

PART ONE

An Introduction From The Alive Production Collective

A DEFINITE RESPONSIBILITY

You, the readers and supporters of *Alive*, are being presented with an especially large issue of the magazine. You are faced with reading a large amount of material. We are putting forward many facts and much analysis. The detailed documentation of the political struggle against factionalism inside the Alive Production Collective must deal with many different matters.

We have to relate the specific events of the struggle which we have been involved in since August of 1978. Further, if these specific events are to be understandable to you, we have to put them in the overall context of struggles spanning many years of our organization.

We have to present an account of Edward Pickersgill's false leadership role over a period of five years in the Alive Production Collective. Further, we have to put the account of Edward Pickersgill's role into the context of our almost 8 years-long history and we have to examine Edward Pickersgill in light of our practical anti-imperialist program.

We have to give some account of the basic structure and norms of our organization. Without some knowledge of this type you, the people who are just learning about this struggle in the Alive Production Collective, will find it hard to get good perspective on the events.

We have to present a self-critical view of the mistakes within our organization because without definite mistakes in the organization itself, nobody like Edward Pickersgill could have remained in a responsible position for an extended period of time. We have to make known our ideological analysis of our mistakes and our political struggle to rectify our mistakes.

A great volume of words has been thrown up by Edward Pickersgill to defend the secret faction we have uncovered. We have to give a point-by-point refutation of the incorrect views put forward in that defence.

The struggle against alien elements who seek to undermine revolutionary progress is a struggle with a history that combines world-wide experience. This history contains valuable knowledge which has served as guidance in the struggle in the Alive Production Collective. Further, this history is well known to many people. Because of this knowledge and because Edward Pickersgill is such an alien element, we have to ground our views in the historical experience of other struggles against factionalism in the world revolutionary movement.

Those of you who are conscious supporters of *Alive's* revolutionary cultural work but who haven't been aware of the struggle in our organization against Edward Pickersgill's factionalism, are now faced with a demanding choice regarding where to place your continued support. We have faced this same choice and have taken a firm stand. So that you are able to take your definite stand we have to present the information on this two-line struggle. We see this as our political responsibility to you.

FULFILLING OUR RESPONSIBILITY

In dealing with these different matters, we face a significant danger. We could easily step over the fine line between answering our responsibilities to other revolutionaries by outlining our political struggle, on the one hand, and on the other hand, answering the needs of our enemies by outlining information that will jeopardize *Alive's* on-going revolutionary contributions. Of course, we will endeavour to skilfully tread the fine line without overstepping it.

Although we are presenting detailed information, we are not going to tell the "whole story". There is no question about that.



A mutual admiration society? A case of opportunist politics makes strange bedfellows? Edward Pickersgill met with Pierre Trudeau just three months before the War Measures Act in October, 1970.

There must be, on our part, an amount of picking and choosing in order to identify what should be told and what should be left untold.

Our responsibility is to tell the story of our political struggle fully enough that you can understand it and utilize it by relating our experience to your own experience. There should be no elbow room for Edward Pickersgill to do his dirty work any more. He has already been rendered ineffective in his sabotage of *Alive's* program. Now, he must be rendered equally ineffective by all other revolutionary groups and in terms of all future dirty work. To facilitate this we are communicating our in-depth knowledge of Edward Pickersgill.

There have been others like Edward Pickersgill putting the brakes on revolution in the past. At the present time others like Edward Pickersgill remain unexposed in the revolutionary movement and are trying to sabotage progress for the majority of the people. Still more disruptors like Edward Pickersgill can be expected to stand as obstacles to forward motion in the future. There should be no elbow room for these characters either. To help render them ineffective, we are adding our practical experience with Edward Pickersgill to the weighty record of the numerous struggles against others of this rotten nature.

ALIVE'S ON-GOING PROGRAM IS ALSO OUR RESPONSIBILITY

We are aware that *Alive* is popular and that the magazine's popularity comes primarily from our overall program, from our development of a lively people's culture. Issues of *Alive* such as this, our 125th issue, are not usually received with the *best* response in the *widest* circles.

Politically conscious revolutionaries, who have an understanding of the necessity for polemics and struggle in strengthening an

organization, will welcome this documentation. The very same consciousness, though, will also make these people the most critical readers of this issue of Alive.

Ordinary readers, who like Alive for its usual literary and journalistic content, may not be welcoming but wondering when, and if, Alive is going to get back to normal.

We do not intend to become preoccupied with Edward Pickersgill. To do so would be to hand Edward Pickersgill a success. He tried very hard to divert our attention from anti-imperialist revolution while he was wrongly viewed as a positive person in our work; now that we have a correct view of him, he will certainly not succeed in diverting our attention from the struggle to overthrow U.S. imperialism in Canada.

The Alive Production Collective will be continuing to publish Alive Magazine and to develop anti-imperialist cultural work in Alive's energetic style.

We consider the in-depth documentation in this issue to be our opening statement against Edward Pickersgill and we will carry the struggle against Edward Pickersgill in an on-going way. However, coverage of this struggle will only be a part of future issues of Alive, not the whole content as in this issue. The largest part of the content of future issues will be the same stepwise development of anti-imperialist cultural work as has been seen in Alive Magazine for a full nine years.

It must be understood though that struggles such as the one outlined in this issue of Alive are the key to continuing Alive's program. Without the struggle to distinguish what is correct from what is incorrect, any revolutionary program will flounder and become a stagnating force among the people. It is incorrect to take the view that an issue of Alive such as this has to be tolerated every now and again as the price for the other issues which are what people really want to read. Rather, the matters outlined in issues such as this are the source of life making our revolutionary work worthwhile.

Alive Magazine does not just appear by the stroke of a magician's wand. Neither does Alive come into existence just because someone dreams of it. If Alive was only the product of some individual's conjuring trick or simply the result of a dreaming session, there would be no need for political struggle to guarantee its continuing worth. Definitely there would be no need to report such struggle. However, Alive Magazine does not owe its existence to fleeting wishes and empty intellectualizing but to the full reality of hard work performed by united people dedicated to a revolutionary world view.

Alive cannot be abstracted from the organization which puts it out. For this reason the struggles that serve to consolidate the unity of the members and supporters of the Alive Production Collective are important to the progress in general anti-imperialist politics. Success in a political struggle inside a revolutionary organization creates a greater internal unity. This motion of unity leads in turn to great strides forward in practical work external to the organization.

HISTORY AND ON-GOING PRACTICE HAVE ISSUED THEIR CALL

We know very well that we have an actual political responsibility to present the explanation of this struggle. It is a significant turning point in the life of our organization. Edward Pickersgill has been a significant saboteur against our political work.

Other exposures similar to our documentation in this issue of Alive have been made by other revolutionary groups. We have taken strong lessons in the past from these exposures of rotten trends that have split from other groups. We find each account of counter-revolution to be of value. Such exposures are certainly of value when the struggle is of weighty importance in historical revolutionary experience. They are of value too, even when the struggle is in a group existing as a relatively small trend in a place where revolution has not yet advanced in a big way.

Because we have often read the documents of both sides as a split in a revolutionary group is explained, we recognize that only one side can be correct (although both sides can be incorrect). We also recognize that the correct line is easily identified by an objective observer. We have tried to prepare our documentation in a popular style to make the identification of our position and the judgement of its correctness or incorrectness as simple as possible.

We are the majority of those who have ever been members of the Alive Production Collective. You are the readers and supporters of Alive Magazine. We believe that we will be seen by you to be correct in this political struggle against Edward Pickersgill's rotten line.

As well as learning from the experience of other existing revolutionary groups, we can also draw on our own experience since we have been involved in polemics with various bad trends external to our organization many times over the years. A previous large, on-going campaign of exposure was put forward against the Bainzites after we split with them in October 1975.

Further, we have read the record of the great polemics in the world revolutionary movement.

We know of Marx and Engels' great struggle against anarchism and other treacherous trends in the First International.

We know of Lenin's great struggle against conciliatory social-democracy and other lines of betrayal in the world socialist movement.

We know of Stalin's great struggle against Trotskyism and other vicious opportunist renegade trends in the international Communist movement.

We know of Mao Zedong's great struggle against modern revisionism and the restoration of capitalism in socialist countries.

We know of the many inner-Party struggles waged by the great teachers of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. Chairman Mao led the best known of these struggles in recent years, which are the opposition of the Chinese Communist Party to the Gang of Four, to Lin Biao and to Liu Shaoqi during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

We know very well the current polemic on the international situation centring on Chairman Mao's correct theory of the differentiation of the three worlds.

We know that our political struggle assumes nothing of the significance of these great struggles even though it bears great importance for us. Nonetheless, we have learned much from these great struggles that we can apply to our own situation. We have learned that political struggle within a revolutionary organization is not a matter of individual choice. It is a phenomenon that develops independent of man's will.

We can also see that any two-line dispute in the process of advancing revolution is in essence much the same as any other struggle between the two lines. Although the struggle inside the Alive Production Collective may be somewhat insignificant in its direct ramifications to the overall revolutionary movement, to a significant extent it has been a reflection of the distinguishing features of the present period in the world revolutionary movement. As a result, we have come to know better the struggles which are of major world importance, just by pursuing our own struggle.

AN OFFENSIVE AGAINST EDWARD PICKERSGILL IS OUR BEST DEFENCE

Before this issue of Alive was prepared and released, making our position in the struggle fully public, the Alive Production Collective waged a similar intensive campaign in its own ranks and amongst its close supporters. This campaign involved full reports on the facts of the struggle, wide education on the Collective's history, ideological study of the struggle's precedents in revolutionary movements elsewhere and in-depth development of a correct analysis of the struggle.

From amongst those who are already cognizant of our struggles the question has arisen of why we choose to take this struggle up in

such a big way. We expect this question to arise again as the struggle becomes more widely known. The answer is: we have no choice to make, it is our responsibility.

To shirk this responsibility would be to succeed where Edward Pickersgill failed; it would be to turn our on-going anti-imperialist program into a laughing stock.

What lessons could we teach in the course of doing educational work around a revolutionary program, if we refuse to apply the measure of active struggle to our own organization?

The great Marxist-Leninist teachers did not carry out their important polemics as a matter of choice because they liked to stir up trouble. No, they simply answered the call that historical conditions put to them. The only choice they made was to choose to do well in answering the call.

Again, we have the humility to realize our struggle is not of such weight, but we learn the lessons of those great polemics to apply them to our struggles. We, too, are simply answering the call of practical conditions. We, too, choose only to the extent of making the choice to do as well as we can in the struggle.

Another question that has arisen is why we choose to present our line in this struggle to the public. We expect this question to arise more widely also as the audience is broadened. Again, we do not choose. Our first analysis was that none of the current struggle should be presented in public. Edward Pickersgill made the struggle a public matter. He did this against our advice and with enough arrogance that he announced in writing his intention to go public. It is our responsibility to respond.

Another question has been why we are addressing the matter in public at such length and to the widest possible audience. This is a matter of our choice. It is a matter of choosing to do well in conducting the struggle. We give our presentation only as much length as we think is necessary to make it understandable. We address the widest audience we can to make our case the most effective we can.

We don't know precisely what sections of the public have heard Edward Pickersgill's announcements. We do know that he has spread his story wildly and has encompassed many strata of society in his audience.

If, in presenting our case, we give more depth than Edward Pickersgill dared to give because of his fear of truth and if we address a wider audience than he has been able to address, we do not consider it to be to our discredit. Rather, it is a sign of our strength, a strength Edward Pickersgill would have done well to properly assess before he challenged us.

We have had real strength for some years and we have never apologized for it yet. Our strength is that we support a political program that answers the felt needs of the Canadian people. Our worth in promoting those politics over the years stems from the fact that we have a good basic organization.

Not one of the questions cited thus far is the most significant question that was posed from amongst those people already cognizant of the struggle. The most significant question has been whether we should "risk" engaging in a struggle against Edward Pickersgill.

There are many factors in this question.

One factor is that he is a worthy opponent. He has manipulative skills on a personal level as well as technical skills in writing. He also knows a lot of information about the internal life of our organization and could reveal some facts that we have deemed unnecessary for our documentation and that are dangerous for our members and supporters. With these skills and facts at his fingertips, Edward Pickersgill could give us a fight in which we could suffer from some cheap shots.

The key question is not how actively we have to fight to win victory nor how much we stand to lose in a dirty fight. The key question is which side will be the one to put forward truth and win victory. Of course, people far and wide will condemn Edward Pickersgill if, in a fit of retaliation, he does endanger individuals involved in revolutionary work by revealing information about

that work.

Another factor is that Edward Pickersgill may only be a mixed-up individual making some large but unconscious mistakes. One worry in this is that we don't want to finish Edward Pickersgill off with one blow if he still has some worth. Another worry is whether we're using an artillery piece to kill a gnat.

The bad line that Edward Pickersgill has pursued may well have been a matter of true error at first but he became conscious of the error at a certain stage and pursued the bad line after that stage with even greater enthusiasm.

At what stage did he become conscious? It is very clear that he became conscious of the wrongness of his outlook at least when the recent political struggle developed openly in the Alive Production Collective, if not earlier.

During the political struggle Edward Pickersgill was told in open terms of other people's opposition to the objective error in his practice. He was also warned against trying to build political capital by promoting his incorrect line in public.

At this stage, when he had clearly been made conscious of the incorrect line he was carrying, Edward Pickersgill gleefully chose to trample over the Alive Production Collective in his mad rush to pursue open degeneracy and to make open attacks against revolution. If he was not already conscious before, then Edward Pickersgill began to be an openly corrupt individual and to consciously uphold his mistakes at this stage. According to his own written account, though, he was conscious of his wrongs much earlier.

Another factor is that Edward Pickersgill has an image in many people's eyes as a revolutionary figure. He has been viewed as the legitimate voice of Alive and as the unifying person who keeps the Alive Production Collective in operation.

There is only one force that can actually promote unity in the revolutionary ranks. That force is a correct political line — a correct theory, a correct practice and a correct balance between the two. We must say of Edward Pickersgill, just as of anyone else: any individual can split and the revolutionary ranks will suffer only a *small loss* if the political line remains correct. If the individual who splits is a person who has rotten politics and who is a saboteur, then there is *no loss*. In fact, the revolutionary ranks are objectively strengthened!

Edward Pickersgill's role as the voice of Alive was an image only, not a reality. It is an image created by the Alive Production Collective as a device to express our views without jeopardizing our members and our organizational structure. When he took an official posture in meetings or in the pages of Alive Magazine, Edward Pickersgill was not supposed to speak in lieu of our organization; he was only authorized to speak as directed by our organization. We have long been careful to monitor our own public voice and so most of these types of statements by Edward Pickersgill have expressed the view of the Collective. However, when he spoke as an individual in his various personal contacts and inside the Collective in his role as a member, Edward Pickersgill most often spoke according to the dictate of his individualism.

We do not fight Edward Pickersgill for any reason but that he is incorrect. The fact that he may have seemed to be a revolutionary figure has little to do with whether we fight him or not. Having made our decision to fight, the fact that he can seem to be a revolutionary is a reason for us to carry our line in public and with great intensity.

Our past *illusion* of his contribution may hang on a little to cause us some second thoughts, some philosophical doubts and some discomfiting personal soul-searching. However, for some time, the *reality* has been that Edward Pickersgill is not a revolutionary figure.

Tempering the example with humility, we can learn from Lenin's exposure of Kautsky in this matter. Lenin was the worthy student of Marx and Engels but he was faced with a dilemma in opposing Kautsky, who had been in personal contact with Engels and who had been Engels' pupil in the literal sense. Did Lenin succumb to

second thoughts? No, he carried out his exposure because of his conviction that he was correct. Despite all Kautsky's self-proclaimed credentials, in practice, Lenin was proved correct.

The significance of our struggle is on a lesser scale. We do not have the genius of Lenin, neither does Edward Pickersgill have the renown of Kautsky, but nevertheless Lenin's bold spirit is a great guide for us.

STRIVING FOR A FINE STYLE OF WORK

We are presenting facts and analysis from the struggle in which the Alive Production Collective has been involved. Our presentation is longer and has more depth than is common for this kind of exposure. We have already indicated that there are potential dangers for us in making this in-depth presentation. There are also potential pitfalls in the presentation for our readers.

We know that many Alive readers feel they are an actual part of Alive Magazine's history and development. We have done a lot to nurture such a feeling because our readers are an actual part of Alive.

From this feeling comes expectation. Our readers expect us to do their contributions justice. We are expected to enhance individual contributions by giving them a common form. In this way we create a powerful collective contribution to anti-imperialist cultural work.

The Alive Production Collective is expected to coordinate this powerful contribution and the members of the Collective are expected to be active contributors too. Our organization accepts these expectations and tries to fulfil them well.

People expect the Collective's contribution to hit a definite high mark. There are also high expectations of the style in Alive. People have praised us for consciously developing a fine style — for doing revolutionary propaganda with a professionalism and a flair uncharacteristic among many Leftists.

It is good to get the praise, however, there is no room for us to rest on our laurels. Having given the praise, people expect that flair as the minimum contribution from Alive. We have to strive to put the fine style of work into everything we do.

