoken to (*comrade F*) a couple of days previously confirming that I would be arriving in the early morning as I wanted to avoid another night in a motel. I left (*place name deleted*) about 4 hrs. earlier than I expected & Michelle phoned to let people know about my slightly earlier arrival.

When I arrived at (*street address deleted*) there was still a light on in the kitchen. I let myself in by the side door. (*Comrade C*) came to the door as I got inside. We exchanged "Hi"s. I flipped on the light in my work room, put down my bag & went into the toilet. As I went in I saw (*comrade J*) sitting at the kitchen table. I said "Hi" to him.

When I came out of the toilet the light in my work room was out again. I went in briefly, put on the light, glanced around & saw that a number of things were out of place & my garbage can contents appeared neatly arranged on the floor. I then went to the kitchen for a coffee. There I found that (*comrade F*) was with (*comrade J*) & (*comrade C*). All three sat at the table and I stood at the counter waiting for the kettle to boil.

(*Comrade F*) led the talking — asking how my trip had been. I said it had been good — that I had seen Michelle & the kids each day, having discussion alone with Michelle each day. After this initial exchange (*comrade F*) said something to the effect that he guessed I

was tired from all the driving and would be ready to sleep. I agreed. He then told me that they had rented a motel room which I should use. The motel was in Guelph on Woolwich Street. I said that I would sleep here (at (*street address deleted*)). (*Comrade F*), at about this time, made the comment "so this is where the dogfight starts!"

In the ensuing exchange I held to the position that I would be sleeping at (*street address deleted*) because it's my home. (*Comrade F*) warned me many times that I should not make a stand on this point and that they were prepared to remove me from (*street address deleted*).

During this exchange I continued to reiterate that this was my home — Michelle (*sic*) & my home etc. After a bit of this I was getting quite agitated & nervous due (*sic*) the subject matter & my tiredness. I took my coffee and went to my work room. (*Comrade C*) followed behind me and (*comrade F*) called out to him not to hit me. (*Comrade C*) responded that he wasn't going to touch me. (*Comrade F*) & (*comrade J*) followed (*comrade C*). At the window end I turned & noticed that my foam mattress was gone from its usual place behind the door and that there were guns & shells lying around near the closet.

I do not remember all of the dialogue — but (*comrade J*) said little or nothing through the whole thing. (*Comrade C*), on one occasion that I said I would be sleeping in my home, stated that if he had ever said anything like that I would have spat in his face.

Again, (*comrade F*) did most of the talking. He told (*comrade J*) to give me the motel key. I declined to take it, saying again that I would be sleeping at my home. (*Comrade F*) then said that it was not mine or Michelle's but the Collective's. He then again warned me that I should not make this stand on this point & said that they were fully prepared to throw me out no matter how much of a disturbance it caused in the neighbourhood. He also said that if I was going to continue to make this stand then I would be coming back with police & lawyers to establish that.

At around this time (or perhaps a bit earlier) (*comrade C*) picked up a shotgun — and then moved it and another (I think) to the kitchen.

(*Comrade F*) then said that he only gave such warnings when he was serious and willing to follow through. He said that "Bob Cruise" was given such a warning, did not listen, and was dealt with. I protested against comparison to that character but my protests were waved aside. A final warning was given and all three were poised to move. I then said that I would go. I asked if I could finish my coffee and (*comrade F*) said "Sure". I sat down and finished my coffee then stood, picked up my bag and headed for the side door. (While sitting I was told I should return at 11 a.m. I may have been told this earlier but don't remember. If I was it was probably when I was first told about the motel.)

I was urged to take the motel key but declined again. (There was no way that I was going to stay in a motel in Guelph!) On my way to the door I said that they should know that I did not think this was a question involving guns. (*Comrade F*) replied that it was a question of "weird" things. They watched me get into the rental car & drive away (sometime after 1:30 a.m.).

I drove over to Kitchener & stayed at the first motel on Hwy. 7 inside Kitchener.

I found the whole experience quite terrifying. It was completely wrong of them and they are way off base in their actions. They are, however, very serious in what they are doing. That much is evident.

## A Specific Document on Ed's Weaknesses, Attempts to Confront Them, and Failures in the Past.

August 27, 1978

The history of Alive comes out of Ed's attempts to engage in a process of helping kids to grow and fighting against mistreatment of those kids, including to some extent himself. Beaten down and back many times it was only in meeting and marrying Michelle that progress began to be made. That others have joined in that and the broadened struggles since, is good, but that they have not come to know the roots of Alive thoroughly is their weakness. Ignorance is not bliss nor is it a valid excuse for inactivity or lack of

investigation. The weaknesses in Ed, institutionalized to some extent in 1965-1968, were not rooted out but only put aside. That they continue to have an effect is weakness and must be combatted. That others have not known the extent of the weaknesses is a weakness in their willingness to investigate and touch the lives of those around them in a deep way. Many hints have been given by Ed and possibilities for opening discussion but most of these have not been taken up.

For example, during the mini-cultural revolution (*comrade C*) approached Ed for assistance with a masturbation problem that he had/has. Ed had about an hour of discussion with (*comrade C*) about this, and later brought up the question of and roots of his own problem with the same thing. This was brought up in front of the Collective. Despite the fact that at least three (*comrades C, I, D*) had had discussions with Ed about this over time — all engaging in it and having slightly different attitudes towards it — and despite the fact that others were obviously cognizant of the question themselves — no one took up or joined in the discussion. Thus in "public" this appeared to be Ed's problem and Ed's struggle with degeneracy. Thus an unwillingness to deal with such matters was again proven — despite Ed's obvious emotionality and evident weaknesses and fears in these matters. This further reinforced the position that personal social/sexual matters had to be dealt with, at least in the APC, among those concerned. This incident was one of those which preceded formation of the 3-in-1 of Michelle, (*comrade I, comrade D*).

Another incident was (*comrade I's*) first plan after finding out that she was pregnant. Her plan was to go away and not let the Collective know. If Ed had been a criminal minded individualist and treating people with utter contempt then that plan would have been grabbed and encouraged. The struggle would have been set aside. That was not done and (*comrade I*) was encouraged to stay. Others directly involved were informed and discussions were set up. This was before [Edward Pickersgill's emphasis] confirmation of the pregnancy. On confirmation the Collective was fully informed of that situation. Ed's feelings for Michelle were laid on the table along with his turmoil on the sexual aspect of things. Discussion on this whole question was only ever initiated by Ed and that petered out over time. Only Michelle continued to struggle with Ed on this matter. That it was agreed to not write about or discuss (*comrade I*) and Ed did not eliminate the possibility of discussion and struggle on this question. (*sic*) That was done by the long lasting line that these matters were and are the affair of those concerned.

### Document Dealing With the Question of (Street Address Deleted) (and Other Houses) And With the Question of APL/PMG

Sunday, August 27, 1978

There are indications that the dominant line in the Collective, on the question of who owns what, is that the Collective owns and the individuals use materials such as houses and equipment. This has definitely been stated in terms of houses on the occasion recently when I was threatened with forcible removal from (*street address deleted*). It has not yet been stated to me in terms of equipment and the PMG business — but I have not made any initiatives on that question such as my attempt to sleep at (*street address deleted*) last Wednesday night/Thursday morning.

What has been said is that if it comes down to a "dogfight" over the equipment etc. the "Collective is willing to start from scratch... this has been done twice already and can be done again if necessary." It is, however, a fact that, overwhelmingly, the struggle to obtain and maintain the means of production was led by and consistently carried by and in the names of Ed and Michelle. The initiatives, risks and responsibilities have been taken and shouldered overwhelmingly by Ed and Michelle. This includes the start up in 1969-70. The development in Summer, 1970, of APL and move to Guelph from Montreal. The establishment in March, 1971 of PM. The struggle in 1972 to put arms (*sic*) length between maga-

zine and business. The struggle to form and give rights to the APC in late 1972. The struggle to build a typesetting business in 1973 and the move to major equipment purchases at end of 1973, beginning of 1974. The dispersal of equipment in 1975 and the re-obtaining of similar equipment in late 1975 was again a burden carried in the main by Ed and Michelle. This business built and operated by Ed and Michelle was always put in the service of the Alive work but from the beginning was kept separate so as to not jeopardize that work or permit, where possible, pressures on and tensions in, the Alive work, to damage, unnecessarily, that economy established and maintained by Ed and Michelle. At various times APC members who worked on the running of PM etc. left for as long as a year. Some came back. Some did not. The business continued and the contradictions were faced and resolved, to the best possible extent.

The business, equipment and customers, have been and are, overwhelmingly, the continuing affair of Ed and Michelle. This is a reality which can be changed in one or the other of two ways. First, Ed and Michelle, together or separately can opt out of the business. This would change the reality. In that case the business as such and as established would only continue if others stepped forward to fully shoulder the responsibilities now carried by Ed and Michelle. Second, others can take over, or attempt to take over, the business without a voluntary opting out by Ed and/or Michelle. This would change the reality also, to some extent, but this would not necessarily mean that Ed and Michelle were out of the business in general — just that specific thing which had been taken.

Alive Press Ltd. and the People Media Graphics operation, then, are and have been a thing owned and operated by Ed and Michelle with differing degrees of support from time to time by a wide variety of others. The members of the APC, and the APC itself, have provided the most and the best assistance and these are the only ones with whom any discussions and analysis is needed and deserved, on the questions surrounding ownership and operation of APL and PMG. It must, however, be seen that the APC and the APC members (including Ed and Michelle for they have a dual role here) have given their support for definite and mutually beneficial reasons. The APC has been able to concentrate on other work and other questions, to some extent, because of the business established and operated by Ed and Michelle. The business of APL and PMG is thus, in fact (legally and in reality) owned and operated, overwhelmingly, by Ed and Michelle. In this it should be known and kept in mind that Ed and Michelle have always, and remain, open to new developments to match changing conditions and have already participated in the establishment and development of many new things in the area of communication/publishing/printing etc. It does not come as a surprise when various differences between and among people necessitate establishment of new and relatively self-reliant organisms. Further, it should be known and kept in mind, the establishment of such new organisms, in the past and in the future, does not mean and has not meant that Ed and Michelle's own organism goes out of existence. That is an internal affair and will continue to be so, of the thing which is Ed and Michelle. To stay in existence, to go out of existence, or to change the nature of that existence in some way has been, remains and will always remain the affair of Ed and Michelle. This, obviously, must take into account pressures and tensions from outside (car crashes, assassinations, imprisonment and a wide variety of other external pressures).

The thing which is true of the APL/PMG business is also true of (*street address deleted*) the house which is owned by Michelle and used by the Collective. It is also true for some others who own (are buying) houses which are also used (to much lesser extents) by the Collective. Individual Collective members have taken on the responsibility for purchasing and maintaining houses and have made them available to some extent or another, to Collective affairs. That the house for which Ed and Michelle have taken legal, financial and social responsibility is also the house most used by the Collective is in evident keeping with Ed and Michelle's history and practice. It is also, to some extent, the reason that the overall

Collective has a foggier perception of the reality of (*street address deleted*) than of other property. A foggy perception, however, does not alter a reality. The house is and has been taken on, owned and operated, by Ed and Michelle. Ed and Michelle have the options of using this property themselves alone, in conjunction with others or even to arrange for the full use of it by others if suitable agreements can be made and maintained. This is a reality and will remain so until it is changed by Ed and Michelle or until external pressures force an undesired change on Ed and Michelle.

The same situation is true for certain other Collective members. Each of those involved in ownership of a house have a dual role to carry — ownership of a house used to some extent by the Collective, and, Collective membership and participation in the decision making process on how and to what extent the house is used. It has never been and should not be the posture of the Collective, to impose on those members who own various things, some plan or plans for the use of those owned things which is not acceptable to the person or persons directly involved.

For this reason it has been, and continues to be, necessary to first establish and comply with the basic needs and interests of those who own and operate the thing in question and then to examine the possible additional activities and processes which can co-exist with those needs and interests. This whole matter is not a mystery (*sic*) nor an illusion, it is a fact based in the reality of our Collective and individual histories. That is the way that things have developed and that is the way that things must continue to operate until there is a revolutionary change in this society, establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, waging of the full-fledged socialist revolution and step-by-step motion towards the communist society. Even under socialism private property and reality continues (*sic*) to exist. Even there certain negotiation and arrangement must be made to take into account the various contradictions involved in such private ownership and private affairs of various kinds.

It is with all of these things in mind that we must approach the question of ownership of the business and houses to which the Collective has access and of which the Collective makes use, to varying degrees.

### Further to Document of August 18, 1978 Complacency Gives Rise to Idealism — The Art of Making Assumptions

August 28, 1978  
Monday afternoon

The history of the APC has not been one of idealism but idealism has certainly been present at each stage and surrounding each thing done or touched. There is, for example, the reality of the material things to which the APC has access and there is the idealistic perception of that reality by some or all members of the APC — varying from time to time and thing to thing.

In writing about this problem yesterday, I concentrated on things which Michelle and I have acquired over the years and the real way in which the APC is related to those things. I wrote of the fact that these realities can be changed. In fact, such realities can be changed in a number of ways. The APC, however, cannot itself own things. The reality of the APC is such that not all members can present themselves as such and a new and different society must be brought into existence before such truly socialist ownership can operate.

To say that such and such a thing is the APC's is idealism and will remain so for quite a long time yet. If too many of the material things have been developed by one couple that does not change the reality of the present commitments and responsibilities. To charge ahead to identify things otherwise and organize things otherwise without agreement and compliance with those who have acquired and maintained those things being used by the APC would be dogmatism, in the least. It should never be a surprise when dogmatism is found keeping company with idealism. They go hand

in hand, exchanging positions of dominance.

Complacency gives idealism full rein to develop. It is the fertile soil in which assumptions run rampant and actual responsibilities to develop things are shirked. Instead, it is ideas which are "developed" and materialism suffers setbacks. Such imbalance cannot last forever even though it can sometimes appear so. Sooner or later reality does intrude and the idealism changes into dogmatism. If the intrusion is rude enough (severe enough) then the complacency will also change into its opposite: the kind of hyper-tension or super-criticism (like super saturation) which is like the proverbial dog eating its own tail. Obviously the danger in this is that the dog will eat itself right out of existence. This is in fact one way that things do go out of existence in the world.

There is another way, of course, for things to go out of existence (another among many). That is, the parts of the thing (where people are involved) can agree to become parts of a new thing — or parts of new things. In this way a thing partly goes out of existence and partly stays in existence through its heir or heirs, so to speak.

If the present way that things are organized, in any situation, is found to be no longer satisfactory then new ways of organizing those things should be examined. When satisfactory alternatives have been identified they should be put to the test of practice. This is, for example, the thinking behind my documents on the RNC, Co-op and Front. This is also a potential advantage in the newly formed (*Group 4*). It is possible that different kinds of things can accomplish the same or even more substantial needs for re-organizing. If that is the case they should be very exciting ideas and very beautiful things. At this point I cannot perceive or even suspect what they might be.

So, in this time when changes and the need for changes are upon us we must put idealism and its confrere, dogmatism, in their place, by an upholding of material and changeable reality; and, we must guard against and struggle against complacency, on the one hand, and hyper-tension, on the other hand. Thus we must not fall into, or stay in if and where we have fallen already on "idealistic but hyper-tense state of mind, and a complacent but dogmatic pattern of work."

### A Begging Document From Edward Pickersgill

Monday Evening  
August 28, 1978

I realize that there are other factors involved than those which I can presently be aware of since I have not been involved in the ongoing discussions at or around (*street address deleted*). With that in mind, then, I make the following suggestions based on the factors I do have at hand:

I would like to do some typesetting work — that is PMG work. In doing this I can return some much needed balance to my patterns and also, perhaps, make it more possible for others to engage in discussions and sorting out ideas.

I would like to resume my sleeping patterns at (*street address deleted*) but would prefer to switch to upstairs, likely in one of the kids' single beds for now.

I would like to catch up on interesting mail which has come in in the past week or so — if any has come in of course.

I would like to begin writing a personal social and political biography, which I do not feel comfortable or secure doing outside (*street address deleted*).

These things are quite important to me and I would not put them forward otherwise. I don't want to put them forward in the form of a proposal, so offer them as a suggestion for consideration. I do not want to hinder on-going discussions and seriously believe I can do these things without interfering with discussions.

I also have three or four relatively short documents which I would like to make copies of and submit. As I have to go out to settle up with both (*car rental business*) and (*car rental business*), results of considerations could be told to me in an hour or two, or perhaps later, at your convenience.

**Re: Statement By Members of the Alive Production Collective to Edward Pickersgill, Tuesday, August 29, 1978 and Re: Four Points For Edward to Deal With**

*Tuesday Afternoon  
August 29, 1978*

As I stated following the reading of the statement, this is a good statement. It is a reflection of the intensity of the ongoing struggle and that is an indication that the struggle is a good one. I look forward to more documents of this quality and other evidences of the continuing, protracted struggle. Differences which I have with some things in the statement are minor but I will try to set them down in a more formal response to the statement. That response will, however, mainly reflect agreement with the statement.

I see the four points as good and positive points for me to address and I will do so in as much depth as I can. The question of factionalism will require some reading/research. I am enthusiastic to examine these points.

**Response to Statement by Members of the APC to Edward Pickersgill, Tuesday, August 29, 1978**

*Thursday, August 31, 1978*

The struggle which you are waging at this time is an important one to each of you as individuals, to you as a group, to the Collective as a whole and to progressive, anti-imperialist politics in general (to some degree). My history as leading member of the Collective has been so integral to the history of the Collective itself that it is required that you stretch yourselves to the limits of your endurance, your experience and consciousness, and "touch the backside of this tiger". There have been many direct and indirect indications through the years of the existence of the mistakes and weaknesses currently under investigation. These will undoubtedly be brought to the light of day during the protracted struggle you have committed yourselves to in a big way. Certainly, as you indicate, the investigation which has been conducted over eleven days (at the date of your statement) must cover the whole period of the life of the Collective and more.

As you indicate, and as Chairman Mao has indicated, haste does not bring success. It should not be mixed up with the taking of quick and decisive action after full investigation and preparation for the action. Certainly the factionalism which is specifically under study at the moment is of great significance to the life of the APC but can it possibly be the only example of factions and factionalism in the APC? I doubt it! My mistakes and weaknesses, the rottenness in my political line and social practice have undoubtedly affected other similar things — directly! and indirectly by failing to oppose bad lines in others effectively. My own mistakes and weaknesses must have inevitably led to a dogmatic opposition to mistakes and weaknesses in others. Such dogmatic opposition, through assertions and commands, would not have given evidence and conducted education but would simply have presented a hard-edged, black and white, so-called analysis. The weight of my pronouncements and the general "correctness" of my "analysis" strengthened the position of commandism in the APC, was in opposition to any genuine development of democracy in the APC, and undermined any real possibility of step-by-step development of secondary leadership and actual democratic-centralist reality in the APC. Under the banners of "do what I say, not what I do" and "do what I say and what I appear to do" the centralist model, on a pedestal, was more and more institutionalized. Thus, when the crash came it was a great shock.

It is not particularly relevant that the shock should have been great enough in 1975 when my leadership almost wiped out the APC, for the resulting defense against a common enemy, the Bainzites, took the spotlight off my mistakes in that year. The depth to which that shock had effect was limited to statements by me such as: "the Bainzites separated me from the APC and separate

from the APC I am nothing" etc. This of course, now, can be seen to be an escapist and opportunist line. All it served to do was draw the APC into a tight circle and continue the major process of building the fortress mentality which has afflicted the APC.

Nor is it particularly relevant that the shock should have been great enough in January-February of 1978 when the first major evidence of my social degeneration was made known in the APC — although not to the whole APC because there was a conspiracy of silence against, or in the case of, one member of the APC. An affair with a second woman, member of the APC, was announced and detailed to some extent, and a long struggle with masturbation was also announced.

These things did not give rise to any relevant class struggle. They did not give rise to study and investigation into the roots and effects of such degeneration and its potential destructiveness to the APC, its programs and its external contacts. No, instead it gave rise to a cover-up, an enlarged conspiracy of silence, both involving internal forces and external forces such as neighbours and friends further afield. The tendency was not to root out this bad thing but rather to protect the good name of Edward Pickersgill and the APC. That this was done was not necessarily a bad thing in itself — but it became a bad thing when it was not accompanied by protracted struggle on the major political contradictions involved. It certainly paid little or no attention to Michelle's needs and problems.

No, those shocks were obviously not enough and the current shock seems to be enough. For that reason the statement is a good and, initially anyway, powerful indication of the desire, the need, of the members to deal a death blow to this mistake and weakness. There is an old folk saying that hell hath no fury like a woman scorned. That can be applied today to the APC. That fury, channelled and scientifically directed, will effect a major cauterizing of the mistakes and weaknesses of all things touched. Though this may cause a lot of jumping and running it does and will fit into the category of another old folk saying, that often "we must be cruel to be kind."

In my initial, brief response to your statement (August 29) I said that "Differences which I have with some things in the statement are minor but I will try to set them down in a more formal response to the statement." In the main, I believe, the differences are of emphasis and wording. If you see something other than that I trust you will, in time, point it (or them) out to me. Obviously you would first have to go over such things amongst yourselves. I will try to go step-by-step in direct relation to your statement: —

Paragraph One: It is a good thing, but an overdue thing, that the members are working to conduct an investigation into my role in the APC. An investigation into open actions and conspiratorial activities is a good thing and nothing to be afraid of by any means. I welcome this as a process which should always be a part of progressive work and organizations. Sometimes, obviously, the process will be more active, more intense while at other times it will be less active, less intense. Some or all of those involved in this process will have more to offer the anti-imperialist forces in the future. Complacency and the "employee mentality/commandism" thing, clearly go hand in hand.

Paragraph Two: Certainly the investigation as a program will necessarily take some extended period of time. Undoubtedly there will be a broadening of the scope of things on which to focus before the final, specific truths can be set down in a knowable and historical fashion, one thing leading to another. The program will, hopefully, give rise to an ongoing conscious process by which ignorance can be combatted and factionalism can be better known as an enemy of our work, thus making it more possible to oppose such mistakes more effectively — less dogmatically.

Paragraph Three: This is a well-established pattern in our history. It has been learned in practice that this is a necessary thing from time to time. To go on tolling the bell, letting complacency over-ride the need for class struggle, would indeed be wrong. I am in full agreement that the work should have been stopped and

should only be geared up again as conditions are ripe. In some aspects of the work this will be sooner and in others, later. Although the current stoppage comes chronologically out of another stoppage (for a construction project), there is no doubt that it (the current one) is a separate one of a new and much more serious kind.

Paragraph Four: I think that what is meant here is that the investigation has only reached its preliminary stages. The drawing of conclusions and the identification of various related problems would be part of the thing which is the investigation. Thus I have only got a minor problem with the first sentence which seems, at least, to demarcate between the investigation and the conclusions. The rest of the paragraph is good and indicates a consciousness, to some degree, of the dictum: no investigation, no right to speak.

Paragraph Five: It may prove to be the case that this is the single most significant internal contradiction in the years long history of the APC but I don't think that that can yet be concluded. Obviously a number of other people think differently at this stage. It might be good to consider that the significance of a contradiction is not determined by the number of people who face it and deal with it. That situation has more to do with the possibility of resolution of the contradiction.

There is here, moreover, a conclusion by you all (correct or incorrect). As such it should be included as number two, at least, if not number one, together with the one conclusion formally mentioned in paragraph six.

To my mind, there have been at least two other internal contradictions which had and have at least equal and probably more significance in the life of the APC:

- 1) the internal contradiction in 1973 (early) re. were we communists, as individuals, and communist as an organization;
- 2) the internal contradiction existing from the beginning up to date and reflected in the struggle to expel (*comrade Q*) or "suspend" her. That general dogmatism throughout the organism is a most significant internal contradiction and more dangerous, in the short and long run, than any contradiction embodied in one individual, no matter how important or so-called important that individual might be or appear to be.

I do not disagree that you are looking for leadership elsewhere. Nor do I criticize you for that. The factors involved in your decision/conclusion are quite real and quite clear. However, I think that you should re-examine any tendency to characterize my attempts to "teach" you a thing or two as incorrect. If you disagree with the things being taught that is fine and you should put your opposition forward. That should always have been and should continue to be the case. For my part, I have and will continue to struggle to learn from wherever I can, by positive and negative experience and, also, will continue to presume to teach what I know and what I am learning wherever and to whomever I can. It's my view, at the moment, that I must exercise more caution than at certain times in the past since I cannot trust myself as much as at those certain times. So, my main emphasis is in putting down my views and seeing what response comes from those I respect. Those responses confirm or deny my views to various degrees. At the same time I have long known that fear of the teacher is a major stumbling block to learning.

Here, then, I have no actual disagreements with your statement and would not be unduly surprised to witness a presentation of evidence that I have displayed some amounts of personal arrogance, individualistic deceit and lying, spontaneity and impetuosity, self-centredness and deep subjectivism. Rather, I will be surprised if, at some point, such evidence is not put forward.