We approached the lengthy documentation which is presented in this issue of Alive, with a consciousness that people expect a fine style from us. We chose to go into matters in depth because it is too often a conservative failing among Leftists that they are not straightforward or honest about reality when the reality concerns their own weakness.

We are ignorant of some things. We make mistakes. We have shortcomings. This is the condition of our Collective, it is the condition of the Left and it is the condition of the people.

If we do not openly acknowledge this condition of the Left, we alienate ourselves from the people. The broad masses of people have a great store of worthwhile knowledge which has been built up through countless experiences in millions of lives. The masses know where worthwhile knowledge originates. The masses will never acknowledge that we have correct ideas if they cannot see that we have gained life's experience.

Joseph Stalin put it very well in his work "The Right Deviation In The C.P.S.U. (B)": "Yes, comrades, one must be able to face the facts no matter how unpleasant they may be. God forbid that we should become infected with the disease of fear of the truth. Bolsheviks, incidentally, are different from all other parties because they do not fear the truth and are not afraid of facing the truth no matter how bitter it may be."

How can Leftists dare to expect acknowledgement of their ideas — never mind acknowledgement of the decisively correct, systematic view of a vanguard — if we don't allow people to see our errors? Too often revolutionaries are quick to proclaim their grasp of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought as a means of summing up experience and slow to gather actual experience or slow to make their experience manifest to the masses of people.

We are required to make our exposure. We are consciously

presenting the lessons we have learned in a different way. In this issue of Alive we are consciously giving our readers the flair that is expected of us.

Many revolutionaries will recognize that, even though our presentation may be somewhat unique by merit of its length and depth, the content of the struggle waged by the Alive Production Collective against Edward Pickersgill is by no means unique. If Edward Pickersgill's degenerate pursuits are unique in the revolutionary ranks, there is no need for our in-depth presentation. If the struggle against false leadership in revolutionary organizations is unique, there is no need for us to outline our struggle in such length. If facing the need to overthrow a wrong trend in a revolutionary organization is our experience solely, then there is no need for this issue of Alive.

Our struggle and our experience are not unique. We can now better march into battle with the main enemy. We can help arm others to free themselves from counter-revolutionary fetters also.

In this we can learn from Mao Zedong who wrote, in "On The People's Democratic Dictatorship": "Taught by mistakes and setbacks, we have become wiser and handle our affairs better. It is hard for any political party or person to avoid mistakes, but we should make as few as possible. Once a mistake is made, we should correct it, and the more quickly and thoroughly the better."

The greatest part of the forces in the revolutionary movement are honest, progressive people. The negative forces may be able to worm their way into the positive ranks but they are destined to remain a minority in these ranks just as they are in society at large. Nevertheless, the negative forces do present themselves to us from our very midst as well as from outside and we must deal with them decisively in both forms if we are to achieve revolutionary advances.

It would be an error for any individual or organization to lightly approach our recounting of Edward Pickersgill's negative role. Many of the experiences we report could be ignored by proclaiming them as bizarre, unique or petty. Our experience could be denied through branding us as unsophisticated, lacking in experience, or poorly versed in revolutionary theory. This would not affect us greatly. We have already learned the lessons of these experiences to the marrow of our bones. However, it would have a bad effect on those denying our experience.

We are not lacking in worldly experience. We did not fall in the pit on various occasions because a simple trap had been laid. We did not suffer Edward Pickersgill's misleadership simply because we were naive.

Readers can talk themselves into believing those false explanations if they want but if they do they will be disarming themselves. The very important warning that people must take from us is that this counter-revolutionary misleadership did not do us harm easily, it came to do us harm despite our watchfulness.

Edward Pickersgill insinuated himself into important positions in our organizations in a gradual process. He spread his rotten influence, not in one sudden cataclysmic stroke, but bit by bit, over a long period of time, in a complex process of giving in to the correct line in order to gain a toehold to further propagate the incorrect line.

We acknowledge that we were not watchful enough and that such disruptive influences are not "inevitable" or "unavoidable". We only caution people not to make light of a complex process and not to presume naivety where errors have been made that would have been difficult to avoid.

OUR INVESTIGATION HAS BEEN THOROUGH

We have taken quite some time to prepare our documentation. We have taken the time necessary to do our task well. We have had to conduct a thorough investigation. We have had to cross-reference facts. We have had to analyze carefully, being sure not to blame every ill in the world on the existence of a faction in our organization. We have had to guard against understating the truth — liberally letting Edward Pickersgill off the hook or letting ourselves off easy. We have had to guard our own security, not

going overboard in stating every fact and every circumstance.

We have encountered a central problem, the same problem which has slowed us at every stage of our contact with Edward Pickersgill over the years. No doubt we will encounter it more in the future. The problem is that we must be painstaking in our statements for we want to present the truth. On the other hand, Edward Pickersgill can be rash and quick in spreading his views because he is not tied to the truth. He need do no investigation for he just speaks whatever nonsense occurs to him. He need not be careful or painstaking in his method for he just speaks lies, conjuring up "facts" and "analysis" as he goes along.

Mao Zedong explains the phenomenon of characters like Edward Pickersgill running amuck in his essay "Things Are Beginning To Change": "Rightists, both inside and outside the Party, know nothing about dialectics — things turn into their opposites when they reach the extreme. We shall let the Rightists run amuck for a time and let them reach their climax. The more they run amuck, the better for us. Some say they are afraid of being hooked like a fish, and others say they are afraid of being lured in deep, rounded up and annihilated. Now that large numbers of fish have come to the surface of themselves, there is no need to bait the hook. They are no ordinary fish, but more likely man-eating sharks with sharp teeth — it is these sharks whose fins people eat."

We are not troubled by the fast speed of lies nor by the slow speed of coming to know truth. No one should be fooled by this phenomenon. Before truth comes out it is easy to sit around proclaiming that its slow process means it will never arrive. This is what Edward Pickersgill has been busy promoting among his contacts. Now he will learn that truth always prevails. Truth may be slow to arrive but once it hits the scene it always dominates over the liars who are the first arrivals. Lies may be fast but they don't go far — lies have short legs!

In his work "Comrade Lenin On Vacation. Notes", Joseph Stalin deals with the question of the lies and slanders spread against revolutionaries and relates Lenin's correct response: "Comrade Lenin smiled and remarked: 'Let them lie if it is any consolation to them; one should not rob the dying of their last consolation.'"

We have tried to deal with the significant lies, slanders and distortions made by Edward Pickersgill and his hard core factionalist partner in Part Nineteen of this issue of *Alive*. We have dealt directly with their distortions of events in August 1978 and events leading up to that date.

It should be understood that we do not claim to have dealt with all the lies and distortions. We have dealt with whatever we saw to be important. We have deliberately not dealt with certain matters in line with the consciousness of our own security. No one should conclude that if some aspects of the faction's accusations, lies, tales, slanders and distortions are not dealt with, then those aspects are acceptable and true. To deal with every lie Edward Pickersgill has told would be an impossible task. Even to deal with those lies we are aware of would take more time than we have in our lives.

It should also be understood that we have already been accused of making an incomplete investigation. Edward Pickersgill's hard core factionalist partner has levelled this charge.

We have made a thorough investigation. This does not mean we have tried to live up to some idealistic pursuit of 100% of the facts and 100% correct analysis. We are not so full of ourselves. We have been careful to gather as many facts as possible and to analyze them as well as we can.

We have set ourselves guidelines to try to avoid errors. We are not presenting everything we have come up with in our investigation. The facts or anecdotes that are presented by the *Alive* Production Collective in this issue of *Alive* have been included only after being substantiated for our investigation by *two* independent sources. We don't claim to have tapped every single source of information. We only claim to have tapped as many as reasonably possible and to have been responsible in using the sources we have tapped — never accepting some story just because it opposes the faction or just

because it comes from someone who suffered at the faction's hand. Most often the facts we present have been substantiated through many more than *two* sources; however, nothing that has not been given this minimum substantiation is presented.

The only exception to this rule of substantiation is the last piece in this issue of *Alive* — Part Twenty. This is the report of a member of the faction about internal workings of the faction. We could not substantiate this information because the other members of the faction refused to talk to us about such matters in any realistic and reasonable fashion. However, even in Part Twenty, many facts have been confirmed — for example, a certain meeting that may be reported can be proved to have happened and to have had those people in attendance who are reported to have been there although the content of the meeting is known only to the factionalists themselves.

Edward Pickersgill has been freely telling people he has contact with that we have been doing nothing but crying on one another's shoulders and blaming all the problems in the world and especially all our personal problems on him as an individual. This is not the case. We have recognized that there are dangers in that realm though.

We have tried not to make Edward Pickersgill a scapegoat. We have tried to be careful to blame him only for those matters that were his fault. This makes the massive volume of material presented here all the more devastating.

We have taken a strong self-critical posture in our investigation and analysis. Many but not all of these self-criticisms are presented in this issue of *Alive*.

We don't think Edward Pickersgill is the cause of all the world's problems. Just the contrary, in fact. We think the problems that Edward Pickersgill created inside our organization are only a reflection of what is wrong in the broader society. Again, this is a stronger indictment than what he supposes we have said about him.

He was supposed to be a conscious revolutionary, aware of the ills in society and how to fundamentally eradicate them, and he was supposed to be a leader, winning others to that same consciousness and mobilizing them in the process of fundamental change. He was not what he was supposed to be. He was the opposite. He viewed society's ills as its commendable points and tried to win others over to his line of wallowing in the mire.

He didn't create the cess-pool of the degenerate imperialist culture. He is guilty of trying to sell people on the idea that the cess-pool is a good place to spend your life.

The final point on this charge is that Edward Pickersgill is as big a liar as he ever was. The fact is he does not know what we have been doing since he split. Whatever he says is pure speculation. If anyone wants definite proof that we have not been wasting our time in self-pity and self-indulgent laments, let them look to our political program now and in future. It is that political program which we have laid foundations for during the past months.

The final point on all other factionalist charges against us is that they are trying to cover their tracks so as to avoid being caught in their criminal acts. Edward Pickersgill, Michelle Landriault and the other two factionalists have all been formally invited to take up their part in this struggle inside the Collective. Only one of them has accepted to do so. Thus, charges spouted by the other three from the sidelines are only of interest as further exposures of their own hesitancy or cowardice. Even if no formal invitation had been issued by our organization, if they actually felt they were so much above reproach in their actions and so very correct in their outlook, they would be entering the struggle without invitation, trying to win others over to their line. They have not been impossible to keep out of the forum of principled struggle, it has been impossible to get them into it!

It should be understood that even yet, if the unreformed factionalists do decide to enter the struggle, either by doing self-criticism and undergoing transformation or by challenging our analysis and position, we will welcome their decision as correct.

NOT SENSATIONALISM, JUST LURID REALITY

There are many aspects of our presentation that represent something of a baring of the soul. We don't make such a presentation in a play for pity or in some desire to arouse moral condemnation of the faction. We present these aspects because they are facts of the rotten practice of the faction.

We want to expose the faction to popular condemnation which arises from sure knowledge of what is politically correct not from a false sense of moral outrage. We present sensitive facts not to be deliberately lurid or sensational but because we have concluded that an incomplete understanding will not allow other honest organizations and individuals to learn from our past mistakes to avoid possible future errors of their own.

If we were involved in a play for pity or an attempt to be lurid, there are many facts and anecdotes, both those that are unsubstantiated and those substantiated by a number of people, which we have held back that would achieve those purposes much more definitely.

We have presented as many facts as we deemed necessary for people to see the development of Edward Pickersgill's rotten line in the workings of our organization.

Again it must be understood that if all the rotten aspects had been imposed on us at one swoop, we would not have tolerated the situation. An important lesson from our experience is that these rotten developments don't take place all at once. They were imposed upon us one by one, in a slowly developing process that resulted in a huge rotten burden being borne by the Collective. We accepted the burden not because we said yes to its whole weight but because we acquiesced at each juncture where Edward Pickersgill increased the burden to tip the scales a little bit more in his favour.

It should also be understood that we have not actually bared the soul and laid out our lives for all to see. Any dishonest person or enemy group that tried to use facts from our presentation to boost their incorrect, shallow assessments of the Alive Production Collective would only be doing themselves a disservice. Such an effort will only serve to expose their own dishonesty because the facts we have chosen to relate are those that illustrate past mistakes without endangering present successes.

We have no need of pity coming out of our struggle against the faction. We have no need of false support, arising from sensationalism or from high moral stances. We accept struggle as the process of life in a revolutionary organization. As Mao Zedong wrote in "On Contradiction": "Opposition and struggle between ideas of different kinds constantly occur within the Party; this is a reflection within the Party of contradictions between classes and between the new and the old in society. If there were no contradictions in the Party and no ideological struggles to resolve them, the Party's life would come to an end."

In the political struggle against Edward Pickersgill, the Alive Production Collective has become a better organization. We have cleared away a dark cloud that stopped us from developing greater unity. We have a more sharply defined view of our basic political program and of the organizational norms that are demanded to carry out that program.

There have been great changes amongst the members of the Alive Production Collective. There is a more open approach to solving problems in revolutionary strategy than ever before. There is more boldness in applying anti-imperialist tactics than was ever dreamed possible under Edward Pickersgill's stifling misleadership. There has been a great upsurge of liberating democracy which was unheard of while Edward Pickersgill pushed absolute centralism. There has been an invigorating storm as members and supporters combine the efforts of their brains and their physical abilities to achieve good results in organizing work.

We have completely re-organized our internal structure. None of the leadership or unit structures described in our account of the Collective under Edward Pickersgill's misleadership exist any longer. We have a completely new organizational form in the internal life of our organization. This new form has been designed as a practical rectification of and opposition to the mistakes

perpetrated under Edward Pickersgill.

We have spent much time in this re-organizing work. We have also spent much time in ideological study so that both our new organizational forms and our analysis of the old mistakes reflect the correct viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

This is what we have been doing, in the main, during the past months. Of course, our investigation into the reality of the faction within our organization and the preparation of the presentation in this issue of Alive have been a significant, time-consuming secondary thrust.

We appreciate the worth of the struggle we have been involved in. It has been a true dialectical process wherein things turn into their opposites. Good has come of bad. We know that it is true that from great disorder comes great order. The political struggle in the Alive Production Collective has proved to be an excellent thing!

In his "Speech At The Chinese Communist Party's National Conference On Propaganda Work", Mao Zedong correctly affirms this reality: "It is not at all strange that erroneous things should exist, nor should this give any cause for fear; indeed it helps people learn to struggle against them better. Even great storms are not to be feared. It is amid great storms that human society progresses."

UNAFRAID OF THE TRUTH

"Undoubtedly, we must criticize wrong ideas of every description. It certainly would not be right to refrain from criticism, look on while wrong ideas spread unchecked and allow them to dominate the field. Mistakes must be criticized and poisonous weeds fought wherever they crop up. However, such criticism should not be dogmatic, and the metaphysical method should not be used, but instead the effort should be made to apply the dialectical method. What is needed is scientific analysis and convincing argument. Dogmatic criticism settles nothing. We are against poisonous weeds of whatever kind, but we must carefully distinguish between what is really a poisonous weed and what is really a fragrant flower. Together with the masses of the people, we must learn to differentiate carefully between the two and use correct methods to fight the poisonous weeds."

Mao Zedong's words from "On The Correct Handling Of Contradictions Among The People" are an excellent guideline for us. Criticism in the realm of lurid facts can easily degenerate into dogmatism under the mask of high morality. Sensationalism is definitely a metaphysical method.

However, undoubtedly we must criticize the lurid practices and analyze them as expressions of an incorrect political line.

To reduce any response like that evoked through sensationalism as people read through this issue of Alive, we can briefly outline, in this introduction, the aspects of the faction that are dealt with that have a lurid quality.

The main aspects having this lurid quality are sexual matters, stories of physical violence and the theft of money.

Edward Pickersgill was a sexually promiscuous person. This opposed the norms of progressive life and was entangled with his whole counter-revolutionary practice. The whole faction was caught up in this sexual promiscuity. Thus, this matter is dealt with in this issue of Alive in as scientific a fashion as possible and to the extent that is necessary. It is necessary only because Edward Pickersgill himself entwined his degenerate sex life with his rotten political practice.

Edward Pickersgill used cowardly physical violence to maintain his posture as faction chief. He used this method with one woman in his faction because she was smaller and weaker than him. This physical abuse was not used by him more widely, it seems, only because he himself is a relatively small and physically weak person.

Edward Pickersgill abused the finances of our organization. He treated Collective funds as though they were his own. He consciously created a situation whereby he embezzled Collective funds over an extended period of time for his own personal use. We did not discover this until after Edward Pickersgill had split from our organization.

We condemn these aspects of Edward Pickersgill's practice. We have condemned this practice to his face, only to be accused of assuming a false moral posture.