Paragraph Six: A minor difference here! The reason that you are all treating this matter so seriously, as outlined in this and other documents and social practice, is that you are aware that in fact you "can" follow my or possibly someone else's rotten leadership. Your conclusion should read that you "will not ..." [*Edward Pickersgill's emphasis*]. If there is a problem then with that seeming to be too permanent and implying that I will not and cannot change (as you

deal with this in your last paragraph) then you should simply add in something like "Edward Pickersgill's rotten [*Edward Pickersgill's emphasis*] leadership anymore." This is quite critical for you because it touches on the APC's history of following Bainzite leadership and it lays an important cornerstone or touchstone for future internal and external leadership situations both from and to the APC.

Paragraph Seven: There are two problems here, from my point of view. First, I would be in agreement with sentence two if it read "and has played a major role in creating" — or even if it read "overwhelmingly major ..."

Second, I disagree on the point that the degree of seriousness of my mistake is intensified or lessened in relation to the number or percentage of women in the organization. I think that my mistakes and weaknesses have a seriousness because women hold up half the sky — in the world. I don't think it would be one iota less serious if women were a minority in our organization(s). By the same token I believe that the seriousness of the "original" mistake with (*comrade I*) was not lessened because it began before the mini-cultural revolution or that it began while she was outside the APC.

Paragraph Eight: While I agree with the various mentioned dangers that must be guarded against I do not agree that what you mention as your first task is correct. It will always be incorrect to place the interests of the majority of present members of the APC and their continuing in the APC work ahead of the class struggle — which may well drive some (even a majority) away from anti-imperialist politics and programs. Placing class struggle as the first task we will have the lives and futures of the majority of people in society in our sights — not just those in the existing organizations. That is, your first task must be to seek the truth (and let the chips fall where they may, so to speak, in terms of those who are members of the APC). Besides, you will never, never be able "to guarantee that the majority of members in the existing organizations continue in their political work and ideological commitment." To attempt to do so as a first, primary or principal task is wrong but is also a foolish goal for it can never be achieved. There are no such guarantees.

The same difference occurs in the last sentence of this paragraph as was outlined re. paragraph six.

Paragraph Nine: In so far as I am included in the "we", for I am obviously not one of the group who made the statement, then I have no disagreement that these are among the specific tasks which must be faced and tackled. By that I mean that re-establishment of trust and acceptance in and of me and my contribution, requires that I be successful — as part of a larger success or not. No amount of success by others will return me to trusted and accepted positions.

I do not want to go on too long in my response to your statement but ask you to bear with me through a concluding thought. Quite obvious, on the wall in the room where your statement was read and given to me, was a quote from Chairman Mao. It is a good quote to focus your attention on and I would like to integrate it in my document here:

"Some of our comrades can't bear to hear any opinion contrary to their own and can't tolerate any criticism. That is very wrong. During this conference, the group meeting of one province started off in a very lively manner, but as soon as the secretary of the provincial Party committee went to sit in, a hush fell and nobody said a word. Comrade provincial Party secretary, why do you go and sit there? Why don't you stay in your own room and think things over and let the others talk freely? Since such an atmosphere has been brought about and people don't dare speak in your presence, then you should absent yourself. Whoever makes mistakes must criticize himself, and we must let others speak up, let others criticize. On June 12 last year, the last day of the working conference in Peking convened by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, I discussed my own shortcomings and mistakes. I asked the comrades to convey what I said to the provinces and localities. I found out later, that many localities were not informed. It's as if my mistakes could or should

be kept hidden. Comrades, they mustn't be kept hidden! Of all the mistakes made by the Central Committee I am responsible for those directly related to me and I have a share of the responsibility for those not directly related to me, because I am its Chairman. It's not that I want other people to slough off their responsibility — there are some other comrades who also bear responsibility — but I am the person who ought to be primarily responsible. The secretaries of our provincial, prefectural and county Party committees, right down to the secretaries of Party committees of districts, enterprises and communes, being first secretaries, should bear responsibility for shortcomings and mistakes in work. Shirking responsibility, fearing to shoulder it and forbidding people to speak out as if one were a tiger whose backside no one dares touch — ten out of ten who adopt this attitude will fail. People will always speak out sooner or later. You think that people really won't dare to touch the backsides of tigers like you? They bloody well will!"

Mao Tsetung, January 30, 1962.

On that excellent and pointedly relevant note, then, I conclude this response to your statement and reiterate that it is a good one and it has been very good to hear and see it.

### What Kind of Organization Is the APC? A Look At Problems Which Arise From An Inaccurate and Sloppy Assessment (For Michelle & the APC)

August 31, 1978

It is easiest to begin by saying what kind of organization the APC is not! It is not a communist organization, not a Marxist-Leninist organization. Yet, when contradictions are faced, internal and external to the organization, it is to Marxist-Leninist norms and teachings that we turn for guidance. This is a contradiction in itself. To live and work by non-Marxist-Leninist norms but then to judge our lives and work by those norms must necessarily create confusion, doubt and an air of failure. The dichotomy between our perception of ourselves, individually and organizationally, on the one hand, and how we judge ourselves and each other, on the other hand, is too great and something needs to be done about it.

If we are to continue to judge ourselves by Marxist-Leninist norms then we must acknowledge that we consider ourselves to be Marxist-Leninists — communists! Less than that will ensure the continued frustration at times of analysis and the summing-up process and, as well, the intensification of the terror which accompanies alienation from one's own body and mind. Such alienation can surely be seen to result from a life lived according to one set of norms but judged by another set of norms.

Is the APC, though not a Marxist-Leninist organization, still some kind of democratic-centralist organization? It has certainly been promoted as such by some. Also, democratic-centralism has been much talked about and held up as a characteristic of the APC. But it is not, all the same, a democratic-centralist organization. Because of this, all attempts to build or enrichen (*sic*) democracy in the membership and/or leadership have failed to last — even, in the main, failed to take hold at all.

The APC was, from the beginning, an organization built on unity around a specific program — the production, dissemination and development of *Alive Magazine*. To date that unity has not been substantially developed and the organizational structures have not been revolutionized. The potential for doing precisely that is now at hand. The consciousness of APC members, some anyway, is raised sufficiently to revolutionize the basis of unity and transcend the narrow confines of the original unity.

In point of fact, none of the organizations connected to, coming out of, or taking leadership from the APC are democratic-centralist in nature. Some appear more democratic but this is attributable to the lower political consciousness of some of the people concerned and not to an actual evidence of democracy. It is attributable to a holding back of the centralism because of the judgement that those

people would not accept such higher authority.

The struggle for democracy in the APC has been waged, historically, under the banners of "struggle for participation" and "struggle against silence". These are not bad things in themselves but did not and could not win in the environment which existed — centralism coming straight down the line from the founder of the thing which served as the basis of unity of the Collective. Nor did the words in the relatively recent and currently used *Alive View* change this actual case, although they are the closest thing to a constitution that the APC has ever had.

That document, imposed from above, did not follow the method outlined in Chairman Mao's January 30, 1962 speech. That we had not seen that speech until recently is no excuse for we should recognize that our actions speak for themselves and our actions were centralist — not democratic. The *Alive View* definitely falls into the category of things discussed by Chairman Mao and should definitely have been in circulation and discussion for a greater period of time. Since it is the closest thing to a constitution that the APC has, and is perhaps the only thing resembling a constitution, we should look at how Chairman Mao says it should have been developed:

"Distribute the draft, invite comments from those present and make amendments accordingly before giving a report. When making a report, one shouldn't just read it out, but should offer some supplementary ideas and explanations. By following this method we can promote democracy more fully, pool wisdom from all quarters and compare different points of view, and our meetings will become more lively. It has been advisable to use this method for the present conference which is being held to sum up the working experience of twelve years, and particularly that of the past four years, for there are many questions and consequently many opinions. But can all conferences adopt this method? No, not all. To use this method we must have plenty of time. It may sometimes be used at sessions of our People's Congress. Comrades from provincial, prefectural and county Party committees, when you call meetings in future, you too can adopt this method if conditions permit. Of course, you are busy and cannot usually spend a lot of time on conferences. But there's no harm in having a try when you find the conditions right.

"What sort of method is this? It's the method of democratic centralism, the method of the mass line: first democracy, then centralism; from the masses, to the masses; integration of the leadership with the masses."

Was this done with the *Alive View*? No. Has it been done with any matter of substance in the APC's history? No. Is it being done now? Perhaps, if so it is a good but long overdue thing. Is it too late to change the APC into a democratic centralist organization? In my view it has been too late for a long time now. The time has passed and cannot be seized in terms of the APC but only in terms of a brand new organization. Should the APC then go immediately out of existence? No, not necessarily, because it groups together certain people and certain experience which can be valuable to a new formation.

Because of the original nature of *Alive Magazine* and because of the original and continuing nature of the APC centralism has always come first and has always played a role in putting out sparks of lasting democracy. In this it would be timely to consider further words from Chairman Mao on the question of democratic centralism and the impossibility of achieving it when centralism comes first as in the APC. From his January 30, 1962 speech:

"Without democracy there can't be correct centralism because centralism can't be established when people have divergent views and don't have unity of understanding. What is meant by centralism? First, there must be concentration of correct ideas. Unity of understanding, of policy, plan, command and action is attained on the basis of concentrating correct ideas. This is unity through centralism. But if all those concerned are still not clear about the problems, if their opinions are still unexpressed or their anger is still not vented, how can you achieve this unity through centralism? Without democracy, it is impossible to sum up

experience correctly. Without democracy, without ideas coming from the masses, it is impossible to formulate good lines, principles, policies or methods. As far as the formulation of lines, principles, policies and methods is concerned, our leading organs merely play the role of a processing plant. Everyone knows that a factory cannot do any processing without raw material. It cannot produce good finished products unless the raw material is sufficient in quantity and suitable in quality. If there is no democracy, if there is no knowledge of what is going on down below and no clear idea about it, if there is no adequate canvassing of the opinions of all concerned and no communication between higher and lower levels, and if instead issues are decided solely by the leading organs of the higher levels on the strength of one-sided or inaccurate material, then such decisions can hardly avoid being subjective and it will be impossible to achieve unity in understanding and action or achieve true centralism."

This is startlingly applicable to the history of the APC and the history of the APC is a good negative example of what Chairman Mao was pointing out. The centralism in the APC was from the start the centralism of one individual. Attempts to enlarge the centre floundered and failed when those who stepped forward were unable to "operate within the narrow confines of Edward Pickersgill's individual perceptions" (as pointed out in the August 29th statement by APC members).

So what had to happen in the absence of democracy? What Chairman Mao points out about factories can be applied to the APC. It had to become ulcerous. That is, an individual body feeding mainly on itself develops ulcers. Those painful degenerations, undoctored, result in spasmodic striking out against anything which, knowingly or unknowingly, bumps into the sore spots. The subjectivism thus flourishes and even becomes malignant. All the time this is happening there is less and less opportunity for democracy and thus less and less opportunity for true centralism — except through radical rupture.

Should we then, because there is a dichotomy between the thing which we call ourselves and the norms by which we judge ourselves, back off and wage the current struggle against Edward Pickersgill's rotten leadership according to lesser standards? No, definitely not. I welcome the opportunity to be judged, touched and even lambasted by Marxist-Leninist norms. I consider the struggle that I am involved in to be a struggle to consolidate myself as a Marxist-Leninist. Though I may be a really shitty example of such I look forward to more auspicious days ahead.