Well, we do have morals, not false morals but proletarian morals. It is from this proletarian standpoint that we condemn Edward Pickersgill's degeneracy; his libertarian illusion of freedom will not divert us. We stand by Mao Zedong's teaching, in the essay "The Debate On The Co-operative Transformation Of Agriculture And The Current Class Struggle": "We are opposed to boundless anxiety and countless taboos and regulations. Does this mean that we should have no anxiety at all? Not a single taboo? Not a single regulation? Of course that is not the case. Who is there who does not have anxiety, the necessary anxiety, the warranted anxiety? And we should have the necessary taboos and regulations too. Without a few taboos, without a few regulations, how can we carry on? It is absolutely right to have the necessary anxiety, taboos and regulations, and the necessary pauses, intermissions, putting on of brakes and cut-offs."

We do not consider the somewhat lurid aspects of Edward Pickersgill's case to be the most significant points. His political errors and misleadership are the most significant points.

We recognize that such things as sexual degeneracy, theft of money, physical violence and some other aspects which we accuse Edward Pickersgill of, such as drunkenness, are often brought to the fore in disputes as forms of character assassination. As a result of many such a smear, people react to any such charge by saying: "Oh, yeah. We've heard that before. That's what everyone says about their enemies."

We hope that our presentation of any lurid aspect does not entail a smear but rather will be seen as a systematic rounding out of our case against Edward Pickersgill.

We recognize that any attempt to smear Edward Pickersgill in order to avoid the political issues would come back on us. He was formally recognized as a leader in our organization and so any criticism has to include self-criticism. We allowed the democratic voice of our ordinary members to be effectively silenced according to Edward Pickersgill's whim. This was our error.

We also recognize that there is in our own ranks, and there is bound to be in the ranks of our readers, a true moral outrage. We are not advocating the false moral stances that we have already been accused of by the faction. We are advocating the fury of the masses talked about in "Speech Delivered At The Eighth Congress Of The All-Union Leninist Young Communist League" by J.V. Stalin.

Stalin said: "What is the explanation of these shameful instances of corruption and moral deterioration in certain of our Party organizations? The fact that Party monopoly was carried to absurd lengths, that the voice of the rank and file was stifled, that inner-Party democracy was abolished and bureaucracy became rife. How is this evil to be combatted? I think that there is not and cannot be any other way of combatting this evil than by organizing control from below by the Party masses, by implanting inner-Party democracy. What objection can there be to rousing the fury of the masses of the Party membership against these corrupt elements and giving it the opportunity to send such elements packing? There can hardly be any objection to that."

OUR READERS SHOULD CRITICIZE US

The aspects of Edward Pickersgill's practice that had a lurid quality have, of course, been aspects that have caused setbacks in our work.

In the financial realm, for example, we have been hit hard. We have been robbed of \$18,000, the equivalent of 25% of our yearly budget. An organization cannot lose that without suffering a setback. We are overcoming the difficulties, however, through generous and selfless donations from those who have been involved in the struggle to oppose Edward Pickersgill. We welcome any further assistance in the way of financial donations.

Edward Pickersgill put his faith in amassing a block of financial capital. We put our faith in the people, specifically in our members,

our supporters, our friends, our contacts and our readers. That Edward Pickersgill put us at a financial disadvantage is to his discredit. The disadvantage, though, is only temporary, albeit significant. That we have maintained and increased our support amongst the people gives us the definite long-term advantage.

Coming out of this struggle, we want to build our contact with people in a big way.

The "Speech Delivered At The Eighth Congress Of The All-Union Leninist Young Communist League" gives good guidance on the question of overcoming errors coming from degeneration of specific elements in the revolutionary leadership. Stalin teaches: "It would be a mistake to think that only the leaders possess experience in constructive work. That is not true, comrades. The vast masses of the workers who are engaged in building our industry are day by day accumulating vast experience in construction, experience which is not a whit less valuable to us than the experience of the leaders. Mass criticism from below, control from below, is needed by us in order that, among other things, this experience of the vast masses should not be wasted, but be reckoned with and translated into practice."

We encourage all our readers to build contact with us either directly, if they are able, or through the mail. We are very open, in fact, we are eager, to receive criticisms and comments on this issue of Alive. We are encouraging regular correspondence of a general nature also.

We will be starting up a "Letters to Alive" column once again. Letters will be published in each issue of Alive. We have published "Letters to Alive" in forty-five of our one hundred and twenty-four previous issues. This was always a very popular feature of the magazine. Building it up again will give readers more direct input to the pages of Alive and it will be a concrete form of opposition to Edward Pickersgill, who stopped the publication of a regular letters column.

We are willing to conduct correspondence with readers such that their letters can be printed or such that we do not print their letters. If readers wish to make commentary but do not want to have their comments appear in print, we will correspond with them privately. Our strong concern is to be able to build Alive in accordance with the needs and wishes of the people we serve. In this we need to rebuild this important form for concrete expression from the people.

We already have a healthy flow of letters coming in. This can be increased if we are more regular with our responses — something Edward Pickersgill did not allow. We intend to put vigorous effort into correspondence.

We re-iterate that we specifically want to hear spoken comments or to read written responses about this issue of the magazine, Alive 125. Do not hesitate to give us your thoughts at length. Do not hesitate to give us your response quickly or to give it to us after the passage of some time. We want to get the response in some form — we don't mind what form it comes in.

As to guidelines for our readers to use in giving criticism we advocate the line we have used amongst ourselves for self-criticism in this struggle. That line is outlined by Mao Zedong in "Speeches At The National Conference Of The Communist Party Of China": "Criticism should be sharp. I don't find the criticism made by some comrades at this conference very sharp; they seem to be afraid of offending others. If you are not sharp enough, if the sting doesn't reach home, the person criticized will not feel any pain and take any heed. Identify by name the person and the department involved. You have done a poor job and I am not satisfied, and if you feel offended, so be it. Fear of offending others is only fear of losing votes and of an uneasy relationship in work. Will I lose my rice-bowl if you don't vote for me? Nothing of the kind. Actually, if you speak your mind and lay the issues on the table sharply, you'll find it easier to get along with others. Don't draw in your horns. Why does an ox have two horns? They are for fighting, for self-defence and attack. I often ask comrades if they have 'horns' on their heads. Comrades, touch and feel if you have any. I can see some comrades have horns, some have horns but not very sharp ones, and others

have no horns at all. In my opinion, it is better to have them, for that goes well with Marxism. One of the tenets of Marxism is criticism and self-criticism."

We produce *Alive* to serve the people. We have produced this issue to serve the people. We have conducted the struggle against Edward Pickersgill to serve the people.

The words "serve the people" coming from the *Alive* Production Collective can't be anything but an empty, abstract phrase unless we get concrete response and tangible feedback from our readers. With such response, we can serve you. You should help build *Alive* Magazine by submitting your thoughts and responses. Your working contribution is the core content of our work. We serve you, the people.

Some Necessary Background

BASIC UNITS

Before anyone reads the actual bulk of our exposure of Edward Pickersgill, it is necessary for us to put forward some specific facts that will make our presentation more understandable.

It is important that people understand the role of some of the basic units in the former internal structure of the *Alive* Production Collective. Three units, in particular, have importance to this documentation. These were called the Caudwell Unit, the Bethune Unit and the Lu Hsun Unit. Other units existed but are not of key importance to the present documentation.

In general the Caudwell Unit was formed as a coordinating committee for the content of the Collective's propaganda and the Bethune Unit was created to coordinate the technical side of producing propaganda. These two units were given formal existence for the first time by a decision of the Collective during the Mini-Cultural Revolution. However, they had antecedents in two previous work units of the Collective, which were simply referred to as the editorial unit and the technical unit. That editorial unit had full existence between May 1977 (*Alive* 77) and December 1977 (*Alive* 103) and partial existence previously between February 26, 1977 (*Alive* 66) and May 7, 1977 (*Alive* 76). The previous technical unit had a very informal existence but can be said to have come into existence gradually in the work on issues between *Alive* 66 and *Alive* 103.

In the Bethune Unit, Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault were the nominal leader and second-in-command, respectively. Neither of them were members of the Caudwell Unit. Three other leading members of the Collective directed the work of the Caudwell Unit.

Before February, 1977, as far back as May, 1971 (when our organization first took editorial work, technical work and distribution work for *Alive* as a direct, group responsibility), the work on various aspects of the magazine was usually done by assigning specific tasks to specific individuals, while viewing the Collective as one single work unit because it was much smaller then. Originally in that set-up Edward Pickersgill took the editorial work as his responsibility. After a time he was officially named "production coordinator" in the technical work, because another leading member of the Collective had taken up a very active assistant's role in the editorial work. It was this other leading member who organized the first writing groups to improve the content of *Alive* and who later mobilized people into the first collectivized editorial team our group ever had.

Through the years, however, Edward Pickersgill has retained the title of editor, which he originally got because he was the only person working on the magazine. He used this retained title to allow himself final veto power on every item proposed for publication in any issue of *Alive*. In this way he guaranteed publication for his own writings which, except for a few examples, were done completely outside the collectivized writing process. Being formal editor also guaranteed Edward Pickersgill the power to refuse to publish writings by Collective members and others who he wanted to "punish". He did this most consistently to the

individual writings of the leading member who actually fulfilled the day-to-day tasks in the editorial realm.

Our consciousness about listing the name of an editor has always been quite simple. We did not do it to glorify an individual. Our view has always been that it doesn't matter how the formality of editorship appears in the public eye as long as the reality is that the magazine is produced by the collective effort of a number of people making contributions on an equal footing. In fact, one of the strongest reasons that we continued to list Edward Pickersgill as editor is that second class mail regulations impose a legal requirement to list an individual editor's name and Edward Pickersgill's name was already known publicly and associated with *Alive*.

Edward Pickersgill retained the official title of editor and his unofficial veto power even after the Caudwell Unit was created, although he was never allowed to be a member of this formalized editorial unit.

The loose attempts at instituting a working technical unit during 1977 were made only because of the indirect pressure brought about by the existence of a collectivized editorial team. In these loose groupings of technical workers and even later in the formalized Bethune Unit, Edward Pickersgill led as an individualistic boss, treating other unit members as simple-minded minions who should do all the work while he made all the decisions.

The Lu Hsun Unit was the collectivized leadership group created by the Collective during the Mini-Cultural Revolution. There are detailed descriptions of Edward Pickersgill's manoeuvres inside both the Lu Hsun Unit and the Bethune Unit later in this issue of *Alive*.

Collectivized leadership groups are the most longstanding unit forms in our organization. There has always been a persistence among the ordinary Collective members to have collectivized leadership and personal responsibility as the method among the leading members. There has been repeated opposition to personal dictatorship, which was promoted in practice by Edward Pickersgill.

Mao Zedong made this point in one of his "Speeches At The National Conference Of The Communist Party Of China": "We must understand that collective leadership and personal responsibility are two aspects which are not opposed but are linked to each other. And personal responsibility and personal dictatorship, which violates the principle of collective leadership, are two entirely different things."

Our organization was first formed around definite, stated principles in May, 1971. The principles were further expanded and formalized in struggles during: (1) October, 1971, (2) March and April, 1972, and (3) August, 1972. There were additional minor struggles for re-organization in December, 1972.

It was during the struggle in August 1972 that our group took a formal organizational name for the first time. We initially called ourselves the *Alive* Editorial Collective but changed the name shortly afterwards to the *Alive* Production Collective, explaining that this name better conveyed all three functions we carried out — editorial, technical and distribution work for *Alive* Magazine.

Additional major internal struggles took place in our organization in the period from September 1973 through February 1974; in May, 1975; in the autumn, 1975; in the summer, 1976; in December, 1976 and January, 1977; in September, 1977; in December 1977 through February 1978; and in August, 1978.

During the period after September, 1973, the Collective identified a formal leadership structure for the first time. At that time, the first collectivized leadership group came into being. It was also the first time that Edward Pickersgill was given the formal title of "leader" of the Collective.

Previous to that identification, there had been definite leaders in our organization who were recognized in practice as such by the ordinary members. These unofficial leaders gave a definite degree of discipline and organization to the Collective's work. They were also recognized as the responsible spokesmen of the Collective by other organizations and individuals.

The situation in the two and a half years' existence of our organization before September 1973 definitely was *not* one where Edward Pickersgill was recognized as the only leader. It has always been the case inside the organization that a number of people were recognized as leaders. The fact that we have maintained a public posture whereby only one leader is known is due to our care for the security of our organization.

The reality of many leaders inside the Collective was one that Edward Pickersgill fought hard to deny in the struggle after September 1973. Many ordinary members argued against him when he proposed the title of "the leader" for himself. The counterpoint was that the ordinary members saw another person as being equal to Edward Pickersgill in practical leadership qualities and two other people as being close to these two leaders in terms of their advanced consciousness.

Edward Pickersgill was eventually successful in having himself named as "the leader"; however, the ordinary members won by bringing the first collectivized leadership group into reality at the same time. Also, the reality continued unaffected whereby the ordinary members always looked to more than one person for day-to-day leadership.

Between September, 1973 and August, 1978, Edward Pickersgill made a consistent effort to take onto himself as an individual all powers of the collectivized leadership groups and to drive each and every leadership unit out of existence.

Edward Pickersgill's approach was one of destructive meddling in the process of collective leadership and of the commandism of a personal dictator in individual leadership. "Two Talks On Mutual Aid And Co-operation In Agriculture" is the title of one of the works by Mao Zedong where he denounces such an approach: "What is meant by excessive meddling? Drawing up subjective plans at variance with reality and regardless of what is imperative and possible, or carrying out plans, even realistic ones, by means of commandism. Subjectivism and commandism are always bad and will be so even ten thousand years hence.... But to do what is both imperative and possible and moreover do it by means other than commandism — this cannot be called excessive meddling. The above ought to be the yardstick when reviewing our work. Whatever is subjectivist and unrealistic is wrong. Whatever is done through commandism is likewise wrong. To mark time and make no advance is a deviation to the Right; to go beyond what is practicable is a deviation to the 'Left'. Both are manifestations of subjectivism."

WHAT EDWARD PICKERSGILL AFFECTED

We have been asked what concrete effects Edward Pickersgill's factional activity had on our external program. We have to answer: "We don't know. Whatever effect there was, is hard to identify. As much as we have been able to assess an effect, there was very little but we are continuing to look into this in depth."

That answer has given rise to some disbelief. How can someone be a leader and not affect, in some way, each facet of an organization?

For many years there has been a formal division of responsibilities among the leaders of the Alive Production Collective. The division is in terms of basic responsibility, not in terms that excludes one leader by creating a petty "empire" for another leader. There has always been flexibility whereby all leaders could take an active part in areas of the work which were being led by others, as well as the areas where they led the work themselves.

The formal assignment of responsibility assures that basic minimums in the on-going political work are properly fulfilled. If more than the minimum is covered by each leader taking up more responsibility in practice, then the political work will definitely move to a higher level.

The division of responsibility is usually called into effect strictly, when there is an immediate burden pressing on the organization. Such a division of responsibility assures mistakes are rectified more quickly. It allows for a special discipline to be applied in developing a

specific area of the political work. It allows a certain task to be carried out at a higher speed while other work still carries on.

Of course, leadership responsibilities are only a small part of getting revolutionary political work done. The biggest factor in successfully completing any task is the labour applied to the task. In accepting assignments of actual labour, leading members should participate as ordinary members and should be on an equal footing with the rank and file.

The practice of the Alive Production Collective in the division of responsibilities has been to make one section of the leadership fully responsible for external work, and another section responsible for internal work. External work has included organizing supporters and new members, holding public and semi-public meetings, doing agitation and propaganda work, popularizing Alive's program, conducting formal political relations with other groups, maintaining correspondence, etc. Internal work included organizing existing members, setting work schedules, coordinating technical work, administering the physical base of operations for the Collective (e.g. finances, machinery, work locales), etc.

Over the years those leaders responsible for external work also took up active involvement in internal leadership; whereas those with assigned responsibility in the internal structures avoided the additional work entailed in external activities.

These people took a high-handed attitude towards anyone outside the organization, as well as treating the Collective members with contempt. Mao Zedong gives a good outlook on the importance of paying careful attention to people outside the revolutionary organization. In "The Role Of The Chinese Communist Party In The National War", one can read these caring words: "There are many capable people outside the Party whom we must not ignore. The duty of every Communist is to rid himself of aloofness and arrogance and to work well with non-Party cadres, give them sincere help, have a warm, comradely attitude towards them and enlist their initiative in the great cause of resisting Japan and reconstructing the nation."

The formal division of responsibility placed both Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault as leaders in internal work.

This is why we say their effect on our external work is hard to identify in many cases. They most often had only an indirect effect. Various specific disruptions they caused in external work are cited elsewhere in this issue of Alive. It is important to note that it is in the internal structure of the Collective that restructuring and reorganization have been, and still are, necessary due to the rotten practice of Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault.

Our external program has suffered very little permanent effect from the recent political struggle. Much of what we have been able to do in the past will still be possible. Many of our previous plans will be able to be implemented in the future.

Of course, production of Alive has been broken off and disrupted and some other activities have been forced to stop temporarily. Other programs, though, have only slowed their pace or have been kept up as normal and, most importantly, some new activities have been developed in the past months.

An additional point of interest is that the reluctance to take on additional tasks so as to help out in the external work, became a laziness in the realm of internal activities. For example, the previously mentioned editorial unit which was created in 1977 in an effort to give Alive Magazine the consistency it lacked, was led by a leader who had assigned responsibilities in external work. When the Caudwell Unit was formalized, the same external leader was assigned to the responsible position.