Though I have been very afraid of criticism in the past I welcome it now as the sole way to overcome that fear and to become deeply familiar with that process. I place myself squarely in the company of those whom Chairman Mao criticized, saying:

**"At present, there are some comrades who are very afraid of the masses initiating discussion and putting forward ideas which differ from those of the leading organs or the leaders. Whenever a problem is being discussed, they suppress the initiative of the masses and don't allow them to speak out. This attitude is abominable."**

And, further:

**"If we have really made mistakes, mistakes which are harmful to the cause of the Party and the people, we should seek the opinions of the masses and of comrades and criticize ourselves. Such self-criticism should sometimes be repeated several times over. If once is not enough and people are not satisfied, it should be done a second time; if they are still not satisfied, then it should be done a third time; it should go on until nobody has any more criticisms."**

And, then:

**"Criticism and self-criticism is a method; it is the method of resolving contradictions among the people and indeed the only method. There is no other method. But if we don't have full democracy and don't truly practise democratic centralism, this method of criticism and self-criticism cannot be applied."**

Thus I see my struggle as one to be waged both against my mistakes and weaknesses and for the establishment of a democratic centralist organization within which this and other revolutionary

processes may carry forward. I can truly be said to be among those of whom Chairman Mao spoke, saying:

**"They are afraid of the masses, afraid of the masses speaking out, afraid of mass criticism. What possible reason is there for Marxist-Leninists to be afraid of the masses? While they avoid mentioning their own mistakes, these comrades are likewise afraid of having their mistakes mentioned by the masses. The more they're afraid, the more they're going to be haunted by ghosts. In my opinion, one shouldn't be afraid. What is there to be afraid of? Our attitude is, uphold the truth and readily correct mistakes. The question of what is right or wrong, what is correct or incorrect, in our work falls under contradictions among the people. Contradictions among the people can't be resolved by curses or fists, still less by knives or guns. They can be resolved only by discussion and reasoning, criticism and self-criticism. In a word, they can be resolved only by the democratic method, by letting the masses speak out."**

And, further:

**"Problems should be brought out into the open frankly and the masses allowed to speak out, speak out even if we are going to be abused. The worst that can come out of this abuse is that we will be toppled and thus be unable to continue in our current jobs — demotion to lower organizations or transfer to other localities. What's so impossible about that? Why should a person go only up and not down? Why should one work only in one place and not be transferred to another? I think that, whether they are justified or not, both demotion and transfer have advantages. They help to temper people's revolutionary will, enable them to investigate and study many new situations, and acquire more useful knowledge."**

Can I be demoted inside the APC? I have been told that this is a question being examined in the current investigation and struggle. Obviously the answer is yes. A firm yes! What was I? The leading member of the APC! Now the overwhelming majority say they cannot/will not follow my rotten leadership. That is good. It is also a demotion, from number one to number last, at least. I accept that demotion and am not scared of it. One of the things I can struggle with from this posture is the quality of contributions which bottom of the line persons can strive for! That's a good challenge in itself.

But I have further intentions in this matter. Given the history of the APC it is a rather nebulous and cloudy matter for me to settle for demotion from a non-elected position to an equally unknown position at the "bottom". So it is my intent to concretize the demotion so that it's (*sic*) quality becomes known and understandable. One step in this process, then, will be to resign as editor of Alive Magazine. I do not yet have a time in mind to do this other than as soon as possible, but will say that that resignation will be submitted immediately if asked for by the APC. If it is not asked for it will be submitted at a mutually acceptable time in the near future. A second step in this process is to submit my resignation from the Lu Hsun Unit effective the day this document is submitted (Tuesday, September 5, 1978).

A third step will be to resign from the APC at some time in the future when the Collective members feel that I have made a sufficient contribution to the investigation into my role in the Collective and into the political life of the Collective as a whole.

Then, having been fully and materially demoted, I will struggle to make a Marxist-Leninist contribution to developing a democratic centralist organization following the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. This is what I mean in my letter to Michelle when I speak of the need to start from scratch. This is also what I mean in my documents of August 1, 1978 and of August 18, 1978 (Can We Overcome Complacency In Our Ranks and Break Out of Our Isolation?) where I address the need for looking at new organizational structures and processes and starting from scratch.

This process which I have outlined concerning my intentions is not in any way an attempt to avoid my mistakes. It is part of a plan to confront my mistakes and weaknesses head on, to eliminate the possibility of cover up of my mistakes and weaknesses by anyone, and to take my mistakes into the open where anyone who cares to examine them can do so. That is, I intend to make my mistakes and



weaknesses a public matter and to broaden the scope of those who can learn from those mistakes. Less than this will certainly ensure that I will never again rise in the revolutionary ranks and will likely even ensure that I will continue to degenerate even further.

**"Everything reactionary is the same; if you don't hit it, it won't fall. This is also like sweeping the floor; as a rule, where the broom does not reach, the dust will not vanish of itself."** (Chairman Mao, August 13, 1945)

It would be a mistake to launch this publicizing of the nature of my mistakes before conditions are well prepared among the members of the APC and those former members who have been drawn into my mistakes. So, I am not in a rush to do this and will cooperate with the APC in this, and also, where possible, with those others. Nor will I rush blindly ahead to dump my case in the laps of people who don't want to know or who will use it against the revolutionary movement. This means that a sketch and a more detailed critical analysis of my mistakes will be needed, one for widespread dissemination at the time of or after announcements of my resignation as editor of *Alive Magazine*, and the other for constant reference by those with whom I have worked and with whom I will work in the future.

**"What possible reason is there for Marxist-Leninists to be afraid of the masses? ... In my opinion, one shouldn't be afraid. What is there to be afraid of?"** If I do not change, or do not continue to change then I will have much to be afraid of for my history will be well-known. But I am not afraid of this for I am sure that I am changed to a degree and continue to change with each passing day.

### Factionalism, Its Roots & Effects in the APC (For Michelle & the APC)

Friday, September 1, 1978

Factionalism has had a role and effect in and on the life of the APC since the very beginning stages of the APC. It took its place in the APC because it existed in the practice of the majority of those who founded the APC. Though a bad trend, and a corrosive process, factionalism was not a known quantity at that time, was not seen, never mind perceived, as a bad thing, and therefore was not opposed and rooted out. The very roots of the founding of the APC were tied into and steeped in factionalism inside that body known as the APL.

From the beginning I was the leader of factionalism and, in all ways of looking at things, the big factionalist. Other factionalist trends in individuals were minor and quite naive, I would think, particularly when placed alongside my own older and quite hardened factionalist tendencies. The other factionalists rose or fell in the APL, to a large extent, in direct relationship to their unity or closeness to me.

When I speak of other factionalist trends I'm speaking about two main ones other than mine. The first, and major opposition faction to my aims and dissenting-from-the-majority views, was the faction of (*4 Alive Press Limited shareholders*). At the same time there was a minor potential faction of (*2 Alive Press Limited shareholders*), but this one never took hold inside the APL. Thus, the faction of (*4 shareholders*) was a definite faction which had aims and dissenting views from the original unity of purpose in founding the APL. This faction from time to time won and lost support from (*3 Alive Press Limited shareholders*). One of the main reasons that this faction was unable to have its way or unleash its intended effect was the distance between them and the centre of the APL operations.

Since I was the main motive force in the main program, their faction depended on unity with me to effect its aims. That unity, however, based on a liberal factionalism in the school system where most of us taught, was shattered before the founding of APL when I was deserted by them and given no support at the time I was fired from teaching in April-May, 1970.

The second main original faction other than my own was that represented by the remnants of the Philosophers (*sic*) Club. That Club was a definite faction in BMHS and outside BMHS. This was a

much more naive faction than that of (*4 Alive Press Limited shareholders*). It was a basic, though misguided, rebellion of youth against the norms of a rotten society. My views and aspirations had much more in common with the Philosophers (*sic*) Club than with those in the APL who aspired to reputations and efficient family businesses.

Thus, Michelle and I, faced with divergent interests and minority groups, chose to unite with the remnants of the Philosophers (*sic*) Club, a group with low expectations in terms of personal aggrandizement and a youthful enthusiasm to tackle the world's problems. This brought us, Michelle and I and the remnants of the Philosophers (*sic*) Club, into direct confrontation with all the other individuals and factions in the APL.

The programs which Michelle and I and (*comrade N*) and (*comrade P*) carried gave rise to growth of our faction in the APL and also to the beginning of a separate organism — the APC. Our faction in the APL became the largest — 8 out of the 18 at the end, I believe. In that it was our faction that controlled, through work, the programs of the APL and we were able to impose our will on the APL. One by one the others were beaten down by our block and our willingness to go all the way in struggle, even to the extent of abandoning the APL form and starting from scratch.

It was the 8 of us then, in 1972, who formed the APC (first called the *Alive Editorial Collective* and then the *Alive Production Collective*). As a result of our ruthless and full-time campaigns, and as a result of our dogmatic approach to struggle, we became the majority of active participants in the APL. By early 1973 there was only one active participant in the APL other than our powerful faction (which did not cease being a faction simply by becoming the majority of active participants). That one person was (*1 shareholder*). By the end of 1973 he too was gone from active participation.

Not one of these participants, shareholders, has ever divested themselves of all their shares and so still, in fact, the APC members constitute a powerful faction in the APL. All of this powerhouse factionalism was organized and led by me. Not one of those who tried to stand against me in that process was successful. The thing which grew from my perception of doing something to change the world, did not and could not be manipulated by those others. This despite my bringing into existence various forms inside the APL, in which these others could have carried their ideas to fruition. Workshops were set up in which these others could use the umbrella protection of APL and all decision making was placed officially on a one-person-one-vote basis rather than a one-share-one-vote basis (for I held more than 50% of the shares and could win any vote I wanted). But this did not work because the majority was split into many factions and the minority was a hard-and-fast block. On the only occasions when proxies were sent to (*1 shareholder*) to oppose our policies, he was presented with my resignation and the threatened withdrawal of the services of our faction. Faced with that, at the end of 1972, (*1 shareholder*) pulled back and we pressed forward.

It was out of this that the APC was born and it was in that birth that the seeds of degeneration, splits and liquidation were sown. The struggles which were waged by my faction in the APL did not only beat down and terrify those others, they also, it can be seen now, had the same effect inside the new born APC. As we conquered all who stood in our way, by conscious factional planning away from the APL, we built up an attitude, among some in our own ranks, of fear and trepidation at the possibility that the faction would ever turn on oneself. The damage was done at the very beginning and the seeds of mistrust were taking root. It would not take long for the corrosion to have effect inside the APC.

The final, ruthless struggle with (*1 shareholder*) took place in August of 1973 and the APC was the sole controlling body active in the APL. Our focus then turned inwards and we started to gnaw at our own guts. The ways that we knew about struggle could not and did not serve us in sorting out internal contradictions. We knew only of an "us and them" form of struggle. Between September, 1973 and about January, 1974, devastation hit the APC by its own

hand and led time and again by me and my rotten politics.

The struggles between (*comrade Q*) and (*comrade P*) had gone through various physical assaults and (*comrade Q's*) terror, which she brought with her to Guelph, was institutionalized, perhaps irreversibly. A last-minute struggle against doing the same in the APC as we had done in the APL, prevented us from expelling (*comrade Q*). She began a series of punishments and suspensions and confinements which continued to her recent departure. She did not want to leave and was not able to struggle against the leadership of the faction she was a member of and so we developed the form of suspension.

Next, and quickly so, (*comrade K*) left our ranks on a half hour notice. We reacted to that with true factional spirit and hardened ourselves against him. We did not attempt to look at ourselves to see what was wrong but only shook our heads at his weakness and wrote him off as a lost cause.

The process of factional degeneration continued to unwind. (*Comrade O*), having experienced the severe and even vicious struggles in the APC, against (*comrade Q*), and in the aftermath of (*comrade K*), left without warning. Again our factional spirit welled up and denunciations abounded. Again we hardened ourselves and deepened our fortress mentality of us and them. And then came the final, for that time, blow. Three weeks or so after (*comrade O*) left (*comrade N*) cracked under the strain (his tears had been met with the usual factional shouting and cursing) and left without warning.

Thus, in February of 1974, the faction which had grown strong was devastated in numbers. There was left only Michelle and I, (*comrade P*) and (*comrade L*). (*Comrade Q*) came and went at this time on a relatively frequent basis. This time was also marked by the arrival of a new car, new truck and a lot of new, expensive equipment for typesetting. Agreements made and developed involved a lot of money and required a lot of work to meet payments. The corrosive effect of factionalism had dealt a heavy blow to the growing power of the APC. As the old folk-saying puts it: The chickens had come home to roost!

Each and every member who had left, had done so because of the inflexibility of the factionalist spirit and structure which afflicted the APC. The removal of the final external opponents in the struggle to control the machinery of propaganda and the content of propaganda, led directly to the first major evidences of the "dog-eating-its-own-tail" syndrome which has afflicted the APC ever since.

Unable to sort out and solve (*comrade P*) and (*comrade Q's*) contradictions we, which overwhelmingly means me, separated them. Then, still unable to sort out (*comrade Q's*) problems (we never really tried to come to grips with (*comrade P's*) problems) we treated her as an internal enemy. Dedicated, to a large extent, to the needs and interests of oppressed youth, we did little or nothing to come to grips with the things which (*comrade K*) represented and so he left. Attempting to solve everyone's social and sexual problems by means of my narrow perceptions we discussed and examined dormitory-type arrangements for men and women, making arrangements for special husband and wife affairs (social and sexual), and so (*comrade O*) left. Showing dogmatism and a deep-rooted xenophobia we mistreated all of these people in their presence and after their departure. We continually closed our circle tighter and smaller. Faced with this contradiction in relation to (*comrade O*), (*comrade N*) left.

These are some of the specific details of, and manifestations of, the effects of factionalism in the early days, months and years of the APC's existence. They are reflections of a deep rooted insularness and dogmatism in relation to external forces and contradictions. They are also reflections of the tendency to turn on oneself in the absence of active pressure from external forces. Thus, it can be seen, that the cohesiveness of the APC was not ever so much an internal thing as it was a defensiveness against external threats. This accounts for the APC's lack of a democratic centralist internal structure and for its hard shell outer appearance and reality.

In an organization formed out of a faction, and in which there is little or no consciousness of factionalism as a bad thing, and in which factionalism is unopposed in any serious, relevant way, there will be many, many examples of factions and factionalism. This is the case in the APC. Factionalism, perceived or not, is a major force in the APC and in the methods by which APC members work and organize, socially and politically. This all stems primarily from me and my history and I must take primary responsibility for it. A part of this process of taking responsibility must be an examination of the roots of factionalism in my own case, long before the APC or the APL came into existence. In that examination people will see how it is that I came to be the most powerful factionalist, faction leader, in the APL and the APC and how it has been next to impossible to root this out in the past — speaking here of the possibility of others rooting it out.

Obviously, the example of factionalism which specifically occupies the APC members (*sic*) attention at this time is that thing consisting of me and Michelle, (*comrade I*), (*comrade D*). There is no doubt that I was the leader of that and would have to take primary responsibility for it even if I were not a direct member of the group, for I am the founder and leader of factionalism itself as a strong and corrosive tendency in the APC as a whole.

This example of factionalism was not a full-fledged faction in the true sense of the word. That is, although it had the basic character of "a group of people in an organization, dissident from the main body", it was a single-issue formation or single-issue faction. It had a "common aim" and not "common aims". It was well-established because, to a large extent, it was easy to identify its membership and easy to determine the focus of its attention. Thus, its members acted in concert on the question of discussion of the sexual affairs at hand, internal and external, but did not act in concert on other questions.

This is an example, a major one, of the nature of factions within other factions — that is, of sub-factions. The events which led to the common ground for formation of this faction, together with the overall factionalist history of the APC, laid the groundwork (prepared conditions) for this faction. It was not however, as dangerous to the life of the Collective, as the corrosive effect of factionalist tendencies in the leadership element, or the various attempted leadership units.

A major mistake which has given rise to the major problem of factionalism in the APC is the failure to distinguish clearly between the enemy and the people, institutionalizing (*sic*) of an incorrectly assessed "us and them" attitude and a deployment of methods for dealing with the enemy, among the people. The error of factionalism itself is a very serious one, with roots spreading far and wide. Those not in the faction, or not listening to the faction's "wisdom" are placed in the ranks of "them" and treated with contempt and harsh words. This has an extremely corrosive effect internally, as we have seen through the years, and a devastating effect on our organization's capacity to win people over to the ideas which we promote. The ideas which we promote are constantly blotted out by the manifestations of factionalism in action and dogmatism in attitudes.

Thus, the effects of factionalism can be seen to be corrosive internally and "suicidal" externally. Factionalism comes up alongside liberalism and intensifies its corrosiveness. The main effect then is to first wipe out the work of a revolutionary organization and, second, to wipe out the revolutionary organization itself. More generally, factionalism dampens and douses the spirits of people in the revolutionary organization, gives rise to employee mentality, builds up commandism, creates distrust and further dissension among comrades, gives full rein to dogmatism, turns insular tendencies into full-fledged fortress mentality, undermines faith in democracy, lets gossips and slanders run rampant, permits outsiders to walk blindly or unconsciously into dangerous situations and generally feeds on and fertilizes any bad thing that comes along.

My view of the specific factionalism which is occupying the

spotlight at the moment is that it is in itself a relatively minor reflection of a very major factionalist problem. Its effect on the life of the Collective is essentially bad in so far (*sic*), especially, as it is in company with all the other evidences of factionalism for which I am responsible. My perception of my role in this specific one, is the same as my perception of my role in all the others — I founded it, I led it and I am primarily and overwhelmingly responsible for (*sic*). Additionally, my perception is that this and all other evidences of factionalism are bad things which must be opposed.

That this factionalism, in its specific exposure, is having a sparking, by negative effect, on the APC is the only good thing — and certainly not attributable to the thing itself. That there was within that example of factionalism a spectrum of views, to some extent must also eventually be perceived. Michelle was and is the only member of that particular grouping (and of a somewhat larger circle in the world) who had had and has had sexual relations with only one person. Her role in that factionalism, then, was different than that of the rest of us. If there was major resistance to social degeneration there then it was embodied in her. That she weakened in this and co-operated in the specific factionalism is, to my view (in my perception) outweighed and counter-balanced in the final analysis by her radical rupture from the thing and from the surrounding elements which had similar factionalist tendencies and realities.

I have further views and comments on the problems and development of factionalism, its roots and effects, in the APC and will continue to pursue these. Let me first, however, put forward the thought that underlying all of the problems faced and being faced, has been the combined effect of impatience and complacency. Impatience with others and complacency with ourselves has wreaked havoc in our development. The complacency has enabled us to live with mistakes without preparing ourselves to deal with those mistakes at critical times. The impatience has led us to take actions and make judgements at times of crisis even when unprepared to do so. This combination has brought on an impotency in the face of internal contradictions and development which has, in turn, strengthened the tendency to factionalism.

For all the bad things in the APC and the APC history to date, I take and will always shoulder, the primary responsibility. To root these bad things out in their entirety and to counter their negative effect will require a lot of identification and criticism of examples of factionalism founded and led by me. In the main I think it can be said that the effect of any one example of factionalism in the APC has had a minor specific negative role in the cumulative process of degeneration and numbing of the collective revolutionary zeal. That this particular example has resulted in such a massive explosion, so to speak, is due mainly to its relatively extended confinement and its relatively volatile nature, in opposition to dearly held principles. By this last I mean that this matter of sexual relations is one in which we all received training designed to keep us away from "playing the field". That was at home and in school. In the playgrounds and on the streets we were all exposed to the actual bourgeois degenerate culture and most of us fell prey to it to one degree or another. Then, inside the APC, this changed again but not by any known educational process or directly traceable ideological struggle. Rather there was a dogmatic posture taken which bottled up the struggle and made an explosion almost inevitable sooner or later. That is, the posture taken was a viewpoint or system based on insufficiently examined premises. That is, the posture taken was mainly one of this is wrong, period.

This dogmatism, combined with a centralist organization coming out of a faction, is largely responsible for the situation in which APC members find themselves whenever they attempt to examine the norms and principles of the APC. There is no constitutional (*sic*) form, there is no concentrated expression of norms and principles, which can be held and studied for guidance, for clarity and for development. There is only the differing perceptions of various members on those norms and principles.

Thus, many outsiders view us, respectfully, as a Marxist-

Leninist organization and we are forced to deny that. Many outsiders view us, disrespectfully, as a communist group and we are forced to defend genuine Marxism-Leninism while still denying that that is what we are. And, finally, many insiders have not been able to see what kind of an organization the APC actually is. This, again, notwithstanding the existence of the current Alive View which is the thing which looks most constitutional but which actually serves to cushion and defuse the drive for a known constituency and a known constitutional structure of norms, principles and positions.

The development of units in the APC and of groups surrounding the APC was not, and could not become, a model of or an example of democratic centralism. Imposed from above and not resulting from democratic processes these units and groups have essentially been factionalist in nature, if not in sentiment. At best they could operate as independent groups united on specific (no matter how noble) tasks. At worst they would become, or did become, weighted down with factionalist constrictions. This has marked the entire history of units, groups, clubs, associate collectives and workshops throughout the history of the APL and the APC. Each of these things had an initial degree of success in giving voice to someone or group. Each of these things fell by the wayside as the main factionalist trend re-arranged itself and re-trenched itself.

Earlier in this document I went through the roots and effects of factionalism in the 1970 to 1974 period. There were struggles waged against external forces other than those in the APL. However, these were mainly characterized, or should be mainly characterized, as skirmishes. These include skirmishes with the revisionists headed by AGP; with the Bainzites headed locally by "Keith" and "Terry"; with cultural careerists headed by "Clare", "Brian", and "Jim"; with university hacks headed by "Gary"; and even with the state police forces headed by "K-W" and "London". In the face of all these struggles our basic factionalism profited and grew, our perceptions of genuine class struggle were clouded and obscured, and our fortress mentality was built up brick by brick in our self-righteous pursuit of our own echoes. And between skirmishes our complacency took deeper and deeper root as we crowed about our perceived victories and took pride in our perceived growing invincibility.

It was into this environ (*sic*) that the leading Bainzites marched at the end of 1974. This time we were faced not with a skirmish but with a genuine attempt to liquidate us by an organization which knew us far better than we knew our actual selves. Our relatively unconscious, but deeply rooted, factionalism was attacked by a most consciously factional organization — programmed and led by the Soviet social-imperialist KGB.

We were upheld as every good thing under the sun, as incorruptible, and collectively we basked in that incorrect identification. The things which were said and the ways that we were introduced, accorded with our xenophobic, dogmatic fortress mentality of "good us and bad them". I was upheld the most and our women were upheld the second most. The factionalism and ignorance which was widespread was a perfect breeding ground for a Bainzite Blitzkreig! The blitz was launched and our physical weakness started to show immediate signs of cracking and splitting. I, the founder and leader of factionalism, was taken from the little pond where I was a big frog, and placed in a myriad of big ponds in each of which I was a little frog trying still to be a big frog. I inhaled and inhaled and inhaled, I was pumped up and up and up. The process of physical breakdown, degeneration was quite notable. At one point my body stopped working completely and at another point half my face stopped working.

Once again the chickens had come home to roost! Having greatly weakened the centre of the centralized organization the Bainzites moved to remove the organization from its known soil, its home base and only base. I obviously and quickly seized at the proposed move to Vancouver and won unanimous support for the move in the usual factionalist way. At the last minute (*comrade N*) and (*comrade O*) backed out of the move and the Bainzite plan began to

unravel. This was not the conscious plan on our part but was a thing which permitted the regrouping of my factionalism at a later date in 1975.

The details of movements back and forth across the country between May and September of 1975 are fairly well known. They can be characterized as some initial panic-stricken attempts to resist the uprooting and destruction of the APC followed by a growing consciousness that we were being attacked consciously and programmatically (*sic*). Once that consciousness was attained the APC again drew together and closed ranks in defense of itself and its factionalist leader. The only member who did not return at that time was (*comrade L*), who had been the main subject of factionalist, centralist attacks by me in late 1974 and early 1975. (So, his loss to the revolution is also attributable to me and my mistakes and responsibility for it must be shouldered by me.)

In the struggle against the continually intensifying Bainzite encirclement and attempted suppression our ranks grew a bit. But more so, the growth was taking place on the front of our fortress mentality — and within that fortress the inevitable social degeneration was taking hold. In a factionalist thing, also, it can be seen that there is a steady expectation that any one (*sic*) can flee the fortress and/or any one (*sic*) can be made to walk the plank.

No matter what new programs or structures were instituted there was always an eventual return to complacency, tolling the bell and reliance on defensive skirmishes for an outlet for revolutionary zeal. Our successes in the main centred on defending ourselves and on promoting other people's ideas and struggles. Our energies were taken up in large part with the struggle to re-establish our power base. Little or none of our energies went into a self-critical examination of our mistakes and weaknesses — and so we did not undergo radical rupture with factionalism nor did we succeed in our aspirations to a democratic centralist existence.

In all of this I am responsible for the mistakes and the weaknesses; I am responsible for the failures. This does not mean that I am a bastard or a rotten person. It means that I am a person who stepped forward and made major mistakes time after time over an eight year period and longer. Nor does it mean that the APC and its work have been or are rotten and useless. It means, in the final analysis, that the work achieved has not come close to its potential. Thus, today, it can be said that as a result of major mistakes and deep-going weaknesses I have failed and the things which I have given rise to have failed.

So, we are faced with a situation where we must attempt to seize victory from the jaws of defeat! That is not too great a task! As Chairman Mao says:

**"Fight, fail, fight again, fail again, fight again ... till their victory; that is the logic of the people, and they too will never go against this logic. This is another Marxist law. The Russian people's revolution followed this law, and so has the Chinese people's revolution."**

Let it be known that this is true for us and for the Canadian people's revolution!

Let it also be known that factionalism is a manifestation of opportunism and is on the organizational front the same as liberalism on the ideological front. They are twin children of opportunism and must be combatted and opposed. There can be no room for either in the ranks of the revolution!