The Caudwell Unit prepared and took full responsibility for the content of twenty-one issues of Alive. This was the series produced in magazine sized format between March 11 and August 5, 1978. Thus, the editorial work, clearly an internal function, was being carried out under the formal banner of external work, simply because it was an external leader who took on the responsibility!

Edward Pickersgill was not the editor of Alive in practice nor was he capable of exercising leadership, or even maintaining a facade

that he was leading, in editorial work. He reacted by calling the editorial workers something that he considered to be quite an insult: "Just a bunch of intellectuals". This was quite a bizarre insult anyway but all the more so since he had more formal education than the leader of the Caudwell Unit.

WHAT THE MINI-CULTURAL REVOLUTION WAS

Two series of events that occurred in the months leading up to Edward Pickersgill's overthrow which people should understand before reading the rest of this issue of *Alive*, are the process that the *Alive Production Collective* went through between the beginning of December 1977 and the end of February 1978, and the specific facts of the last struggle in that process, which occurred during the last two weeks of February 1978.

The three month process which ended in February 1978 has been called the high tide of the Mini-Cultural Revolution by the *Alive Production Collective*. The high tide of the Mini-Cultural Revolution was a process of struggle over a large number of points of relevance to our individual members, to our organization as a whole, to *Alive Magazine*, to our general anti-imperialist political work and to our overall revolutionary commitment.

In the process we posed very crucial questions about our future strategy and tactics in our anti-imperialist program. We assisted our members to overcome many unresolved points of hesitancy, misunderstanding or disagreement, which held them back to one extent or another in their revolutionary role. We also reviewed many important aspects of the *Collective's* internal structure and revamped many of the alignments in our day-to-day work.

All in all, we uphold the whole process of the Mini-Cultural Revolution as positive. There were negative points, however.

The process began as a result of the need to deal with the fact that Edward Pickersgill had given a physical beating to a woman member of the *Collective* in the course of an argument. The woman was later revealed to be a member of the faction and the argument was later identified as an inner-factional dispute. This was a negative point.

The process actually began a few days after the physical beating by Edward Pickersgill. Edward Pickersgill, having issued a document of supposed self-criticism which shifted all blame onto others, led the *Collective* to try to carry on as though nothing significant had happened. The physical beating happened on Monday, November 28, 1977 but *Collective* discussion of the incident only began on Friday, December 2. The discussion began because the comrade leading the editorial work refused to allow the preparation of the next issue of *Alive* until Edward Pickersgill's indefensible action was fully discussed. This reluctance to address Edward Pickersgill's unacceptable action and willingness to be misled by him were negative points.

When the process of struggle was started in December, 1977, it was scheduled to continue for only three weeks. The consciousness in the *Collective* at the time was that the next issue of the magazine would be produced in the first week of January 1978. However, Edward Pickersgill turned it into a much more extended process. He raised countless petty issues, initiated many pointless discussions, pursued a great number of dead-end tangents and put small irritants forward to be resolved on a par with important points of political principle.

The original schedule of three weeks was undoubtedly an underestimation. The process could have been completed, though, in five or six weeks, if we had not been subjected to Edward Pickersgill's diversions. Edward Pickersgill succeeded in making the process consume at least twice as much time as was necessary. This is a negative point.

It is also negative that the *Collective* members tolerated and even participated in extensive discussions started by Edward Pickersgill on points that were objectively of secondary importance.

In his diversionary activity Edward Pickersgill managed to obscure his own glaring faults while playing up minor faults in others as though they were political crimes. It is negative that we

allowed Edward Pickersgill to get himself off the hook. It is negative that we allowed others to be needlessly subjected to harassment.

All things taken into consideration, however, our assessment is that the process of struggle inside the *Alive Production Collective* during December 1977, January 1978, and February 1978, was a positive and constructive experience in the life of our organization. Its negative points do not tip the balance in such a way as to change this verdict. In general, we have the same balanced view towards other major struggles in the history of our organization's internal life. We consider them to be positive, in the main, although we are conscious of significant negative points in these struggles. It was positive that we learned how to struggle in these processes and applied this knowledge with great success in our struggle to overthrow Edward Pickersgill in August, 1978.

We are often asked why the three month process that ended in February 1978 was given a name when other previous struggles were not named and why we chose to call it our Mini-Cultural Revolution. Some people have quipped "Did you have an earlier struggle called 'the Mini-Leap Forward' or a 'Let 10 Flowers Blossom Campaign'?"

Our previous struggles were never named. This accords with the experience in most other organizations. We are somewhat ambivalent about the fact that this three-month long struggle was named, since we were saddled with the label when Edward Pickersgill brought it to the public eye in his lead article in *Alive* 104. Previous to that, the name was not a formalized thing.

The name arose from a very simple passing comment. In the process of this three-month struggle a large number of documents were written presenting various comrades' views on a wide range of issues. In fact, each and every comrade in the *Collective*, except Edward Pickersgill, produced an average of fifty documents in this three-month period. Some documents were only one or two pages but many ranged from four to eight pages.

A problem which had to be resolved was how to circulate each document from this massive volume of writing among all the *Collective* members. The resolution was to take up the style of a wall newspaper. The walls in a number of rooms in the *Collective's* central work place were used to post these documents for general reading. Of course, the walls filled up quickly and were kept full throughout the process. A regular phenomenon was to see a number of the comrades standing side by side reading newly posted documents. As a result, one of the leading comrades commented one day that "the documents are like the 'big character posters' in the People's Republic of China — people eagerly reading the new posters like this must be the way it was during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution."

Edward Pickersgill quickly became enamoured with this idea and made a big point of saying "This is just like China's Cultural Revolution, this is our Cultural Revolution."

The comparison was quite a wild one, obviously. To draw such a direct parallel between a political movement encompassing masses of people numbering in the hundreds of millions, on the one hand, and a tiny newly developing revolutionary organization like ours, on the other hand, was to have incredibly large delusions of grandeur.

The comrade who had made the original comment objected to the terminology Edward Pickersgill had picked up. The comrade suggested something less grand would be more appropriate. It was suggested we call the process our Mini-Cultural Revolution. The name was accepted and popularized to counter Edward Pickersgill's grandiose phrasing.

Even so, many of the comrades stated that the term should not be used to promote a serious acceptance of a high blow, conjured up image of our "greatness". The phrase, then, should only be used internal to the *Collective*, many comrades cautioned. However, Edward Pickersgill, as mentioned, committed us to the name by using it in print.

A further interesting point is that in February, 1978, at the end of the three month process, Edward Pickersgill made a big point of having the *Collective* declare that only the "high tide" of the Mini-

Cultural Revolution had ended but not the Mini-Cultural Revolution itself. This was a continuation of his petty-minded parallel with the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. The "high tide" of the GPCR was the time period immediately after 1966, usually identified as ending in 1969. The GPCR itself continued until 1977, however, because its historic mission of rooting out such rotten elements as Lin Biao and the Gang of Four had not been completed during the "high tide".

We accepted Edward Pickersgill's words that the Mini-Cultural Revolution should continue. Many comrades pointed out that such a continuation would serve to promote a self-critical consciousness and a powerful trend of new revolutionary determination through the next period of our work. These were nothing but words to Edward Pickersgill. To us they were a serious commitment and beacon. He didn't have an inkling of how serious we were!

We consider this issue of *Alive* to be the final act of our Mini-Cultural Revolution. That one-year-and-two-months long process is now over and we begin a completely new stage in our work. It is an appropriate way to end a Cultural Revolution: overthrowing a rotten element in the leadership, after a process of searching out the wrong line no matter how high one has to look, and completing the overthrow with an educational campaign. Yes, we have had quite a complete Mini-Cultural Revolution!

IN THE FACTIONAL WAY

At the very end of the "high tide" of the Mini-Cultural Revolution, after the Collective had already gone back to its usual political work but before we made any renewed external thrusts — like production of an issue of *Alive* — Edward Pickersgill pulled a stunt which prolonged the process by one week.

The incident started when Edward Pickersgill had one of his frequent arguments with the woman factionalist who he had physically beaten in November 1977. After this argument, the woman withdrew from performing her assigned Collective tasks for the day because she was ordered to do so by Edward Pickersgill. This was a common scenario. However, Edward Pickersgill treated it on this day as being quite uncommon. He produced a special document for the attention of all the comrades in the Collective giving his political analysis of the source of the woman comrade's recurring problems.

Edward Pickersgill's document was extremely devious. It related the incidents in the earlier argument, it related his political analysis and, near the end of the document, it assured all Collective members that the source of the woman's problems was not the fact that "she is going to have a baby and I am the other party to this pregnancy."

The actual point of the document was to announce the pregnancy, which was only known to the members of the faction before this written statement was made. Not only was the pregnancy unknown to other members of the Collective, the fact of a sexual relationship between the woman and Edward Pickersgill had previously been kept secret. Needless to say, there was some dissatisfaction over this document.

Edward Pickersgill produced a number of further documents. He lied in these documents and when caught out in his lies, kept changing the story until some version gained acceptance. In his second document on the question, he said the pregnancy was the unfortunate result of a frivolous one night stand. The woman and he had succumbed, he said, to all the heady feelings of warmth and comradesly love one night after a particularly good Collective meeting in December 1977.

The comrades found that hard to swallow.

In his subsequent documents, Edward Pickersgill admitted he had lied, did no self-criticism and settled on an account whereby he had engaged in sexual activity with the woman beginning years previous because she sympathized with his plight in having a sexual relationship that was "on the rocks" with Michelle Landriault. He also said such bizarre things as he had only fallen into sexual rela-

tions with this woman for limited periods of time which were separated by long periods of no sexual activity. He cited six of these limited periods and said they had engaged in sexual activity an average of twice only in each period. "In all, then, we engaged in such activity a total of perhaps a dozen times."

We do not believe this scenario. It does not answer the facts as we know them. However, we are not concerned to know the actual scenario. Neither were we concerned in February 1978. Edward Pickersgill laid out this story without being asked to do so.

We felt in February 1978 that we were not being told the facts about the relationship but we did not demand those facts. All we demanded was to know the truth around two points coming out of the revelation of the relationship.

The first point was that we were not concerned that a sexual relationship was kept secret but we were concerned if the secret relationship had been having an effect in the Collective's political life which could not have been known to us. The second point was that we were not concerned if a healthy monogamous sexual relationship had been kept secret but we were concerned if a promiscuous situation breaking Collective norms and going against proletarian morals had been developed in secret.

These points were discussed openly in the Collective and were put directly in the form of questions to the pregnant woman and Edward Pickersgill.

Michelle Landriault has accused us in writing of not pursuing this investigation vigorously because most Collective members were too complacent. The fact is that Edward Pickersgill, Michelle Landriault and the other two factionalists had all the relevant facts at the start of the investigation. They never gave us this relevant information either voluntarily or in answer to our questions.

Further, the investigation was not pursued complacently but with vigour. Discussions took place over a period of a full week — these discussions did not involve all the members of the Collective. Some comrades did not find out about the secret sexual relationship until some months later, even finding out only after Edward Pickersgill had already split in August.

Edward Pickersgill did a lot of manoeuvring to throw the investigation off track. He refused to answer questions, saying, "How would you like me to ask you all sorts of details about your personal relationships?"

He often refused to attend meetings discussing the matter. He denounced comrades for inviting the woman to attend these meetings. When the comrades carried through with the meetings he berated them for trying to get clarity on questions without tapping into the advanced consciousness of the leading member — and this, after he had been informed of the discussion and refused to attend!

Both he and the pregnant woman led the Collective to believe that their sexual liaison was a healthy monogamous relationship. None of the factionalists contradicted this false understanding.

At the end of the investigation a meeting was held at which the two central issues around the secret sexual relationship were reviewed in a series of formal questions. Each of these questions was answered by everyone present, including all of the faction — except Michelle Landriault who was in the hospital.

At the end of the meeting, a series of resolutions were put forward to formalize the conclusions of the investigation. The resolutions were passed unanimously, with everybody at the meeting casting a formal vote — including three of the four factionalists.

The conclusions of the meeting were: 1) the fact that the sexual relationship had been kept secret was not a significant factor in the political life of the Collective; 2) this secret sexual relationship was not to be condemned as a manifestation of promiscuity, it was identified as a monogamous relationship which, some years ago, superseded the previous monogamous relationship between Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault — a sexual relationship that was seen to be "on the rocks" for a long time; 3) there was no further need for the organization or individual members to demand

any more explanation from the people involved in this relationship than is demanded from people involved in any other sexual social relationship; 4) given Edward Pickersgill's responsible position in the public posture of the organization, and given that we would play into slander-mongers' hands if the leader of the Collective had a public divorce or was seen to be father of the baby of a "mistress", we did not consider it necessary, in alleviating any charges of promiscuity, for Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault to legally divorce or for Edward Pickersgill to have a legal second marriage.

No factionalist spoke up at the time to contradict these conclusions and all voted in favour of them. Edward Pickersgill used the formal conclusions as weapons in his hands right away. He asked if there were any outstanding doubts or questions. When two members asked for clarity on the beginnings of the relationship, he angrily denounced them: "Do you want me and her to get up on the table and give a demonstration of how we started having sex?"

Of course, this was a distortion of the actual question which concerned the time period that the secret sexual relationship began. This question arose because of the disbelief directed towards Edward Pickersgill's written scenario. This disbelief still exists because this scenario does not fit known facts.

Edward Pickersgill quashed any and all further questions by proclaiming they probed his sexual relationship with the pregnant woman more than others would tolerate probes into their sexual social relationships.

A couple of days later when Michelle Landriault came out of the hospital she was given copies of Edward Pickersgill's documents to read and she was given a formal report on the discussion and the decisions on the case. She also had further discussion with various individual Collective members.

Her accusation later, in August 1978, was based on the fact that she was not brought into any Collective meetings or otherwise given access to the whole membership to discuss the secret sexual relationship, that the formal questions were not put to her and that she was not part of a formal vote. It is true that we did not practice the illusion that Michelle Landriault's single vote would change the formal decision by itself. However, it was she who knew that we had made a false decision. She did not choose to bring out the facts she had to prompt the investigation to be re-opened and decisions to be reversed in new votes.

She claims we were complacent in not pursuing the formal process with her. Well, she was fully informed of the formal process and missed all opportunities to volunteer the facts she had to contradict our conclusions. Is this not the complacency she pins on us in its one hundredfold form? She was not a pure innocent but a conscious factionalist. The factionalists were not guilty of complacency towards facts but of conspiring and acting to suppress facts.

THE STRUGGLE BEGINS

It is important that people are given some brief account of the events around the overthrow of Edward Pickersgill. The recent process of sharp political struggle in the Alive Production Collective can be seen to have three distinct parts. The struggle went through its opening stage between Tuesday, August 15 and Monday, August 21, 1978. The second stage covered the time span between August 21 and Thursday, September 7, 1978. The third stage began on September 7 and has continued up to the present.

The process started on August 15, when Michelle Landriault ran away from the Alive Production Collective and covertly left town. She hoped that her running away would create a stir around the personal problems in her marriage with Edward Pickersgill. Such a stir, she felt, would be bound to lay open the facts of Edward Pickersgill's degenerate sexual activity and then the Collective was bound to put a stop to his promiscuity. She reasoned that after his come-uppance, she might be able to have her husband for herself within the Collective or, if he was expelled as a result of the fury of

the organization, to have him for herself outside the Collective. At a minimum, no other woman would be left at peace to have her husband.

She ran away in the hope of creating a stir. She has stayed away for a different reason — to continue the working arrangement of the hard core of the faction. Since their split from the Collective Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault have patched up their personal differences to such an extent that they can act as a coordinated force of practical opposition to our organization.

Michelle Landriault left Guelph in such a way that no other Collective members knew she was going until four hours after she was gone. When she left town by train, she took one of her two children with her. Her second child was on holiday with another Collective member. Michelle Landriault got off the train in the town where these people were vacationing and by arrangement picked up her child at the station before reboarding another train.

Michelle Landriault revealed to the other Collective member, who had brought the second child to the train station, the existence of the faction which she had helped create and build into a fully developed, degenerate reality. Her motive in this revelation was a backbiting attempt to cause an uncomfortable situation for her factional cohorts. In this attempt, she emphasized not the political function of the faction but the fact that Edward Pickersgill pursued promiscuous sexual relations with the women who were the other factionalists.

Michelle Landriault hoped to create the opinion that she was forced to run away because of an intolerable personal situation. She failed to achieve her wish because, despite the incorrect motive that led to the revelation, the newly gained knowledge that a faction existed became an immediate spark for principled political struggle. Of course, those people who vigorously took up the struggle were in no way inclined to approve of Michelle Landriault running away down easy street.

The fact that a faction existed in the Collective was responsibly reported by the comrade who had seen Michelle Landriault at the train station. This was done by arranging a phone call from a phone booth in Guelph to a phone booth where the comrade was vacationing — an arrangement that guaranteed that the information given in the phone call would not be monitored by police "bugs" on the Collective members' phones.