Let those who are just waking up to the blinding effects of factionalism in the APC not restrict their perceptions of it to the first part that they see! If we are to root it out, cauterize it, then we must face it all — all its roots and all its effects in the APC. To do this we must see our factionalism but we must also confront our complacency. As Chairman Mao says: **"Complacency is the enemy of study. We cannot really learn anything until we rid ourselves of complacency. Our attitude towards ourselves should be 'to be insatiable in learning' and towards others 'to be tireless in teaching'."** (October, 1938)

I have in the course of the years fallen into the pattern of being "bored of learning" and "tired of teaching." This despondency and

degeneration comes time after time from my factionalism and from my historic inability to impose democracy on the things I touch. These mistaken ideas and wrong-headed patterns are tied up together in a repetitive and redundantly stupefying cause and effect relationship.

There is a depth to my mistakes and weaknesses which requires that I start from scratch or give up altogether in the face of the morass I have given rise to. I choose to start from scratch, to respond to failure by fighting again. I choose to attempt to turn failure into success.

**"If a man wants to succeed in his work, that is, to achieve the anticipated results, he must bring his ideas into correspondence with the laws of the objective external world; if they do not correspond, he will fail in his practice. After he fails, he draws his lessons, corrects his ideas to make them correspond to the laws of the external world, and can thus turn failure into success; this is what is meant by 'failure is the mother of success' and 'a fall in the pit, a gain in your wit.'" (Chairman Mao, July, 1937)**

My factionalism and other mistakes have been so thoroughly shitty, that if and when I succeed I should indeed be very witty! The same can be said for others who have been caught up in or joined into my mistakes of their own volition. I must bring my ideas into correspondence with the laws of the objective external world. I do not think, and I say this with all due respect to the "members of the APC", that this means bringing my ideas into correspondence with the laws of the APC.

### **The Difference Between Secrecy and Privacy Is a Thin Line; Without Clearly Defined Norms The Distinctions Blur and the Rights of Individuals And Groups Go by the Board! (For Michelle & the APC)**

*September 1, 1978*

Neither secrecy nor privacy are bad things in themselves, it is only in their application that they serve good or bad ends. The motivation for the secrecy and the privacy must be the major determining factor in judging the value of the secrecy or privacy. The effect which the secrecy or the privacy has on others can also play a part in judging the value of the secrecy or privacy.

Even a conspiracy of silence is not a good thing or bad thing, as such. Again it is the motivation for the conspiracy of silence and the effect of the conspiracy of silence which must be studied to determine its goodness or badness.

Although in this society, the term "conspiracy of silence" has negative connotations and immediately brings bad images to mind this is the result of propaganda in the bourgeois culture. For example, a conspiracy of silence by a revolutionary group about its involvement in certain activities and about its membership would be a bad thing in the eyes of the bourgeoisie but a good thing in the eyes of the revolutionary organization itself.

What exactly is a conspiracy of silence? A dictionary defines it as: A secret agreement to keep silent about an occurrence, situation, or subject especially in order to promote or protect selfish interest. A revolutionary conspiracy of silence then would be seen by a bourgeois to be a bad thing for, to a bourgeois, revolution is an action in the selfish interests of the revolutionaries!

Was there a conspiracy of silence by me and Michelle, (*comrade I*), (*comrade D*) on the question of sexual relations? Yes there was. To determine whether it was a good or bad thing we must study the motive and effect. We must also look at whether it was a good thing which became a bad thing or a bad thing which remained a bad thing etc. Did the conspiracy of silence remain a conspiracy by four people? In a sense yes and in a sense no. The extent of the thing remained a conspiracy of four but the essence of the thing became a conspiracy of (*number deleted*). The conspiracy of silence by (*number deleted*) against the external world was seen to be a good and

necessary thing by (*number deleted*). But what of the conspiracy of silence against the one APC member? Was that a good thing or a bad thing? It was seen to be a necessary thing because of the perception that the one member would not be able to handle the thing which was the secret — thus it was good because it was perceived to be necessary.

But this was also the logic of the original conspiracy of silence. It was determined that none of the four knew enough of the nature of the contradiction to deal with it in a wider circle. It was also determined that none of the four knew who could handle dealing with this contradiction. Thus was the conspiracy of silence established. At the same time however, discussion was launched (successful or not) and an agreement was made that none of the four would engage in sexual relations until further notice.

The conspiracy of silence was thus motivated not by fear of discovery but by a desire to sort out the problem. There was an inevitability to the aspect of discovery since it was quite well recognized that the event of (*comrade I's*) pregnancy was "conspiring" to undo the secret in the foreseeable (*sic*) future.

The conspiracy was never one in favour of or working for social or sexual degeneracy. The conspiracy was (misguided or not) a reflection of the need to oppose that degeneracy which had already taken place. That that conspiracy did not halt the degenerating process is attributable to a wider set of factors that (*sic*) can be found in that conspiracy itself.

To that extent, the conspiracy was not one which conspired to commit an act but rather to hide a series of acts until the perpetrators were better able to deal with it.

This brings us back to the existence of secrecy in the APC and the problems of privacy in the APC. Is it wrong to have secrets and even "conspiracies of secrecy" inside an organization? No, it is not wrong. There will continue to be secrets inside organizations. Is it wrong for an organization to have secrets from outside forces? No, it is not only not wrong, it is a necessity.

What is a secret? It is: Something kept hidden or unexplained — something kept from the knowledge of others or shared confidentially with a few. We can see that internal secrets should be far fewer than external secrets and should be kept only long enough to permit a preparing of conditions for explaining the thing at hand.

But what, then, is privacy? It is: The quality or condition of being private (of or concerning a particular person or group; not general; not open to or controlled by the public); withdrawal from public view; seclusion — and finally, secrecy.

Individuals in the APC have an assumed, acquired right to privacy. The APC itself has a seized right to privacy from outside forces. These things are clearly demands made in our history and have many times given rise to struggles and splits. What rights to privacy do groupings inside the APC have or need? That has never been so clear. It has never been dealt with in a proper way. What rights to privacy did the four of us have last January? That was not clear then to us and is not clear yet in the face of dogmatism on the questions of secrecy and privacy.

Norms imposed on the APC from Marxist-Leninist sources may not be applicable to those individuals involved in that situation, any more so than they are applicable to the often professed non-Marxist-Leninist APC itself. When the situation involving (*comrade I*) and myself and Michelle was made known a cursory examination by the APC resulted in a re-establishment of the privacy of the three of us. That is, we were left to deal with it ourselves in practice. How is it that I can have an affair with (*comrade I*) and that be treated relatively lightly, while a second and similar affair with (*comrade D*) can be treated so differently? Both were primarily initiated and conducted prior to the mini-cultural revolution. Is there such a difference between having had a mistress once and having had a mistress twice? The mistake is substantial but how much more substantial is it or more surprising can it legitimately be when it is repeated? When a mistake is made and not fully rooted out it is bound to be repeated. People who make mistakes cannot

possibly simply will themselves out of repeating the mistakes.

Liberalism, rampant throughout the Collective, from top to bottom, caused a relatively casual and cursory examination of the mistake made public in the APC in February of this year. Liberalism caused a casual attitude to be taken to the formation, the known formation, of the discussion group of Michelle, (*comrade I*) and (*comrade D*). Liberalism prevented anyone outside that discussion group from investigating the constituency of the group or the progress of the group (or lack of progress).

And I must and do take primary responsibility for all these mistakes. I take primary responsibility for the lack of democratic centralism in the APC and for the lack of struggle to develop a constitution in which would be known the norms of privacy and secrecy. Nobody can show me such norms because they have not existed outside the narrow, dogmatic perceptions of myself and others individually. Nobody can show me a norm or point to a time in our history when we discussed and reached agreement on monogamy, the rightness or wrongness of engaging in relations with a mistress, or anything along these lines because these things were never hammered out in the APC, in theory or in conscious practice. They were avoided along with many other necessary things in the interests of "peace and friendship".

And again I take primary responsibility for all of this! These things are attributable to my mistakes and my weaknesses. They will not, however, be rooted out of the APC by simple criticism of me or self-criticism by me. Nor will they be rooted out of the APC by my intended resignation from the APC. That we can be sure of! My responsibility and the burden of my mistakes will still be with me whether in or out of the APC. That is a fact!

If secrets, then, inside the organization must only be temporary, and held only until conditions are prepared for their dissemination, what of privacy? Is that also a temporary thing? No, it is not. It is as permanent a thing as the individuals and groups (married couples etc.) will have some rights to privacy. This is why we need to have clear understanding of the nature of privacy and the role of secrets. This is why we need to struggle against the blurring of distinctions and struggle for known and agreed upon constitutionalized structures in our organizational forms.

### Promiscuity: Is That A Thing Which I Have Been Guilty Of? (For Michelle & the APC)

September 2, 1978

I am asked to deal with my degeneration and am eagerly taking up that in as all-rounded a way as I can. My aim is to go beyond the usual superficial and cursory analysis which has been evidenced in my factionalist and liberal history. In a point put by members of the APC I read: "It is our perception that over the past years there has been a degeneration in your workstyle and your whole lifestyle since promiscuity became a factor of your social practice in the Collective." At another place the same members have clearly said that they have drawn only one conclusion, and that conclusion was something other than that I have been promiscuous.

The sentence quoted above is classically in the genre of the famous "have you stopped beating your wife?" joke in which a yes or no answer cannot be given without indicating that you have in the past or are now beating your wife. I do not agree that I have ever been a promiscuous person and hence do not agree that my degeneration stems from or has been intensified by promiscuity. The "have-you-stopped-beating-your-wife" type of logic is also characterized as "a priori" thinking.

In order to correctly identify mistakes and thus to place them in a posture for change and the cauterizing process I speak of in my own case, we must avoid "a priori" thinking. We must oppose casual drawing of conclusions and making of assumptions. As is evident, to some degree, in my current writings, it is my view that my mistakes stem from factionalism, liberalism and wrong-headed

centralism rooted in times prior to the APC and flowering in a big way in the APC. The degeneration in my workstyle and lifestyle is attributable to the chain of failures resulting from these things.

What is promiscuity? Although it is a word most usually applied to sexual relations it is also applicable in other spheres. A dictionary defines promiscuous as: Showing little or no discrimination; engaging in sexual intercourse with many persons casually; casual, carelessly, irregular; promiscuity.

Have I been promiscuous? No, I have not ever been a promiscuous person. In fact, I would contend, my history proves quite the contrary. Have I been guilty of mistakes in my social and sexual relations? Yes, but not mistakes of promiscuity.

A cursory glance at my history might well indicate that there has been evidence of major degeneration in my workstyle and lifestyle in the past eight months. But a more scientific study and investigation, just with the facts at hand to the [APC] members, would prove that the patterns evidenced in the past months have been equally evidenced in various periods through the years of the APC and even before that. The degeneration has always been directly related to the failure of attempts to achieve progress in the work and life goals perceived and set down in *Alive* and prior activities. These failures were inevitable given the wrong methods used and mistaken ideas on organizational forms. Here I refer people to my document: Factionalism, its roots and effects in the APC, and to my other documents on the life and problems of the APC.

Degeneration of my workstyle and lifestyle does not only "involve" my increasing and repeated inability to initiate and lead democratic Collective programs. That degeneration is a direct result of that increasing and repeated inability. Mistakes and failures on my part have more often than not given rise to despondency, degeneration and passivity on my part. Is watching television better or worse than (*sic*) leading a factionalist and centralist set of programs? It is a passive alternative and a passive response to the despondency and the degeneration. It is a way of getting out of the way. It contributes nothing positive to the life of the Collective but it can cut down on the negative contributions of centralism — in quantity if not in quality.

As for the matter of sleeping in the daytime, there are good and bad aspects to this. Sometimes this has been a result of the process of degeneration — resulting from time wasted. But sometimes it has been a result of long hours of hard work going right through the night. I don't feel that it is particularly important for me to go into or detail the latter. It is sufficient to say that failures in programs and aspirations has (*sic*) given rise on many occasions in my life to extended periods of wasted time and gloomy contributions to the life of the society immediately around me.

To examine these reflections of my bad lines (my mistakes and weaknesses) is fine but to concentrate on their manifestation in the past six months or so would be a mistake. They were not unique in my history and nor did they accelerate appreciably more or less than at other times when my mistakes and weaknesses brought on a major awareness of failure once again. For example, would it have been better in the past months if I had boycotted television and worked to rule in the daytime? Hardly! This has also been done in the past, on occasion, as a response to failure and has not served to root out the actual mistakes and the actual weaknesses.

The things noted by the [APC] members are one of many possible reflections of degeneration — but they are not the criterion of the degeneration (*sic*) and study of them will give only a superficial account of the nature of the degeneration, its roots and effects. In short, I have been more comfortable working at night than in the daytime since 1966. Also, I have been a television addict, to one degree or another, since about 1962. This is the same period that I have been a cigarette addict and a coffee addict. That coincides with the time I became a school teacher at the age of 17 and began a long line of major failures. Since in one more month I will be 34, this means that I have been an addict to those things for almost half of my entire life. I know deeply and very viscerally the truth of the

logic of the people: fight, fail, fight again, fail again, fight again, fail again — till their victory. I am not ashamed of my failures because I know that I have tried my hardest. If anything I am ashamed of how long it has taken me to recognize that my entire methods have been based on entirely wrong premises. And, to a great degree, I am and have always been, saddened by those who have been hurt in the turmoil of my mistakes.

The degenerations, periodic and quite frequent, in my workstyle and lifestyle do not date from promiscuity and nor do they date from or particularly accelerate from particular events in January or February of this year. To accept that perception as accurate would be to opt out of and avoid deep going struggle to root out and cauterize the long-established mistakes and the corrosive effects of factionalism and liberalism throughout the history of the APC.

The stated perception of the members of the APC is an indication that they are not yet going deeply enough into me, themselves or the APC. That, hopefully, will come. Further writings by me or my history of work and life, may well help the members in that necessary process.

In my last year of professional teaching I made several sound collage tapes for playing in my classroom as my students wrote and produced books of poetry, short stories and even a couple of science fiction novels. A constant item, one which was placed on each tape, was the refrain from a song by a pop group whose name was, I believe, *America (sic)*. The song was one of many "anti-war" songs of the time and was called *Anthemn (sic)*. The refrain went something like this: "I've got something to live for, how about you? / I've got something to die for, what else can they do?" That piece, played with a somewhat haunting lyricism based on flutes and acoustic guitar, served as a slightly chilling counter-point to the wildness of songs like *Magic Carpet Ride*.

In a certain sense that refrain has relevance to my weaknesses and my mistakes — and hence to my periodic despondency and degeneration. I have not been and am not afraid to die for what I believe — but I have run into problems in living what I believe. This was and is inevitable when there is a completely wrong-headed approach to implementation of ideas, beliefs. For, uncorrected, this inevitably leads to the point, time and again, where one is willing to die for ideas which constantly appear to be failing. That must bring despondency and degeneration. Attempts to "fight again" based on the same old premises return the fighter to the same dead end. Only when the mistaken ideas are rooted out and the correct ideas moved forward to serve as premises for the struggle, can the victories be achieved.

## To The Members of the APC Guelph, Ontario

September 4, 1978

Comrades,

In accordance with and as a part of the ideas I have put forward in writings titled:

(1) Response to statement by members of the APC to EP, August 29, 1978; (2) What kind of organization is the APC? A look at problems which arise from an inaccurate and sloppy assessment; (3) Factionalism, its roots & effects in the APC; (4) The difference between secrecy and privacy is a thin line; without clearly defined norms the distinctions blur and the rights of individuals and groups go by the board; (5) Promiscuity: is that the thing which I have been guilty of?

I hereby tender my resignation from the Lu Hsun Unit, effective September 5, 1978, the date of submission of this and those documents.

Another and longer piece of writing, titled: — *The Tangled Web*: I have touched bottom but have not ever been a part of that social strata, should be ready for your initial examination by the weekend of the 15-17 of this month.

Yours sincerely,

**Response to: Statement by Members of the APC to  
Edward Pickersgill, September 5, 1978  
(Rec'd at 1 p.m. Meeting)**

September 5, 1978 — 3 p.m.

I thank you for your statement and look forward to the schedule of meetings you have outlined. I will attend those meetings as promptly as possible and will attempt to make my participation a useful and positive one. Positions and views which I have will continue to be made as much as possible in a written and recordable fashion.

As a starting point I will bring a written response to your statement of today, with which I have some disagreement on minor points.

As I said verbally, I here state in writing, that neither I nor Michelle have any great interest in arguing about control or ownership of Alive Press Ltd. or its related activities and are willing to participate amicably in a process of paperwork necessary to place those things and debts in the hands of others, if the Collective wants that to be done. Michelle has said this to me and in so many words. Other than that I do not speak for, nor do I wish to speak for, Michelle.

Finally, I do not need the \$40 you offered at this time but thank you for the offer.

Yours sincerely,

**Response To Yesterday's Statement By  
Members of the APC**

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

I look forward to your responses to my various documents which you state are all wrong and mischaracterize the current struggle and completely distort the history of the APC and attempt in a single stroke to destroy the revolutionary principles and stated policies of the APC. In the meantime I stand by the ideas and points put forward in those documents and am not able to see the things you have stated.

There is agreement, on my part, with your contention that a rotten political line cannot possibly manifest itself in but a single facet of practice and inevitably taints many, many facets of a person's practice. In my own case I look for evidence in all facets (*sic*) of my past practice and have been doing so for some time now. For a time it scared me to consider how extensively factionalism and dogmatism and centralism permeated my practice and my consciousness. Now it does not scare me so much because I am confident that I am coming to grips with my bad lines and history and rooting them out. Obviously this will take a relatively long time to complete but I am satisfied that the struggle is well under way and progressing at a satisfactory rate.

I know that I am not involved in intentional provocations but do realize and understand that my intentions do not govern other people's responses. Also I am certain that your comments on Michelle making statements known to be lies are very far from the truth and a sign of the things which I addressed in my writings of the past week on factionalism and the nature of the APC itself. Speaking for myself, I am not a liar and have not been giving anything other than my definite views on various points. If there prove to be irreconcilable differences on some points of view regarding things such as "business enterprises" they can be worked out quite easily.

If, for example, you wish me to resign as president of Alive Press Ltd., as a director of Alive Press Ltd., and to transfer all my shares in Alive Press Ltd., all you have to do is make a written request within the framework of Alive Press Ltd. Other than that I will, given the current attitudes to the ongoing struggle, be offering these resignations in the foreseeable (*sic*) future whether requested or not. On tendering of such resignations it would also seem appropriate for a written and authorised acceptance of my

resignations, especially if they are requested before conditions are seen to be suitable by me.

Perhaps, in reference to your last paragraph on page two of your written statement, it would be relevant for me to reiterate a point which I have been making periodically since August 1, 1978. That is, I see the APC as being steeped in wrong ideas and practice since its very inception. My concerns, then, are for the Collective but only to a degree. My main concerns are that we and others learn important lessons about such factionalism, such centralism and such anti-democratic practice as I am primarily responsible for in connection with Alive. This is not to say that nothing good has been done or said in the 8 years of the APC. A good number of good things have been done and said and there is a fair amount to be proud of by those who have contributed directly or in support roles. It is, rather, to say that those things go by the board compared to the factionalism, dogmatism and wrong-headed centralism which has permeated the APC all along.

As in the past with other struggles I am of the opinion that while the class struggle on the specific and general political questions must be waged in a protracted struggle, we must at the same time be able to clear up other points which occupy some participant's (*sic*) minds and make it difficult for them, rightly or wrongly, to concentrate on the great issues at hand. Surely the best results will be achieved if and when such sideline issues as "small businesses and who is shouldering them in practice and other ways" have been resolved. Since I have, in writing, stated my intention to resign from the Collective and from the businesses and have also stated my willingness to examine the necessary paperwork for transferring my legal and economic responsibilities to other members of the APC, I do not see any reason for further hasty, and, in my view, superficial, presentation of single copy documents for my signature. While it may all be seen to be a minor and mere-formality internal affair by you, it is hardly that for me and for my capacity to earn a living in the near and distant future. While I would be cautious to raise such a livelihood to the level of principle at this time it remains a fact that it is an issue, and one which must be resolved in a mutually beneficial way.

Since there has been a major stated position taken that I do not own People Media I am taking steps to close that bank account. As you know, that account is not needed by you to process cheques made to People Media. Thus my personal connection to People Media since March, 1971, will be severed and my relationship will be contained within the APL framework.

Regarding the schedule of meetings which you have proposed, I reiterate my willingness to participate in them. It would be good if recognizable norms were put in place to govern the conduct of these meetings. In the four-hour meetings, for example, it would be good to have a ten minute break sometime around the half-way mark. This is not meant to imply that these things are not already in your considerations. For my part I would like to reserve the right to respond to various questions and documents on the day following each meeting if I feel that that would be best. In the course of the five day schedule I will endeavour to deal with all of the points raised and if not possible will endeavour to let you know at what point in time I will be able to do so.

Yours sincerely,

**Note to the APC**

Thursday, September 7, 1978

On last Tuesday, when I picked up a sweater at (*street address deleted*) I noticed that all of the material, other than desks and my box of clothes had been moved from my former workroom. I would like to be informed of the status of my papers and documents which were gathered there.

It would be good if I could have access to some of these: Copies of the documents written since August 15, 1978 will probably be important for reference during the next five days of meetings; the package of personal papers left for me by Michelle which contains

my citizenship certificate; the manuscript to Chains; a set of Alive dating at least from the beginning of 1978 and if possible from November, 1975; and copies of the first two Bainzite (AIA) documents of the recent series of three.

Yours sincerely,

### Michelle Landriault's Letter of Resignation

September 7, 1978

Alive —

My new address is (*street address and place name deleted*).

Enclosed is a cheque for 1 year's subscription to Alive Magazine.

So that there is no doubt I am letting you know that I no longer consider myself a member of the Collective. I remain a friend.

I would appreciate having the Electrolux vacuum cleaner.

In getting a phone I attempted to make it clear that the phone in Guelph remain. With Bell however you never know so keep an eye on that.

The kids are doing well and send their best wishes.

Sincerely,

(*Please turn over*)

Enclosed is a piece of Bainzite literature which was mistakenly packed in with our things.

### Michelle Landriault's Letter On Money Worries

September 7, 1978

Alive Press —

A Short (*sic*) note to let you know that a letter is being sent to E. Pickersgill. The letter is from my lawyer and part of it deals with the rental of (*street address deleted*) by Alive Press Ltd. The rental agreement will be for mortgage payments and continued insurance of the house and property.

Sincerely,

### Edward Pickersgill's Letter About Sideline Issues

September 8, 1978

President

Alive Press Ltd.

Box 1283

Guelph, Ontario

Dear Friend,

I understand that there has recently been a shareholders meeting at Alive Press Ltd. in which a new board of directors and a new president were elected. Could you please notify me in writing whether this is the case and what, if any, my status is with reference to those positions. It would also be good to be informed of the company's attitude towards my "personal guarantee" commitments to (*business name deleted*) and towards my share holdings in Alive Press Ltd.

You can contact me by writing and mailing to my name at (*street address deleted*).

Yours sincerely,

### Edward Pickersgill's Letter About Personal Matters

September 8, 1978

c/o (*Comrade M*)

Box 1331

Guelph, Ontario

Dear Friends,

If there is need to get in touch with me I can be contacted by mailing a letter to my name at the (*street address deleted*) address. A

change of address card in the post office will take care of forwarding it to a place that I will check on as regular a basis as I can.

Checking through the bag of clothes you gave me yesterday I notice that the only things I'll probably be needing are my brown winter jacket and my winter boots. Perhaps you could set them aside for me or send them down to Michelle's address when you get it. I'll be checking in there periodically too, of course.

If you do receive personal mail for me I'd appreciate your forwarding it via the route outlined above.

Yours sincerely,

### Edward Pickersgill's Letter of Resignation

September 9, 1978

Alive Production Collective

Box 1331

Guelph, Ontario

Dear Friends,

For personal and political reasons I tender my resignation from membership in the Alive Production Collective and from membership in those organisms connected to the Collective. Also, for the same reasons, I tender my resignation as editor of Alive Magazine. I am hopeful that in the near and distant future we will be able to find some mutually acceptable and beneficial forms for exchange of information and development of anti-imperialist cultural works.

Yours sincerely,

### Edward Pickersgill's Letter Issuing Empty Threats

September 30, 1978

Alive Press Limited

P.O. Box 1283

Guelph, Ontario

Dear (*comrade N*) & (*comrade P*),

I am informed that you have made statements to (*3 individuals' names deleted*) of (*3 business names — customers of People Media Graphics — deleted*), respectively, which amount to a direct accusation that I have stolen \$18,000.00 from sources represented by Alive Press Ltd., People Media Graphics and the Alive Production Collective. You know that your accusations are false. I categorically deny your accusations. I will endeavour to continue to answer your accusations to each of those who have been burdened with them by you.