The information was received in Guelph by a leading comrade of the Collective in the evening of Wednesday, August 16, 1978. This comrade spent two days planning a course of action to use in making this significant information known. It was also necessary for the comrade to think over the ramifications of such a revelation to our organization.

Right after Michelle Landriault ran away, Edward Pickersgill made public two letters she had left behind. The two letters gave different explanations as to why she left. One letter was to the Collective. The other letter was to Edward Pickersgill personally. Before he released the personal letter to the Collective he blacked out sections which referred to his sexual promiscuity and factional activity. He lied by saying the blacked out lines were deleted because they only dealt with "personal matters".

He also released a copy of a document written by him which he claimed had caused Michelle Landriault such unease that she had to leave. Previous to August 15, this document, which was actually written on August 1, 1978, had been read only by Edward Pickersgill, his hard core factionalist partner and one other leading member of the Collective.

On the evening of August 15, Edward Pickersgill quite frantically asked various comrades if he should go to where his wife was, to encourage her to come back. These comrades did not give any definite answers because they were surprised to see him in such a frenzy. Previously, Edward Pickersgill was always the first to proclaim that all comrades' political commitment should stand above their personal involvements.

"Even if your husband or your wife runs off, you should never run after them, you should be most staunch at such times." That was always Edward Pickersgill's advice to other comrades in

distressing circumstances. However, when his own turn came he fell to pieces more completely and more quickly than any other comrade ever had in similar circumstances.

On Wednesday, August 16, Edward Pickersgill withdrew from his Collective responsibilities for a day so that he could go running after Michelle Landriault. On August 17, he made a written report on his conversation with his wife. The upshot of the report was that she refused to come back to him, to Guelph or to the Alive Production Collective; and, her intention was to live in the place where she had stopped running for at least one full year. He had pulled a romantic ploy of "proposing marriage to her for a second time" and begged her to consider returning to him. She said she stood by her expressed intention but agreed to phone him the following Monday to let him know her final decision about whether she would return or not.

On his return to Guelph, Edward Pickersgill began to revamp a number of people's living arrangements in such a way that he could have the house he was living in free and clear as a family home for him, his hard core factionalist partner and the two children. He pursued this further by taking money without authorization from the collectivized finance system, in which he participated, to buy a brand new double bed for his projected second honeymoon.

These antics were opposed by other comrades who pointed out that he was living an illusion. It was clear that Michelle Landriault and the two children were most probably not coming back for at least one year. This reasoning fell on deaf ears.

On Friday, August 18, Edward Pickersgill called a meeting of all available Collective members to be held in the late morning. A document was presented to this meeting by Edward Pickersgill which attempted to spark a new two-line struggle against "complacency". This was labelled by him as a follow up to his August 1 document. At the meeting, he also proposed that the two week break in the publishing schedule of Alive after issue 124, be formally ended and that work on the next issue be started.

This idea was opposed by the other leading comrade who had received the information about the faction. This comrade counter proposed that the publishing break not be ended at that time, saying there were many points he would like to broach with reference to questions of leadership and in the context of an important two-line struggle.

Edward Pickersgill was blind to the actual meaning of this counter-proposal. His "complacency" document contained many hidden references to this other leading comrade, against whom Edward Pickersgill had launched a trumped up two-line struggle just previous to Michelle Landriault running away. Thus, he thought the other comrade was knuckling under and meant by his counter-proposal that he intended to support the diversionary issue of "complacency" and to make self-criticism for the "errors" Edward Pickersgill had falsely identified in the comrade's style of leadership.

Edward Pickersgill happily threw his support behind the counter-proposal, which was agreed on unanimously.

THE STRUGGLE RAGES

The leading comrade who knew of the existence of the faction popularized this knowledge throughout the Collective by issuing a written document on the evening of Friday, August 18, 1978. Just before this document was circulated, it was shown to Edward Pickersgill. Having read it, he asked the comrade what he intended to do with it. The comrade repeated the explanation he had given when he first handed over the document, that is, he intended to make it available for reading by the whole Collective.

Edward Pickersgill tried to discourage this plan. He asked: "Are you sure you want everyone to read it? Don't you want to deal with it in the Lu Hsun Unit first? Do you think everyone can handle it?"

The comrade answered very simply: "I don't know if everyone can handle it. Yes, I do want everyone to read it."

Edward Pickersgill replied to this document being circulated by producing a number of documents of his own. He tried to stave off

his overthrow by drowning the comrades in a mass of words and a plethora of details — within twenty-five days after August 18, he had produced forty-eight documents! He took up a number of superficial poses in his hope of out-manoeuvring the opposition to his degeneracy and his factionalism. None of his manoeuvres worked, much to his dismay.

Edward Pickersgill began his defence by attacking other comrades in his documents issued throughout August 18 and into the next day. This was denounced as a smokescreen.

He then shifted his focus to one of making grovelling, self-denigrating statements in his documents issued during the rest of August 19 and August 20. This was denounced as a false attempt since his "self-denigrations" broke Collective norms on self-criticism, which has nothing in common with self-flagellation or piling epithets up against one's own name.

Late on August 20 Edward Pickersgill took up yet another posture, beginning to act like he had become deranged under the pressures of the struggle. He began to wander around aimlessly or sit in a chair staring off into space with his eyes wide and bulging. He would speak to others in very clipped sentences, often cryptic in form and senseless in meaning. This was denounced as a play for sympathy. It is well known in the Collective that the means of not getting ground down in the rigours of two-line struggle is to fully integrate with the majority of Collective members but Edward Pickersgill was holding himself entirely aloof. Further, it was he who had attempted to grind down others under a huge volume of words, not others who had put heavy burdens on him.

During the first days after August 18, the members of the Collective took a formal position: "We can no longer follow Edward Pickersgill's leadership."

This decision was made known to Edward Pickersgill. On the basis of this formal group consciousness, the members told Edward Pickersgill that the best way for him to achieve success in this struggle is to unite with the majority and to accept the position of an ordinary Collective member — a member being disciplined under serious criticism.

Edward Pickersgill, though, chose to throw himself completely behind a devious personal defence of his past mistakes and to deepen his incorrect outlook. His intransigence on the incorrect line has jeopardized his chances of ever achieving success in this struggle. Whether he is a member or a non-member of the Alive Production Collective, this struggle is going to be a pivotal struggle in his life.

Edward Pickersgill has been told by the Alive Production Collective that we hope he will come over to the correct line and transform himself in a process of self-criticism. It would still be good if he were to transform himself into a person truly of value to the people.

However, as materialists we must see that in the time span of the present struggle, Edward Pickersgill has consistently refused our encouragement and he has dug himself in deeper and deeper in a position of opposing revolution.

The Collective organized and invited Edward Pickersgill to a formal meeting on Monday, August 21. At this meeting, we affirmed once again that Edward Pickersgill was no longer the leader of our organization. We also put on record our satisfaction with the powerful thrust of new spirit that had come with the release of the great initiative of the ordinary members. We stated that a process of investigation was to be formally begun and that the first stage of this process was a two week long series of initial interviews with all available Collective members.

Edward Pickersgill was asked, by the Collective, to take some time off so that he could get more into the frame of mind that was required for a protracted process of re-education and transformation in his new role as an ordinary Collective member. It was suggested that he take two weeks of time off. A place only sixty miles away from Guelph was suggested as a locale for his holiday and it was suggested that he come back for one day after one week's time off to report on his activity. On the day he was to report back

he was also to be given the questions that the Collective wanted him to answer in writing for its investigation.

Edward Pickersgill negotiated to come back to report twice, once after three days and once after one week. The Collective agreed but, smelling a rat, cautioned him strongly that he would only be "touching down" for long enough to receive the Collective's instructions and to give his own report. Further, he was told specifically to arrive for this session around 9 a.m. on Thursday, August 24. He was given \$260.00 to cover his expenses.

Edward Pickersgill ignored the advice of the Collective, not taking his time off in the suggested place, but instead, going further afield to meet with Michelle Landriault on these three days.

Edward Pickersgill returned on August 24 in such a manner as to cause a deliberate disruption to the Collective and the people with whom he shared living accommodations. He phoned on Tuesday evening to say he was going to save himself the cost of a motel for his last night away by driving all night to arrive in Guelph just before our scheduled meeting. Then he had his factionalist partner phone on Wednesday evening to say he had left a little early — such that he would arrive in Guelph at 1 a.m.

To counter-act the disruptive effect, we rented a motel room for Edward Pickersgill and some Collective members waited to meet him on arrival. When he arrived, the Collective members took his brief report on his activities and told him about his motel room. Edward Pickersgill refused to take the motel room key and announced he was intending to sleep in his own bedroom. He was cautioned not to discount the Collective's advice a second time and not to start a "dirty dogfight". In response he went into his bedroom to try to hole himself up and put an end to the dispute in a way that would be in his favour.

All through this argument he acted like a deranged person again, hysterically repeating over and over that the house he was in was owned by Michelle Landriault and himself, that it was his family home, etc. He was answered by citing the fact that the house is owned in Michelle Landriault's name but has been bought and paid for with Collective money.

When Edward Pickersgill went into his bedroom in this frenzied state, one of the comrades, as a matter of intelligent concern, followed him into the room so as to remove two guns and ammunition that Edward Pickersgill always kept close by his bed. Immediately, and ever since, he yelled that this contradiction did not involve a matter of guns — implying that the comrade took the guns as a threat. In fact, the worry was that Edward Pickersgill would threaten the others — the guns were simply removed to another room and the comrade returned empty-handed.

In his bedroom, Edward Pickersgill became quite hysterical, making provocative statements to the other comrades and insisting on staying in the house he "owned". The Collective members stated that he was only trying to provoke them to remove him physically. They also questioned whether he intended to create an incident to wake up the people in the area and have someone call the cops.

Later, Edward Pickersgill spread slander quite widely about this incident. He has said various things at various times, saying that he had been "roughed up", that he had been "threatened with a physical beating", that he had been "threatened with assassination", that "guns had been involved", that comrades had to restrain one another from hitting him, and that he had been "physically thrown out of his own house". Also, he has emphasized ominously that he might still be in danger of such actions from the Collective.

Nothing even remotely like a physical confrontation happened on August 24, or at any other time, between Edward Pickersgill and the Alive Production Collective. At approximately 1:30 a.m. on August 24, Edward Pickersgill left, drove to a city 16 miles away and took another motel room there.

At around 11 a.m. Edward Pickersgill arrived for his formal meeting with Collective members. At the beginning of this session he made a verbal self-criticism for provoking the 1 a.m. incident. This was a complete sham, as witness his later actions and a document he wrote two days later (see Part 18 of this issue of Alive).

THE STRUGGLE BECOMES PROTRACTED

On August 24, Edward Pickersgill asked for and received the bulk of the personal belongings Michelle Landriault had left behind. He was given a truckload of clothes, bedding, dishes, etc. belonging to his wife, his kids and his wife's relatives. She had sent a list of requests through him and every one of these requests was fulfilled. She was also given additional personal belongings which she had forgotten to list.

During the next four days Edward Pickersgill delivered the personal belongings to Michelle Landriault and hung around the area she was staying in. Once again, by doing this he was ignoring the place the Collective suggested he stay.

On Tuesday August 29, 1978, Edward Pickersgill returned to Guelph for another formal meeting with the Collective. At this meeting he gave us eight of nine documents he had written in the previous week and one document written by Michelle Landriault. The written document he held back was one written for his hard core factional partner about the August 24, 1 a.m. incident.

The Collective presented him with a copy of the following statement and the following four questions, requesting answers to the questions in writing.

Statement by Members of the Alive Production Collective to Edward Pickersgill Tuesday, August 29, 1978

For eleven days now we have been conducting an investigation into major political questions arising from your role in the Alive Production Collective. The points at issue involve you as an individual and the political life of the Collective as a whole. Regarding you as an individual the investigation is encompassing both your open actions and your conspiratorial activities.

We view this investigation as a program which will of necessity extend over a protracted period of time. Haste will not serve to uncover the important issues in their full nature and a partial uncovering will not allow us to learn the valuable lessons involved in this large political contradiction.

We are also of the view that our standing program of anti-imperialist work must be examined in light of the current contradictions and in the course of the current investigation. Thus our involvement in some aspects of on-going practical work has to come to a temporary halt. Which aspects of practical work we return to and which schedule we follow in returning to these aspects of work, are matters to be decided step-by-step during the course of time taken by our investigation and struggle over the serious contradictions at hand.

Our investigation has not been anything but an investigation. We have been seeking facts since it has been made obvious to us that there are significant facts in the life of the Collective that either have been unknown to us or that have been obscured so that their actual significance has been unknown to us. We will not hesitate to "seek truth from facts to serve the people" when that part of the process arises. That is, we recognize that we will be drawing conclusions but we also firmly believe that it is too early as yet to do so.

In our eleven days of looking into this, the single most significant internal contradiction in the years-long life of our organization, we have drawn only one conclusion. This conclusion is upheld with no dissension whatsoever by we, the members of the Alive Production Collective. This conclusion was arrived at early in this whole process and has already been communicated to you verbally in a number of ways by a number of people. We put this conclusion to you in writing at this time because you have thus far only shown a grasp of it in passing words of acknowledgement. You have not been seen to grasp it in practice. Your practice still reflects attitudes of same-thing-as-usual, attitudes through which you have subjected us to displays of your personal arrogance, your individualistic deceit and lying, your spontaneity and impetuosity,

your self-centredness and your deep subjectivism. You have presumed to "teach" us a thing or two as you went along and you have dared to keep intact your contempt for the individuals making up the majority of the Collective. These are serious matters which will have to be taken up during your re-education and remoulding. We suggest you immediately begin to transform in practice on these points.

OUR ONE CONCLUSION: We cannot follow Edward Pickersgill's leadership anymore.

Edward Pickersgill established a formal faction in the ranks of our revolutionary organization and standing with a few members carried out conspiratorial activities against the majority of members of the Alive Production Collective and connected anti-imperialist groups. Edward Pickersgill has abandoned his own role in revolutionary leadership and has created a situation where secondary leadership and collective leadership are little more than a mockery. Edward Pickersgill has treated ordinary members of our anti-imperialist organizations with utter contempt — not treating them as revolutionaries with great initiative that should be released to advance the progressive movement but treating them as clowns, buffoons and non-political people who should only operate within the narrow confines of Edward Pickersgill's individual perceptions. Edward Pickersgill has succumbed to the social degeneracy of the imperialist culture, seriously blackening the chances of the organizations he has led to successfully carry out their political programs in the sphere of revolutionary culture. Edward Pickersgill has pursued in practice a line on the woman question squarely opposite to the stated and agreed on line of the Alive Production Collective; he has followed the line of degrading the role of women by reducing them to the level of sexual commodities, a serious matter by itself but more serious since in numbers women constitute a basic majority in our organizations — women make up more than 50% of our organizations.

These facts all seriously undermine people's faith in Edward Pickersgill. These facts mean people view Edward Pickersgill's every word with cynicism. These facts mean people doubt the ability of Edward Pickersgill to put forward correct views. We must avoid a situation where this shaken faith in Edward Pickersgill becomes lack of trust in leadership groups and democratic-centralist organizational structures themselves. We must avoid a situation where the cynicism insidiously transforms itself into disillusionment with anti-imperialist political work. We must avoid a situation where the doubt in Edward Pickersgill becomes doubt that it is possible to formulate and implement a correct line for revolution in Canada. In order to avoid these bad tendencies it is necessary for individuals to affirm for themselves that they are for strength not rot in the anti-imperialist revolutionary movement. It is also necessary for our organization to show strength so that the individual anti-imperialists will take that strength to fight disillusionment. Our first task must be to guarantee that the majority of members in the existing organizations continue in their political work and ideological commitment. It is for these reasons that we strongly state and that we have quickly stated that we cannot follow Edward Pickersgill's leadership anymore.

A task that we must also face is to attempt to win over and re-educate those involved in the conspiracy, both hard-core and transient members of the faction, but this is a secondary task. If we are successful in this people will once again trust and accept Edward Pickersgill in the ranks of the anti-imperialist revolutionary movement. If we have great success it may be possible for people to trust Edward Pickersgill's leadership once again after an extended passage of time and for Edward Pickersgill to participate in some future leadership structure.

Four Questions Posed by the Alive Production Collective to Edward Pickersgill

We have identified a well established faction in the ranks of the Collective over the course of our recent investigation. This faction

involved 4 people, with you as the leader.

We would like you to deal with this question of factionalism in a revolutionary organization. Generally, what is your assessment of the political error of factionalism? What effects does a faction have on the life of a revolutionary organization?

Specifically, what is your perception of the effects of this particular faction on the life of the Collective? What is your perception of your role in this faction?

We know that superficial treatment of these questions could be done by just about anybody. We would like you to go into these questions in some depth.

* * *

We would like you to carefully examine the relationship you have had, both in the near and far past and the relationship you have at present with Michelle.