Further, your statements to these people that most of the \$18,000.00, which you allege I have stolen, was in cash is an additional lying embellishment on the lie you are spreading. Your assertions that the Alive Production Collective receives cash political donations in amounts close to \$75,000.00 per year are also, as you know, absurd lies and run counter to the entire history of Alive and the Alive Production Collective. Your attempts to create an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust are bound to fail and already (*sic*) being seen to fail by those whom you have approached in recent times. Your attempts to float, with (*individual's name deleted*), the illusion that a part of the alleged \$18,000.00 "theft" is proved by your possession by subterfuge of copies of a personal loan form signed by me and my wife is casting you in a very ridiculous light. That loan has nothing to do with you or Alive Press Ltd. or the Alive Production Collective. I am responsible, as I always have been, for payment of that personal loan. To present that as a part of some alleged theft undercuts your already diminished credibility in the very circles you have approached with your unfounded allegations.

As a founding shareholder in Alive Press Ltd., as a member of the board of directors and President of Alive Press Ltd. for most of the time since its founding in August, 1970, as the founder of People Media, and as the individual who has personally carried the People



Media bank account at the CIBC, St. George's Square, since March, 1971, I will now address the question of money which I have drawn since August 15, 1978. These amounts were drawn in a perfectly legal and moral fashion and I have no difficulty in identifying them. August 15 is, as you well know, the date of departure from Guelph of my wife and co-worker, Michelle.

August 21, 1978 from PM Acct. ....\$200.00  
September 7, 1978 from PMG Acct. ....\$250.00  
September 10, 1978 (directly from  
[business customer's name deleted] a cheque  
to PMG and cashed by me) ..... \$801.00  
Also, I take responsibility for  
the cheque which Michelle cashed  
on August 15th, 1978, from PMG Acct. ....\$400.00

TOTAL .....\$1651.00

I acknowledge that I have drawn this amount of money, \$1651.00 and clearly state that this is a straight-forward return for monies and work which I have invested in the previously mentioned businesses. I understand, although I have still to be officially told so by you, that on or about September 7, 1978, a new board of directors was elected at Alive Press Ltd. by a shareholders (sic) meeting called without either Michelle or myself being notified. I further understand that neither Michelle nor I are on that new board of directors. Prior to that meeting (if and when it actually took place) the four members of the board of directors were: me, Michelle Landriault (my wife), (comrade N), and (comrade O) (comrade N's] wife).

I have in my possession copies of a certified cheque made out to (comrade N) by himself and over my signature, though unknown to me, in the amount of \$1690.00, from the People Media account and deposited in the Bank of Nova Scotia where (comrade N) and (comrade O) have their personal bank account. Thus, it can be seen, among other things, that since August 15, 1978 my wife and I (two of the four members of the board of directors of Alive Press Ltd. at the time) have drawn \$1651.00 for personal use; and, (comrade N) and his wife (the other two members of the board of directors of Alive Press Ltd. at the time) have drawn \$1690.00 for their personal use. Obviously there is more to this matter than that, but initially this can be seen to be the case.

In my case, it is clearly on the financial books of Alive Press Ltd. that the company owes me an amount, due to shareholder advances, of: \$22,782.66. I consider that the drawings which I have listed above act as repayment of \$1651.00 of the amount owed to me by Alive Press Ltd. Thus the loans by me to Alive Press Ltd. now amount to a total of \$21,131.66. (I will write to the company's firm of accountants, [firm's name deleted], and notify them of this information.)

In discussion with various people informed in these matters I have been told that my shareholders (sic) advances are in fact Demand Loans, and that I have the legal right to demand payment at any time. I have also been informed that such an act would most likely bankrupt Alive Press Ltd. since it is a small and uneconomic business. Also, in such an event, I would then receive two (typesetting equipment) for which I was required to sign Personal Guarantor notes with the supplier, (supplier's name deleted).

Despite my disappointment at your recent activities with regard to my integrity and good name, I have no wish to cause such an extreme situation. Rather, I would prefer to settle this matter outside of the realm of lawyers and courts, if this is possible. (I am, however, now willing to go to lawyers and court if necessary given the accusations you have made against me.)

I am willing to settle this matter by forgiving the entire loan by me to Alive Press Ltd. in exchange for three things:

1. Through the offices of the supplier ((supplier's name deleted)), you transfer to North Star Graphics ((place name deleted)) the (typesetting equipment) which was obtained two and a half years ago and which is due to be paid up in one and a half years from now, with the agreement that North Star Graphics will finish the payments on the outstanding balance of that machine;s (sic) purchase contract (a matter

for which I remain personally responsible anyway);

2. You either come to an agreement with Michelle Landriault, acceptable to her, in the matter of leasing from her the property at (street address deleted), which she owns, and in which property you operate and have the head office of Alive Press Ltd., OR vacate those premises entirely in such a manner that Michelle can sell the premises in good order and in such a way that that matter will no longer interfere with her attempts to regain full health following her recent hysterectomy, gall bladder removal, suspected intestinal cancer, and current bout with Cronin's (sic) Disease, all of which problems you have known of all this time; and,

3. You return to Michelle the Electrolux vacuum cleaner (and assorted attachments) which her mother gave to her this year and which you admitted to (individual's name deleted) you have in your possession and intend to keep as some peculiar kind of recompense for the \$18,000.00 which you have alleged that I have stolen, and return it by either shipping it to Michelle's new home address, which you have, or by dropping it off at (individual's name deleted)'s home in the coming week.

I will wait for your response until Thursday, October 12, 1978. If there is no acceptable response by that time then I will turn the matter over to my lawyer and ask him to proceed with whatever steps are necessary to reclaim the full value of my \$21,131.66 loan to Alive Press Ltd. At that same time, if matters proceed that way, I will also inform my lawyer of the unfounded and libellous statements you have made against me and seek his advice on that matter as well. These actions will be taken on my behalf and for the resulting shared benefit of myself and my family. I am notifying my wife's lawyer of the information regarding my assets and that in the event of my meeting with an unforeseen accident in my current travels, these full assets are transferred to my wife and sons.

In short, I suggest that it would be best for your continued operation that you comply with the three points which I have offered in exchange for my loan.

Yours sincerely,

Copies to:  
Michelle Landriault  
(3 individuals' names deleted)

## A Letter From Michelle Landriault's Lawyer

September 25th, 1978

Registered

Dear Sir:

Re: Michele Pickersgill

We represent Michele Pickersgill in respect of certain matrimonial problems existing between herself and her husband, Edward Pickersgill.

Additionally, we represent her with respect to her interest in the publishing business known as "Alive Press" in which she has worked since 1969 with her husband. We have today been advised that you have unilaterally taken over the residence which formally comprised both the matrimonial home and the business enterprise. I am instructed to advise you that my client is prepared to permit the business to continue operation in the premises in consideration of a payment of \$450.00 monthly \$225.00 of which is presently due and owing for one-half of the September rental.

Failing your immediate remittance of the foregoing sum in a series of twelve (12) post-dated cheques in equivalent amounts of \$450.00 we will commence the appropriate application in court to regain possession of the property.

Trusting to hear from you at your earliest convenience, I remain,

Yours very truly,

C.C.: Mrs. Michele Pickersgill

## A Letter From Edward Pickersgill's Lawyer

January 17, 1979

Dear (supporter's name deleted)

Please be advised that we are solicitors for C. Edward Pickersgill, who has entered into an agreement with Michelle Landriault to transfer the above property into his name alone. The actual transfer will be registered in the next few weeks.

Mr. Pickersgill is willing to sell the property to you under the following terms and conditions:

1. The purchase price is to be \$41,000.00.
2. The (typesetting equipment) purchased by Alive Press Limited in late 1975 or early 1976 and the andover, times and megaron type

discs and other type discs that you have in duplicate are to be transferred and delivered to Erin Graphics Incorporated via (salesman's name deleted) of (supplier's name deleted).

3. Should Alive Press Limited be unwilling to transfer the (typesetting equipment) the purchase price of the property would be \$43,500.00.

4. The first mortgage of approximately \$33,000.00 would be transferred. Other financing to be arranged by the purchaser.

Mr. Pickersgill requires a response indicating a serious intention to enter into an agreement along these terms by February 2, 1979 or he will list the property for sale with a real estate agent.

Yours very truly,  
(Lawyer's name deleted)

## PART NINETEEN A Refutation From The Alive Production Collective

### THE OPENING SALVO CAME TWO-AND-A-HALF WEEKS EARLY

The first document written by Edward Pickersgill which has direct relevance to the development of our political struggle is titled "A Note To The Lu Hsun Unit Of The Alive Production Collective, August 1, 1978". This August 1 "Note" was read on the day it was written by two members of the Lu Hsun Unit other than Edward Pickersgill. After August 15 the "Note" was read by all other members of the Alive Production Collective.

On August 1, Edward Pickersgill engaged one of the two other Lu Hsun Unit members who read this document in discussion about its content for approximately 20 minutes. This Lu Hsun Unit member was never a member of the conspiratorial faction. The other of the two Lu Hsun Unit members was Michelle Landriault who was a member of the conspiratorial faction. According to Edward Pickersgill's own words, he and his hard core partner in the faction discussed this "Note" at great length on a number of different occasions.

The reason that the former discussion was one-of-a-kind and lasted only 20 minutes was that Edward Pickersgill cut it off short and declared that the "Note" should be thought over for a period of time before it was discussed further. He did this because he encountered opposition from the non-factional Lu Hsun Unit member. Of course, the next "period of time" saw the development of the major political struggle against Edward Pickersgill's factionalism, so the "Note" was never "discussed further" with him.

Written two-and-a-half-weeks previous to the point at which the political struggle broke into the open in a big way, this "Note" is interesting because it was the first open indication of Edward Pickersgill's plan. This plan was to end the existing Alive Production Collective and to create a new organization. He planned a new organization to allow himself to continue his self-serving role, falsely occupying a leading position in a revolutionary Collective.

It is interesting to note that Edward Pickersgill kept a tight clutch on his plan during both quiet times and times of intense struggle all throughout the subsequent five-and-a-half weeks, right up to Thursday, September 7. On that Thursday, Edward Pickersgill, holding to this same plan, declared verbally that he had come to "the end" with the Alive Production Collective. At the time of quitting verbally Edward Pickersgill presented a list of personal demands which were introduced with the phrase: "If this is going to be the last time I'm ever going to see you guys..."

All indications are that Edward Pickersgill is still on the unchanging continuum which embraces his incorrect approach in every phase of the present political struggle since August 18 and embraces his early-born fixed idea on a plan to preserve his false

leadership role, a fixed idea dating from August 1, at least.

Clearly, the actual thing which is outlined in the August 1 "Note" is not Edward Pickersgill's plan but the facade he put forward to prettify and cover up his real plan. The facade, presented as a plan in itself, was designed to please the Alive Production Collective members' most significant interest — revolutionary politics. The facade — to give birth to a more advanced revolutionary organization — is certainly a much prettier thing than the real plan — to advance Edward Pickersgill's selfish personal interests.

Edward Pickersgill wants to emerge unscathed from the political struggle focusing on him. He wants people to focus on the "con" rather than on his true predatory nature. Pursuing his real plan has been a consistent matter with Edward Pickersgill but this has meant his presentation of the facade covering his real plan has not been woven with consistency, rather it has been a matter of much patch work because the facade is full of holes.

### THE SHARK PLAYS THE SHELL GAME

On August 1, Edward Pickersgill put forward in his "Note": "We know that the APC is so structured as to be able to participate in a much wider frame than production and dissemination of Alive magazine, but non-members of the APC quite rightly do not have the same perception as we do."

This states the clear contradiction between the appearance of a thing and its essence. What "we know" is the essence, what non-members perceive is the appearance that is contradicted by the essence.

In his 38th document, written on August 31, 1978 — the last day of the same month — Edward Pickersgill contradicts his August 1 analysis. That document, titled "What Kind Of Organization Is The A.P.C.?" reads in part: "The A.P.C. was, from the beginning, an organization built on unity around a specific program — the production, dissemination and development of Alive magazine. To date that unity has not been substantially developed and the organizational structures have not been revolutionized... Is it too late to change the A.P.C. into a democratic-centralist organization? In my view it has been too late for a long time now. The time has passed and cannot be seized in terms of the A.P.C. but only in terms of a brand new organization."

Note that the shark's real plan did not change whatsoever but his facade, which includes his "historical" view and his present analysis of the Alive Production Collective, did change completely. For many years Edward Pickersgill was fond of the slogan, "we should be able to change our tactics from morning to night." Obviously, this shark is also very fond of the idea of changing history and present reality from one month to the next.

Under which shell is the pea to be found? The key to operating