It is our perception that the internal reality of this relationship has been tumultuous, but externally portrayed variously as: "a model"; "exemplary"; "non-existent"; "on the rocks"; etc. You have given various reasons for these often contradictory portrayals of this relationship which in themselves and in view of your social practice in the Collective have created a mystery as to the nature of the relationship. Further, it is our belief that this relationship has played a key role in your present activities and that over the years has affected you in your leadership position. We ask that you weigh and consider the positive and negative effects that this relationship's features has had on you.

* * *

During the Mini Cultural Revolution the members of the Collective all addressed to one degree or another the question of their social backgrounds. You did not address this question. You have never addressed this question in terms of your own involvement in social and sexual degeneracy. We have heard about jobs you have had, the music business, the drug scene, your male friends and their involvement with women but we have never heard any account of your own involvement with and attitudes towards women during periods of your life before the Alive work began. Such an account is conspicuous by its absence. Given the present facts about your own social degeneracy we think that it is necessary for you to address this question of your own social background.

It is entirely up to you whether or not you choose to address the question of your own social background and history. It is entirely up to you what you choose to address and confront and what you choose to avoid addressing. It is entirely up to you what amount of detail such an account involves. However we would encourage you to address this question as fully and completely as possible.

* * *

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. In our view this degeneration accelerated appreciably since the faction of which you were the leading member consolidated its existence some six months ago. Examples of your degeneration in lifestyle include your increasing tendency to spend much of your time watching T.V. and sleeping during the day; both of which contribute little to the political and social life of the Collective. Degeneration of your workstyle involves your increasing inability to initiate and lead Collective programs and inability to concentrate and follow through on work assignments taken on by you. There are other examples of this degeneration.

We believe that it is important for you to address the question of your degeneration in work and lifestyle in as full a way as possible providing examples wherever you can and including analysis of its political ramifications in general, on the life of the Collective, and on your own capacity to lead.

FURTHER EXPOSURE

On Tuesday, September 5, 1978 the Alive Production Collective and Edward Pickersgill had another formal meeting. At this meeting, Edward Pickersgill reported on his activities by saying he had stayed in the place suggested by the Collective during the previous week and that he had made contact with a man who ran a gun selling business in that town. This statement was meant as an ominous warning to the Collective that even if we did not allow him to have the guns he always kept in his room, he would be able to get guns. Edward Pickersgill, who is not at all fit or trained to get into a physical fight, has long put his faith in such weapons when feeling threatened.

The important point in this matter is that Edward Pickersgill was not being threatened physically in any way by our organization. Nor has he been threatened in this way at any time since. Nor is he threatened in this way now. Edward Pickersgill is only threatened ideologically by our efforts in this struggle.

On September 5, Edward Pickersgill gave us seven documents he had written.

Two hours after this formal meeting, Edward Pickersgill met briefly with the Alive Production Collective again. At this meeting he turned over a copy of an initial written response to our September 5 statement and was asked to carry through on a commitment he had made at the earlier meeting. The commitment had been to transfer all his shares in Alive Press Limited to someone designated by the Collective and to sign a form of resignation as President and as a Director of that company. Two suitable forms were drawn up during the two hour interval and Edward Pickersgill was asked to complete them with his signature. He exposed his rotten deviousness and revealed his own bluff by refusing to sign either document.

At the meeting on September 5, the Collective presented Edward Pickersgill with a copy of the following statement.

Statement by Members of the Alive Production Collective to Edward Pickersgill Tuesday, September 5, 1978

We have carefully reviewed the documents presented to us one week ago. The documents in question are 8 handwritten statements by Edward Pickersgill and one handwritten statement by Michelle Landriault. These statements are dated on various days between Tuesday, August 22 and Tuesday, August 29. We consider that all of these documents are wrong.

These documents by Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault mischaracterize the current political struggle in the Alive Production Collective. This political struggle is a significant matter and, for our part, it is being waged in a principled fashion. To reiterate the facts we put forward in writing in our Tuesday, August 29, 1978 statement, we are conducting a deep-going investigation to assure that the struggle is firmly based in reality and we are not jumping to hasty conclusions.

The documents presented to us by Edward Pickersgill completely distort the history of our organization and worse, they present the history in such a way as to attempt, in one stroke, to destroy the revolutionary principles and stated policies which are most basic to our political organization.

All this is to be expected. Rotten practice, such as has been exposed on the part of Edward Pickersgill and the conspiratorial faction which he created, cannot be anything but the material reflection of a rotten political line. A rotten political line constitutes a system of thought and a whole realm of practice. Thus, a rotten political line cannot possibly manifest itself in but a single facet of practice, it inevitably taints many, many facets of a person's practice. This is the simple explanation of the rotten nature of the statements by Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault.

We take a dialectical view to the documents presented to us by Edward Pickersgill. These documents are openly and consciously

provocative. That is, Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault know their statements are lies, mischaracterizations and distortions, yet they have made the statements anyway. The only explanation for this is that these two individuals want to provoke an unthinking, angry response from the majority of Alive Production Collective members. We will not be provoked to make an unthinking response. We are provoked to anger, and justly so. Our anger, though, is being channelled to determination in the political struggle, not to erroneous personal hatred for these two individuals.

We continue in the hope that future practice will show Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault to have taken up a responsible and correct ideological re-education and a remoulding of class outlook and lifestyle. The revolutionary ranks need Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault and, by the exact same token, the dark forces of political reaction would like to claim them. The choice belongs to Edward Pickersgill. The choice belongs to Michelle Landriault.

We do not intend to be shaken from the present path of investigation and struggle by ultimatums and shrieks from people on an erroneous political line. We, the members of the Alive Production Collective, are exercising effective and practical dictatorship over the life of the organization. This dictatorship is necessary because the struggle at hand is the most important political struggle ever faced in the internal organizational life of the Alive Production Collective. This dictatorship renders completely ineffective any and all grumbling diversions on matters of "business", "finances", "personal ownership", etc. Thus, it is an objective waste of time for Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault to continue their attempted smokescreens in this direction. Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault should live up to their own often repeated admonishments to others, putting themselves at the command of the Collective discipline and forgetting ridiculous individualistic pride. There is no reason to fear the democratic dictatorship of the majority.

If the concerns raised by these two individuals are true concerns for the Collective and have been misread by us as petty individualist concerns, let us assure these individuals that we have all such matters well in hand, in healthy shape and under complete Collective control. Further, even if these concerns are honest, they are nonetheless unfounded. To illustrate this point, we call these individuals' attention to the fact that one of the serious errors of their faction was to treat with contempt the revolutionaries who are comrades of the Alive Production Collective. To begin to rectify this error in their practice, these factionalists should get adjusted to the reality that we are not "green", "wet behind the ears", "inept", "naive", "innocent", "idealistic", etc. We are materialists. We are people guided by revolutionary politics. It is those with the hard core factional mentality whose practice has proven to be out of tune with reality.

To summarize our view: political struggle is the only point on the agenda worthy of immediate attention; whether Edward Pickersgill and/or Michelle Landriault implement some desire to personally own a small business is not even a point on the agenda!

* * *

We also want to inform you that the content of our discussions and investigation during the past two weeks is being documented in writing. You will be shown all such documentation as soon as it is prepared.

You will also receive our written response to each point in each of your documents issued between August 18 and August 29.

The situation we are facing immediately is the return of an APC comrade from a five week holiday. The return is expected this evening (it has been postponed by six days due to travel difficulties). We need elbow room to put the present situation to this comrade in a correct and understandable political and factual context. For this reason, we propose you make your stay in Guelph today another "touch down" trip and leave again this afternoon.

We suggest that you follow the same program as during the past 7 days. We suggest you return again on Thursday, September 7 at 4 p.m.

We suggest a program of discussion, information exchange and struggle with you directly, beginning on Thursday. This program will take the following form: Thursday at 4 p.m., a 2-hour session; Friday at 2 p.m., a 4-hour session; Saturday at 1 p.m., a 4-hour session; Sunday at 1 p.m., a 4-hour session; and, Monday at 4 p.m., a 2-hour session. The Monday session will be a review of this first stage program and a time to set out details of the program beyond that session. All the earlier sessions will be open for presentation of our questions and positions, presentation of your questions and positions, and struggle between positions.

Between each session you will maintain a similar posture or the same posture as you have maintained in the past two weeks. That is, you will not live or work in the Collective situation. All these sessions will be held in the Collective meeting room at (*street address deleted*).

As far as we are concerned, you can maintain use of the (*vehicle description deleted*) during the next period of time.

We can provide you with \$40 today. This will round out the amount of money provided to you by us in the last two weeks to \$300. We would also like to inform you that we will not necessarily pay your personal credit card gas bill nor your monthly car payments, since these are debts benefitting you as an individual and not the Collective and these are debts you have mounted up without our approval.

EDWARD PICKERSGILL QUILTS

On Thursday September 7, 1978, the Alive Production Collective had its last formal, direct contact with Edward Pickersgill. After this we received formal statements through the mail only and had one other direct contact with him for approximately two minutes.

The official report of the September 7 meeting follows.

"At the beginning of the meeting Edward Pickersgill handed over the handwritten originals of two documents to the leading comrade present, adding that he had carbon copies for his own reference. The leading comrade pointed out that the Collective members also had a statement which would be read out. Edward Pickersgill said that he could read out his documents also.

"The meeting started by Edward Pickersgill reading out his longer document entitled 'Response To Yesterday's Statement By Members Of The APC'. He read this statement in a dull monotone with no signs of emotion. At the suggestion of the leading comrade present, Edward Pickersgill also read out his shorter document. This was done in the same dull monotone.

"After this the Collective's statement was read aloud. Only a few words of this were read before Edward Pickersgill interrupted, asking for a copy of the statement. He was given a copy and the reading continued.

"As the reading began Edward Pickersgill tightened his jaw muscles, and clenched his teeth. He did not take his eyes off the copy during the entire process. He showed few signs of emotion, raising his eyebrows slightly at some points and giving a faint smile on two occasions.

"When the reading finished, Edward Pickersgill stated that he could deal with the questions posed at the end of the statement in just a minute, but first he would like to clarify one point. This point was one made in the statement about Edward Pickersgill's declared intention of making his documents public. Edward Pickersgill's 'point of clarification' was to state that he did not want to make the current series of documents public. He alleged that he intended to make two documents which we have not yet seen — a sketch and a biography — public.

"The leading comrade present sharply responded to this fast foot work by calling on Edward Pickersgill to stop treating us like a pack of idiots. We had read his written statements and that was what we

had responded to.

"Edward Pickersgill immediately backed down, muttering that he thought he had made the points clear in his earlier documents but perhaps he should re-read them.

"Edward Pickersgill then went on to answer the various questions posed at the end of the Collective's September 7 statement.

"Regarding his current Collective membership, he stated 'I'd have to say that I'd have to consider myself as a member who is on his way out.'

"On the question of continuing in the discussion program outlined to him on Tuesday, September 5, Edward Pickersgill replied that he did not have a clear understanding of what the discussions were meant to be about but that he was willing to participate in them and answer any questions we may have. He added that he was 'willing to see the process through to the end.'

"One of the comrades asked, 'What's the point? What's the point in seeing "the process" through to the end?'

"Edward Pickersgill replied by re-iterating that he wanted to see the process through to 'the end', but if that's not what we wanted then that was fine too. He showed no enthusiasm for the struggle.

"Edward Pickersgill also made reference to the fact that he was going to resign from the Collective at some point in the future but if we wanted he could resign sooner if we asked him to.

"The leading comrade interjected and demanded that Edward Pickersgill stop putting everything on the Collective's plate. The comrade told him to stop putting the question of when he was to terminate his relationship with us, his resignation from the Collective, and 'the end', in our laps for us to decide. Edward Pickersgill had raised these as issues, not the Collective.

"The comrade continued by pointing out that Edward Pickersgill is an intelligent, reasoning individual and knows full well that forming a Marxist-Leninist organism or becoming a Marxist-Leninist himself is not easy. Edward Pickersgill attempted to interrupt but the comrade ignored this, and continued to address the question of Edward Pickersgill's declared intentions to take up Marxism-Leninism. He asked, 'What is your power base for the plan?'

"Edward Pickersgill replied, 'No, no I don't have such a highblown opinion of myself that I want to form a party or organization.' He said that he simply wanted to make a contribution but added, with false humility, that this was probably an example of him overestimating himself.

"The comrade retorted by asking Edward Pickersgill if he meant that he would join an existing organization.

"Edward Pickersgill replied, 'No, I don't consider any of the existing organisms to be democratic-centralist or Marxist-Leninist.' He added that he would not be making any organizational connections for an extended period of time.

"The comrade replied by stating, 'So you're telling us you're going to live in a fantasy world.'

"Edward Pickersgill retorted, 'No, I hope not.'

"The next exchange revolved around statements made by Edward Pickersgill about his capacity to make a living in relation to the question of Alive Press Limited. The leading comrade present initiated the exchange by asking Edward Pickersgill how Alive Press was connected to his capacity to make a living.

"Edward Pickersgill replied that he wanted to make a living but there were a few things standing in his way like him being president, on the board of directors and a shareholder of Alive Press Limited. He indicated that we had had his verbal assurance that he would resign as president of Alive Press Limited and would transfer his shares to Collective members, adding that we would also get this in writing.

"The comrade replied, 'If you really want to know, the fact is that you're not president, you're not a director and you are a shareholder.'

"Edward Pickersgill asked in response, 'How did that happen?'

"The comrade retorted, 'We held a shareholders meeting.'

"Edward Pickersgill stated, 'So, I'll be notified of that in writing will I?'"

"'Why?'"

"'Because I think it is important that I be notified in writing.'"

"The comrade replied, 'If you notify us in writing of the fact that you want written notification, we will consider it.'"

"The comrade added sarcastically, 'If we're going to have red tape then we'll have lots of it and we'll be able to trip up real good. We should have a real tangle around our feet.'"

"Edward Pickersgill went on to ask whether various business associates had been notified of his status change inside Alive Press Limited, pointing out that he was personal guarantor on several pieces of equipment on lease purchase agreements. The leading comrade present pointed out that the question of personal guarantor does not come up unless the bills aren't paid."

"Edward Pickersgill said, 'Right. Let's forget about that.'"

"'We are going to pay the bills,' noted the comrade."

"'I don't doubt that,' Edward Pickersgill mumbled in response."

"The comrade then pointed out that the issue at hand was how the question of Alive Press Limited could possibly affect Edward Pickersgill's ability to make a living for himself."

"Edward Pickersgill began, 'It affects my livelihood in terms of whether I'm president or sit on the board of directors and have responsibilities in Alive Press Limited. But, that's good, now I can go out and be an ordinary person and find a job just like anybody else.'"

"The comrade retorted, 'Well, I've been on the board of directors of Alive Press Limited for a long time and it never stopped me from getting a job.'"

"'But you weren't the person signing all the papers, signing for all the equipment.'"

"Sarcastically, the comrade replied, 'That was touché, a masterful thrust.'"

"Edward Pickersgill said, 'I'm not trying to make a masterful thrust now.'"

"'But you're doing it anyway. Well, you really got me there, you really floored me,' the comrade responded in the same sarcastic tone."

"Another comrade then began to ask Edward Pickersgill what his plans were, where he planned to live, etc. To each of these questions he gave long rambling responses. Finally one of the comrades pointed out, 'Listen, you don't have to give a big explanation about everything, yes or no would be a satisfactory answer to certain questions. You should just explain the things that need to be explained. You keep going off on a tangent. You're explaining all the things that don't need to be explained. You're explaining none of the things that do need to be explained.'"

"Edward Pickersgill replied, 'Yeah, right'. He continued to veer off on wild tangents at great length."

"Finally one comrade asked, 'Are you going to give us an address where we can get in touch with you?'"

"Edward Pickersgill replied, 'I want to remain in touch with you guys. I'll definitely send you stuff in the mail and come to see you to drop stuff around. I won't send any of these documents in the mail but I'll phone and come to meet you. I want to keep in contact with you unless you don't ever want me to contact you again.'"

"Angrily the leading comrade remarked, 'Don't try pulling that again. Stop trying to drop stuff on our plate.'"

"Ignoring this comment, Edward Pickersgill asked, 'Has there been any mail for me?'"

"Angered by Edward Pickersgill's arrogance, the comrade replied, 'Get lost. You come here, you shit all over us and then expect us to cater to your every whim.'"

"Edward Pickersgill said, 'What I meant was a personal letter for me from Michelle.'"

"The comrade sharply replied, 'Like I said, never mind that.'"

"At this point Edward Pickersgill stated, 'So if that's it then,' and started to put his documents away. Referring back to a list of things he wanted which had been presented earlier, Edward Pickersgill

said, 'I guess I'll be needing some of these things for sure.'

"He added, 'I can bring you my resignation.'"

"In response to the question of when, he stated, 'I can bring it later today or tomorrow. Maybe I can bring it on the 15th when I bring this biography. I don't know if you want to see the biography but you still might find it interesting.'"

"The leading comrade patiently stated, 'Listen, you have got to get off that track. You are the one who is creating this atmosphere. It is wrong. You should stop doing it. You have written in your document on factionalism all this stuff about "us and them". Now you come here today and create an "us and them" situation. We didn't create this situation. The trouble is that we're now faced with a situation of "we're damned if we do and damned if we don't". But we're not going to allow that to stop us from making our position known.'"

"Edward Pickersgill gave fleeting acknowledgement to this statement and then asked again about the things he wanted. He added, 'If this is going to be the last time I'm ever going to see you, it would be good to have my clothes and that isn't on the list.'"

"The comrades then began to examine the list presented and asked questions about specific items."

"One comrade asked, 'Why do you want the manuscript to *Chains!*?'"

"He replied, 'Well, I was thinking about finishing it, finishing the writing on it.'"

"'I don't see why you have to have the manuscript.'"

"To this, Edward Pickersgill responded, 'Well, I don't really need the manuscript. A set of Alive would probably do the trick just as well. As long as I've got a full version of *Chains!*'"

"The leading comrade present then looked over the list that Edward Pickersgill had made up and said, 'Well, I'll tell you what we can give you and what we won't give you. You can have your clothes and personal papers. Any stuff which pertains to or belongs to Michelle Landriault, we can't give you that. She'll have to get in touch with us for that. As far as the manuscript for *Chains!* goes, no you can't have it. A set of Alive, well, those are kind of scarce so we won't give you one of those.'"

"Edward Pickersgill responded, 'Well, I'd like the set of Alive. Aren't there even copies from 1978?'"

"Hoping for some reasonable answer and some display of positive sentiment towards Alive, the comrade replied, 'Yeah, like I said, they're kind of scarce. Why do you want it?'"

"Edward Pickersgill answered, 'Well, I thought it would be kind of nice to have on hand, sort of a footnote to history.'"

"Disappointed by this vile answer, the comrade responded, 'Well, to hell with that. We don't want to be anybody's footnote!'"

"All the comrades present laughed at this point."

"Edward Pickersgill mumbled, 'Don't worry about it, I'll pick a set up somewhere else.'"

"The comrades then organized to bring Edward Pickersgill's things for him. One comrade left the room to gather up the requested items of clothing and personal papers. At this point Edward Pickersgill stood up to leave, saying that he would wait outside in the car. He was in such a rush to get away that he would not even wait for his things."

"He turned to the comrades and said, 'So, see you later.'"

"The comrades replied, 'Yes, we'll see you.'"

"Edward Pickersgill then left. His belongings were given to him as he sat in the car outside, about five minutes later. He then drove off."

We never received any of the documents, phone calls or direct contact for document delivery that was promised by Edward Pickersgill in this September 7 meeting."

Also, despite his announcement that he would seek work as an ordinary person, Edward Pickersgill has incorporated a new company, called Erin Graphics, so that he can be a corporate President once again!"

The statement that the Alive Production Collective prepared for the meeting on September 7 follows.

Statement by Members of the Alive Production Collective to Edward Pickersgill Thursday, September 7, 1978

We have carefully reviewed the seven handwritten documents by Edward Pickersgill presented to us on Tuesday, September 5, 1978. These documents are dated on various days between Thursday, August 31 and Tuesday, September 5. We consider that these documents are wrong, that they reflect more of the same in terms of Edward Pickersgill's rotten approach to the political struggle he must face and the Alive Production Collective must face.

We consider that Edward Pickersgill's seven documents are nothing more than outright lies, distortions of the reality of history and slander against revolutionaries. Innuendo, fabrication, insult and contempt are the additional elements Edward Pickersgill uses to spice up his putrid dish. We strongly suggest that Edward Pickersgill abandon this high-flying, full-blown manoeuvre which he has cooked up as a vile and irrational alternative to doing honest self-criticism for mistakes that have actually been made. We remind Edward Pickersgill that it is easy to claim "full responsibility" for mistakes that have never been real but which have been conjured up in a distortion of other comrades' contribution to anti-imperialist revolution. What is truly difficult is to realistically assess one's actual mistakes, to make honest self-criticism and to transform in such a way as to move anti-imperialist revolution forward. Edward Pickersgill will never move himself or revolution forward by arrogant comparison of himself "claiming full responsibility" to Mao Tsetung making self-criticism nor will Edward Pickersgill create any motion by proclaiming himself, without objective criteria, to be a Marxist-Leninist. It is not self-proclamation that is the first step that Edward Pickersgill must take, rather self-criticism is the first step.

We can quickly wipe out two distortions Edward Pickersgill has made.

First, we do not consider the political struggle at hand to have great magnitude simply because Edward Pickersgill is involved. It is the political content of the struggle that determines its nature not the personalities in the struggle.

Second, up to August 29, we had drawn only one conclusion. That is, there was only one conclusion clearly evident from our investigation that we formalized as a statement of agreement between the members of the APC. Of course, there were and are many other facts and series of facts which make inescapable conclusions evident. We did not try to obscure this but we tried to make clear that there was only one formally recognized, formally agreed upon and formally stated conclusion amongst us. Further on this point, Edward Pickersgill's petty semantical dispute about "will not" as opposed to "can not" is an excellent exposure of his idealism and arrogance. Suffice to say that "will not" implies that objectively a choice exists and that one aspect of the choice has been supported over the other by conscious decision; "can not" states that objectively there is no choice, only a hard reality that one can accord oneself with or be punished by the physical laws one doesn't accord with. Thus, Edward Pickersgill is advising the Alive Production Collective to emulate King Canute by pretending it can command such an objective phenomenon as the motion of the ocean's tide. We reject such advice.

* * *

It is obvious that the program of discussion which we have proposed is not going to be successful. Edward Pickersgill has announced his intention to implement one of his well known postures in this program, that is he will agree to participate in words but will sit mute and contemptuous in practice. This boycott in practice is Edward Pickersgill's choice not ours but our choice is how to judge such a boycott. We will not put up with this "how-do-you-do-here's-a-kick-in-the-stomach" attitude. We intend to do more than offer Edward Pickersgill an opportunity and a place to

degrade our dearly held principles and Collective programs.

Edward Pickersgill wrote to us on Tuesday, September 5: "Positions and views which I have will continue to be made as much as possible in a written and recordable fashion." This is fine. We will pursue the exchange in writing also. We are left to wonder why Edward Pickersgill agreed to attend a series of "discussions" which he intended to turn into a monologue or "lecture" by us. This does not accord with the depth of contempt for us that is apparent throughout all his documents of the past 20 days.

Edward Pickersgill has described the Alive Production Collective in various ways in his documents dated between August 31 and September 5. "... The APC was born and it was in that birth that the seeds of degeneration, splits and liquidation were sown." The organization is "afflicted" with "the factionalist spirit and structure." The Collective is "an organization formed out of a faction." In repetition he says, the Collective is "a centralist organization coming out of a faction." Edward Pickersgill calls this revolutionary grouping, "the morass I have given rise to." In a general insult to world revolution and the comrades who are revolutionaries throughout the world, Edward Pickersgill claims the norms of the Alive Production Collective are "norms imposed on the APC from Marxist-Leninist sources."

Edward Pickersgill has characterized the revolutionary anti-imperialist work of the Alive Production Collective. "The cohesiveness of the APC was not ever so much an internal thing as it was a defensiveness against external threats." He terms the past achievements of the organization as "the overall factionalist history of the APC." The struggles waged against the state, against U.S. imperialism and against counter-revolutionary misleadership "should be mainly characterized as skirmishes." "Little or none of our energies went into a self-critical examination of our mistakes and weaknesses." And finally, he sums up, writing "... 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."

Edward Pickersgill has proclaimed his attitude towards the comrades in anti-imperialist work. He will pursue a path "which may well drive some (even a majority) away from anti-imperialist politics and programs." Standing against the view that a correct line, a principled approach and a fine style of work are the guarantee of a unified organization and a successful revolution, Edward Pickersgill squeaks: "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." We remind Edward Pickersgill that Chairman Mao's axiom is that these things are achieved by making class struggle the key link. Chairman Mao did not say that class struggle is the first task. Again proclaiming the comrades as "green", etc. Edward Pickersgill pronounces: "it has been next to impossible to root this out in the past — speaking here of the possibility of others rooting it out."

Edward Pickersgill has announced his future intentions in no uncertain terms. "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." He intends "to resign as editor of Alive Magazine." Further intentions are "to submit my resignation from the Lu Hsun Unit effective the day this document is submitted (Tuesday, September 5, 1978); and, "to resign from the APC at some time in the future" and he repeats this noting "my intended resignation from the APC." Edward Pickersgill goes on to show that he has a plan and announces in no uncertain terms what is to be the facade he shows the world instead of the plan. "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." Excellent exposure! Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought is scratch! "There is a depth to my mistakes and weaknesses which requires that I start from scratch." Edward Pickersgill is guilty of serious political errors and he faces that by heading out on a yellow-brick road to the land of Marxism-Leninism!

There are more announced intentions. What we have been presented with from Edward Pickersgill is what he calls self-criticism and what we call a reactionary polemic against progressive politics. He tells us that this stuff we've been presented with is going to be made open and public by him. The intention is "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."

In case we have missed the point in his practice, Edward Pickersgill states in writing his refusal to observe the discipline of the majority of our organization. "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."

Edward Pickersgill has put forward that the problems in the APC exist because "there is no constitutional form." He has also written that he will struggle for a constitution in some fantasy organization, not in the very real Alive Production Collective, with very real anti-imperialist revolutionaries. We encourage him to notify us when this constitution is written because we would like to study such a glorious document, and more, because we would like to be able to mark the occasion by observing whether or not, in fact, the writing of a constitution does solve problems. We will certainly inform Edward Pickersgill of any and all observed solved problems which are a result of his constitution becoming a reality.

Edward Pickersgill explains he remains in association with us only until "the Collective members feel that I have made a sufficient contribution to the investigation." We now inform him that we are fully capable of conducting independent investigation and that there is no reason for him to hang around on our account. After all, a very small part of any investigation seeking truth is to search out the words of liars.

In light of all this, we ask Edward Pickersgill, after today are you going to continue with the proposed series of meetings for this weekend? If so, why? Do you still consider yourself a member of the Alive Production Collective? If so, what are your new reasons for continued membership in light of existing statements by you?

A final question: in light of your performance on Tuesday, September 5 at 4 p.m., what is your current view of the following written statement by you. "There 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."

DEVIUS DEVIATE

It is interesting to note that Edward Pickersgill was convinced he was going to have to split from the Collective almost right away. This is exposed by his devious activities immediately after the time period of August 18-21.

In a written statement on August 19, Edward Pickersgill announced intentions to show photocopies of the documents from the struggle to Michelle Landriault. He showed her some documents on August 22 and 23. However, he held back some significant documents and also showed her some unrelated documents from the false two-line struggle on "complacency" that he had tried to start. Further, in copying some of his own documents he deleted comments by other comrades which had

been written on the bottom of the pages to refute his statements.

The two documents he held back were titled "Getting A Point Out On The Table", the document that prompted Edward Pickersgill's overthrow, and "Report On Ed's Trip To See Michelle, August 16, 1978", an interesting deletion since only she could confirm the correctness or incorrectness of this report. However, he did make sure to show her a copy of his August 18 document calling for a struggle against "complacency", which had no real relevance.

On August 29, Edward Pickersgill went to a bank where a loan had been negotiated earlier to buy a car. This loan was being paid off by comrades participating in a collectivized finance system. Without ever informing these comrades Edward Pickersgill renegotiated the loan with Michelle Landriault signing as guarantor, so as to get \$2,000 in funds. The installments now extended over extra years and had larger monthly payments, and the people involved in making these payments only discovered this fact because the bank inadvertently sent the new loan form to the address of one of our comrades.

Also, Edward Pickersgill misrepresented his occupation in negotiating this loan as "owner" of Alive Press Limited, which he as an individual never has been. Further this misrepresentation came after he had been removed as President and as a director of that company.

More deviousness occurred on September 5 and September 7, respectively when Edward Pickersgill took advantage of his signing power on a Collective bank account to empty the account and fill his individual pockets with all its money. He did this on each occasion just before coming to a scheduled meeting of the Collective. We only discovered this theft by notification from the bank. Edward Pickersgill never told us he had taken the money.

On Sunday, September 10, Edward Pickersgill went to see a customer of People Media Graphics, Alive's commercial typesetting business. He picked up a cheque for work done by our comrades and cashed it, so as to keep the money for himself.

The two hard core factionalists also did the same with another typesetting customer's payment for work done by other comrades.

In this, it is clearly shown that Edward Pickersgill thinks he is a classic bourgeois, thinking he can live off the fruits of other people's labours!

Also on September 10, Edward Pickersgill phoned the home of a salesman from Alive's equipment supplier and told the salesman all about his split from Alive.

Edward Pickersgill also had Michelle Landriault establish contact with the faction member who had been forced out of the Collective by him before the struggle to overthrow him began. Further, he contacted a number of People Media Graphics customers and poured out a heart rending version of events that was nothing but a series of lies from beginning to end.

For example, he told many people that he wanted to be an independent, revolutionary, creative writer — sort of a Canadian Lu Hsun. In this context he told them with great pride that he wrote in Alive not only under the pseudonym of John Burnley but also using the name Bob Harris — that is to say Edward Pickersgill, as an individual, was the author of the very popular *Chains!* He further added that he intended to finish this piece of writing even though he was no longer in the Alive Production Collective.

This is patent nonsense and defies logic.

Edward Pickersgill was not the individual author of *Chains!* This popular serialized novel does not have an individual author. It is a collectively written piece of literature. The chapters of this novel have been written week after week by team work. Edward Pickersgill was a part of this team — he had the task of writing up the drafts of chapters — but he was not the whole team. Others plotted out the novel's development, did up the general outline, touched up the drafts, and so on. Each chapter was discussed at length by the whole team both before and after its draft was written.

An obvious proof that another method was being used other than Edward Pickersgill's individual abilities is that we did not

publish the chapters under his individual pseudonym, John Burnley. Bob Harris is the pseudonym of a writing group not of any individual. The writing group will carry on and finish the writing of *Chains!* as before.

Another point that Edward Pickersgill gave great emphasis when he talked to various people, was that the Collective was refusing to give him an electrolux vacuum cleaner that "means a lot to Michelle Landriault because her mother gave it to her". This point was raised in conversations with external people; in a series of phone calls to the Collective at 2:30 p.m., 2:40 p.m., and 3:25 p.m. on Friday, September 15; in Michelle Landriault's letter of resignation; etc.

This ridiculous point came up simply because a Collective member told Michelle Landriault that arrangements for giving her the vacuum cleaner would have to wait until after we asked Edward Pickersgill about our discovery that he had stolen a large sum of money. We only discovered the theft on September 10.

The point was resolved when Edward Pickersgill came to see some Collective members for approximately two minutes on Thursday, October 12 in a prearranged handing over of this important family heirloom. On that day Edward Pickersgill was also given a car-load of his own personal belongings which he had not specifically requested. This is a sign of the actual good faith of the Collective. The vacuum cleaner was not requested in her earlier list of demands for personal belongings. If Michelle Landriault had requested the vacuum cleaner at the same time that we forwarded a truckload of her belongings, she would have seen our lack of attachment to this machine that had such great sentimental value for her.

MAJOR DEVIIOUSNESS

When we discovered that Edward Pickersgill had stolen a large sum of money from the Collective, we did an immediate investigation into exactly how much was stolen. This investigation was most thorough with each step being repeated three or four times at least. We allowed Edward Pickersgill the benefit of any and all doubt — where there was a possibility that money was unaccounted for through someone else's error, we did not add it on to the total we say he stole. However, we do suspect that he was actually the one to take the money that slipped through such loopholes or errors in our finance system.

Where there was an unknown amount for a known purchase we overestimated the money outlay, so as not to do Edward Pickersgill any injustice. Where there was a donation claimed but not proved to have been made, which was unaccounted for, we did not accuse Edward Pickersgill of stealing that amount.

By this process we came up with the amount of money which we have openly accused Edward Pickersgill of stealing. The amount is \$18,000.

The Alive Production Collective is an organization that has an overhead of over \$6,000 per month or, more exactly \$75,000 per year. This amount is raised in very small part by the revenue of our work. It comes mainly through voluntary donations to our political fund.

There are two other significant elements of the financial systems to which Edward Pickersgill had access. One: some members and supporters of the Collective earn their living by using the organization's technical equipment to run a small commercial business, People Media Graphics. Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault did the bookkeeping for this business. Two: some members of the Collective were involved in pooling all their earnings and all their living expenses in a collectivized finance system. Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault participated in and administered this system.

Edward Pickersgill broke off all direct contact with the Alive Production Collective after September 7, 1978 and went into hiding as far as the organization was concerned. However, he continued the pattern he had established after August 18 of telling customers of People Media Graphics his version of the struggle in

the Collective. Some people approached by Edward Pickersgill responded to hearing his distorted story by contacting us and asking for discussion. We began having such discussions with various people on September 26.

Such discussions have been carried out where they were requested, in a manner that told no more information about the political struggle than was necessary to refute Edward Pickersgill's lies. A point that was brought out in the discussion was the fact that Edward Pickersgill had stolen \$18,000.

Edward Pickersgill only heard that his embezzlement had been uncovered through these third parties. Edward Pickersgill issued a formal response when the people he was talking to began to ask about the stolen money. He sent some people involved in the struggle a letter saying the charge of embezzlement was not true and threatening action in the bourgeois courts! Further, after he turned right and wrong upside down in this way, he attempted bribery and extortion, saying he would forgo litigation if the Alive Production Collective gave him various items equivalent in financial worth to \$21,000.00! He wanted to double his money and then some!

The threat of court action was not brought into reality but it was interesting to learn that Edward Pickersgill is willing to use the bourgeois legal system as it was set up to be used — for the criminal advancement of individual financial gain and the impoverishment of the majority class whose labour creates all true wealth.

Michelle Landriault got in on the act in short order. She had her lawyer send a threatening legal letter to one of the shareholders of Alive Press Limited. This letter was dated September 25, 1978 but it was actually postmarked October 3 and was received October 5. Edward Pickersgill's letter threatening legal action was dated September 30, later than the date on Michelle Landriault's lawyer's letter. However, Edward Pickersgill's letter was actually sent earlier than the other letter, being postmarked October 2 and received October 3.

The following is the reply sent to Michelle Landriault's lawyer.

(*Lawyer's name deleted*), B.A., LL.B.,
(*Firm's name deleted*),
Barristers, Solicitors, Notaries,
(*Address deleted*).

Without Prejudice

(*Lawyer's name deleted*),

I have received your letter of September 25, 1978, sent by registered mail on October 3, 1978. My response is one of surprise and a feeling that you are confused.

I was interested to read that you "represent Michele Pickersgill in respect of certain matrimonial problems existing between herself and her husband, Edward Pickersgill," since I have been aware of these personal difficulties on my sister-in-law's and my brother's part. I have not yet determined why you specifically mention this in your letter to me but, as I note, I take the point with some interest.

It has occurred to me that a possible reason you have mentioned "matrimonial problems" between Michelle and Edward Pickersgill is because it is perceived that I have some connection to these problems. If this is the case, let me assure you that I have done nothing at all to directly or indirectly cause "matrimonial problems" between Michelle and her husband, Edward.

I was more keen to read the information in your letter about Alive Press Limited, since I have working commitments to this corporation.

You are misinformed on some small points regarding Alive Press Limited when you write, "the publishing business known as 'Alive Press' in which she has worked since 1969 with her husband." Neither Michelle nor her husband nor anyone else has worked in Alive Press Limited since 1969; Alive Press Limited did not exist in 1969. Alive Press Limited was incorporated only in August, 1970.

At the time of the incorporation of Alive Press Limited, Michelle was not involved, as were Edward Pickersgill and six others. Michelle became involved as a shareholder in Alive Press Limited

for the first time in January 1971, along with four other new shareholders. Thus, it would be more in line with facts, (*Lawyer's name deleted*), if you had written, "the publishing business known as 'Alive Press' in which her husband has worked since August, 1970 and in which she has worked with eleven other people since January, 1971 (and with as many as eighteen other people in more recent times)." The point in this matter is that Alive Press Limited is not synonymous or significantly similar to the married couple Michelle and Edward. They are only two of a large number of shareholders and together as individuals they hold only 13 percent of the voting shares issued and 5 percent of the total shares issued.

Although I am sure that Michelle is not confused on these facts, her husband Edward has been speaking in confused terms about the facts during the past weeks, and I thought it important to draw your attention to these small points on which you are misinformed, so as to assist you in your task of representing Michelle's interests both in her marriage and in her Alive Press Limited shareholdings.

The next sentence of your letter involves no small point of misinformation, rather it presents a major accusation which has no relation to fact whatsoever. I was very surprised to read: "We have today been advised that you have unilaterally taken over the residence which formally comprised both the matrimonial home and the business enterprise." Who informed you of this nonsense? Perhaps they could also inform me, since I have done nothing to give rise to this accusation which is leveled at me! Is this a joke?

If the accusation is not a joke there are many points of misinformation that must be dealt with.

First, I have not "unilaterally" done anything in the family and business connections that do exist between Michelle, Edward, myself and others. Second, I have not "taken over" any residence.

There is only one residence that I know of that has been connected to both Michelle's private property holdings and Alive Press Limited. (This may or may not be the residence in question — I don't know since you never identify the place in question.) That residence was left behind in the hands of some other people with whom Michelle lived, when she moved away from Guelph without notice on August 15 of this year — I believe as a result of the "matrimonial problems" you write about. At that time Michelle's husband, Edward, was one of the group of people who were left behind living in the residence. Subsequently, he too left this place behind when he moved away from Guelph, with less than one hour's notice to me or any other friend, on September 7 of this year — I believe to seek or implement reconciliation with Michelle.

In a handwritten letter left for her group of friends when she left Guelph on August 15, Michelle said: "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." In the same letter Michelle gave indication that she wanted to maintain her share of the financial payments on the residence since she would only be away for one year. She wrote: "I'll write once a month and if possible, knowing what payments you have to make, see what I can contribute monthly." To date she has not contributed any share towards the payments to her creditors, rather she has, through you, demanded payment to herself from her friends. To date, her friends have made the arrangements to financially cover Michelle's mortgage and other payments for the residence, using the signed, blank cheques to make the actual payments, just as she indicates in her letter.

On September 7, 1978, Michelle sent a letter to Alive Press Limited, addressed to the company's official postal address, P.O. Box 1283, Guelph. This letter, in full, reads: "Alive Press — A short 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, Michelle Landriault."

Given the above letter you can understand my surprise when,

twenty-nine days later, I was the one to receive a letter from Michelle's legal adviser. My initials (*N*) not *E*, which Michelle refers to in her letter. Her husband, Edward, of course, has the initial *E*. He also had a living arrangement involving the street she mentions in her short note. I do not live at that residence, nor have I ever lived there. Further, I do not in any way embody Alive Press Limited, to whom Michelle sent her short note. Thus, how the legal letter finally came to me is a mystery to me.

Although I am not one of the people who live or who have lived in this residence, I did discuss Michelle's concerns over the future financial payments for this residence with her by phone at 9:20 on the evening of Thursday, September 14. During this phone call I reached, on behalf of the people using the residence, a verbal agreement with Michelle which specified that her mortgage payments and other financial commitments for this property would be paid by those using the residence directly to those holding her mortgage and to her other creditors. This arrangement was agreeable simply because this was and is being done anyway. Michelle informed me at that time that her lawyer had sent a written agreement including the same specifics as our verbal agreement. Although your letter is the only legal letter thus far received, it is obvious that it was not sent before that phone call and the content of your letter, of course, bears no relation to the content of the letter which was promised.

In another phone call, at 2:40 in the afternoon of the next day, Friday, September 15, Michelle assured me that this agreement between herself and the people using the residence would not be affected by some disagreements which existed at the time with her husband, Edward.

The phrase "taken over", which you use in your letter gives me some confusion. Clearly, the people who now use the residence in question have not been affected by a "take over", since they live there still, as they have done for some time. Also, Michelle and her husband have not been affected by a "take over" since they each made their choice to move out of the residence and away from Guelph independent of any action of mine.

The implication of your phrase "take over" is that I am using the residence for some selfish interest that I might have or that I am using the residence in some peculiar kind of way in a disagreement with Michelle or Edward. None of this is the case. As an individual, I don't use the residence whatsoever; certainly I don't use it for some selfish interest.

Since they left Guelph I have told both Michelle and her husband, Edward, that I would like to see them again and I have sent the same message to them through mutual acquaintances. Thus, even if I did have some control over the residence or some say in Michelle or Edward Pickersgill's lives, I would be using that control and that say in accord with this sentiment of mine — the hope of continued warmth and friendship between myself and Michelle and Edward. I would never try to govern the way Michelle operates her private property holdings or to interfere in any comings and goings of Michelle and her husband Edward to and from her residence.

Of course, the fact that, after eight years of living in Guelph, Michelle now lives in (*place name deleted*) and Edward now lives in (*place name deleted*), by their own choice, is the clearest practical proof that I have no control in their affairs and no say in their lives.

Thus, (*lawyer's name deleted*), you can see it is not a question of "taking over", rather it is a matter of who was left behind. It is not a question of "unilaterally" doing anything, rather it is a matter of doing something according to a stated agreement with Michelle. (Also, there is no question of one-half the September payment being owing — all the appropriate mortgage payments were made in full for September.)

Further, the whole question has little to do with me personally: I do not live in the residence in question nor have I ever lived there; I do not have any individual working or business connection to the residence in question.

The question arises, I suppose, of why I was the person Michelle spoke to by phone on September 14. I can only guess, but my guess

would be that Michelle chose to discuss her verbal agreement about the residence with me because she knows me best — after eleven years of friendship — and because she has an existing formal connection with me as my sister-in-law. It should be understood that she did *choose* to speak with me: on the evening of September 14, she phoned earlier first, at 8:15 p.m., talked to one of the individuals actually living in her residence and arranged to phone back later when I could arrange to be at the phone.

Further points of misinformation also deserve attention.

I am not the best informed person on this particular matter, either legally or in reality, but my understanding is that the residence in question is not well characterized as a "matrimonial home". It is my understanding, from Michelle and from Edward, that their married relationship had ended in all but formality some time before she acquired the property in question. It is further my understanding that Edward had a relationship of sleeping in common with someone other than Michelle during the year and four months that each lived in the residence in question.

Certainly, it is wrong to say the residence in question comprises, formally or informally, the "business enterprise" if the business mentioned is supposed to be Alive Press Limited. At one time the legal head office of Alive Press Limited was registered at the street address of a residence which Michelle owns, however this is no longer the case.

I have taken note that you first sent your letter to me at (*street address deleted*) in Guelph and that it was forwarded to Michelle's husband in (*place name deleted*). This is because he has arranged to have all mail addressed to the Pickersgill family at (*street address deleted*) forwarded to him. I am not available at that address and, as the facts I have cited in this letter show, there is no reason for anyone to think that I am available there. (The fact that Edward was the one to receive your letter to me throws a humorous light on the accusation of "take over".) I would appreciate if you correspond with me in future at my actual address — this will assure that I receive your letters more quickly than eleven days after you send them. If you stop using the (*street address deleted*) address it will avoid a situation where Edward sees my mail before I do — an unfortunate situation because at present Edward's friendship for me seems to be at a low point as a result of his own problems.

Regarding your request for twelve post-dated cheques: I, of course, will not send you any such cheques in any amount, for reasons obvious from the facts in this letter. I have been assured, though, by the people using the residence in question that they will fulfill the verbal agreement I arranged with Michelle — to directly pay her creditors all financial payments due on the residence and to make the payments on time. Again, I can assure that there is no half payment outstanding for September.

I note with interest that even if the position outlined in your letter was factual, which it is not, you have overstepped proper bounds. You have offered nothing in the way of a "lease" or other formal document, as Michelle promised in her phone calls, in exchange for the demanded post-dated cheques. You should note, too, that even if a formal landlord-tenant relationship is to come into being between Michelle and her former house-chums, it is at odds with the provincial Landlord/Tenant Act to demand post-dated cheques for rent. I am not a lawyer, but, (*lawyer's name deleted*), you are supposed to be.

My last point refers to your threat of court action in your letter to me. If you continue to send me such aggressive letters, so much at odds with reality, then you will do yourself a disservice for I will clearly be in the better position to win any court action.

Warm regards to your client and formal salutations to you,

(I enclose a photostatic copy of this letter with the original, in case you want to give a copy to Michelle Pickersgill, to whom you gave a copy - c.c. - of your letter to me.)

IS STEALING A LITTLE BETTER THAN STEALING A LOT?

Friends of Edward Pickersgill have requested that we detail and

prove the embezzlement. We have told them that something would be done in due time but that we would not make public names and documentary evidence to prove the theft. The reason for this is the security breach involved in announcing and documenting who gave what amount by way of a donation to the political fund of a revolutionary organization.

Suffice to say we have demanded, received and thoroughly checked, documentary evidence for every penny that we accuse Edward Pickersgill of stealing. The money was stolen mainly from our political fund, and partially from People Media Graphics and the collectivized finance system. The money was amassed by Edward Pickersgill under his personal control throughout a period of two years but mainly in the ten months prior to August 18, 1978. The reason why \$18,000.00 must be considered a minimum figure is that there is evidence of Edward Pickersgill perpetrating similar thefts in earlier times but this evidence is hard to substantiate due to the passage of time.

It is interesting to note that some of those who have asked us to detail the amounts involved in the embezzlement were approached at the same time by Edward Pickersgill for personal loans in amounts of thousands of dollars. He also contracted a bank loan to give himself an extra \$2,000.00 immediately after August 1978. Further, as mentioned, he demanded another \$21,000.00 from the Collective in November and in January 1979 he tried again with a demand to a supporter for \$10,000.00 — his demand was for \$2,000.00 in money and for \$8,000.00 worth of equipment.

Clearly, money means a lot to Edward Pickersgill!

Various individuals can confirm for themselves various specific amounts in our account of Edward Pickersgill's embezzlement. No one but the Collective can confirm the full picture, however. This may give rise to some doubts about the truth of the full picture but we do not see any way around such doubts without jeopardizing our supporters.

For those who can confirm that Edward Pickersgill stole a specific amount, say \$800.00 or \$400.00 or \$600.00, however, no more facts are needed. Even if this is all that was stolen, it is wrong. It weakened our group.

Edward Pickersgill always promoted the agreed norm that anyone leaving the collectivized finance system should be given \$200.00 no matter how much they had contributed and no matter how long a period of time they made contributions. Of course, there has never been any doubt that anyone leaving the Collective should be given some "share" of the political fund to recoup their donations or that someone quitting an association with People Media Graphics should be allowed to dip into the business' funds. It should also be known that Edward Pickersgill *never* allowed anyone who quit the collectivized finance system to take even the \$200.00 allowed by the norm — sometimes he insultingly offered as little as \$10.00.

So, if he stole \$400.00, it was \$200.00 more than he had coming to him and \$400.00 more than he gave most others. This alone is a measure of his hypocrisy and arrogance. As the amount rises to over \$18,000.00 we get a more precise measure.

Another doubt that people have is that we might have miscalculated in our figures, missing some key outlay of money or something. Our answer to that is: we may well be bad mathematicians and accountants but we can't be so very bad as to be out by more than half the total. That would be a whopping mistake! Even if he only stole \$9,000.00, isn't that still outrageous?

DRAWING UP ACCOUNTS

Between July, 1976 and August, 1978, Edward Pickersgill had \$24,905.93 in cash pass through his hands. The rest of the dealings in the finance systems during that time were strictly monitored and conducted through banking systems with checks and balances.

Of this amount, \$8,725.00 can be accounted for in legitimate use of the funds. That figure is made up by five categories: People Media Graphics expenses — \$3,225.00; Alive Press Limited expenses — \$2,600.00; legitimate personal expenses — \$500.00;

legitimate Alive Production Collective expenses — \$2,400.00.

Thus, \$8,725.00 subtracted from \$24,905.93 equals \$16,180.93. On to this figure we add \$801.00 and \$400.00, amounts for work done by People Media Graphics which Edward Pickersgill picked up from customers after August 18 and kept for himself. Thus, the amount goes up to \$17,381.93. On to this figure we add \$1,008.00, the amount for three unpaid invoices of \$336.00 each for servicing of equipment, due March 1, 1978, June 1, 1978, and August 1, 1978, respectively. Edward Pickersgill said these invoices were paid with amounts he took from the bank by cheque. Thus the amount goes up to \$18,389.93.

Now we only need to account for the flow of cash which built up to the original figure that we cited: \$24,905.93. This figure is made up of the following amounts: January-August, 1978 cash drawings from People Media Graphics — \$600.00; January-August 1978 cash drawings from the Alive Production Collective's political fund — \$3,735.93; misappropriated donation to the Guelph Committee for Working Class Rule in Canada, January, 1978 — \$950.00; misappropriated incoming cash for the collectivized finance system — \$5,500.00; misappropriated dues payments — \$660.00; one comrade's special cash donation, November 1977 — \$2,000.00; one couple's special cash donation, May 1978 — \$1,250.00; and, another comrade's special cash donation, November 1977 — \$385.00.

This makes up \$15,080.93 of the amount. All the rest came through a scheme whereby Edward Pickersgill took *all* the cash donations made by one couple. These amounts were: August, 1976 — \$3,000.00; September 1976-November 1977 (various amounts) — \$3,800.00; December, 1977 — \$1,500.00; April, 1977 — \$600.00; May-August, 1977, three amounts — \$600.00, \$200.00, and \$125.00. The total for donations from this couple was \$9,825.00. Thus the total cash flow passing through Edward Pickersgill's hands was \$24,905.93.

THE SECOND RECRUIT TO THE FACTION

There have been many, many details of the struggle in the months up to date, needless to say. These, however, don't have to be gone over in detail to show the course of the struggle.

Three events or series of events of significance have happened.

Other than these the situation can be described as "factionalist slander, as usual; Collective unity and struggle, as usual." All the stories and slanders cited to date have been broadcast more widely and more wildly by the factionalists in intervening months. The Collective has held to its revolutionary duties with discipline in the same time period.

One significant matter concerns the woman who was Edward Pickersgill's second recruit to his faction years ago. This is the woman who had been pregnant and who was forced out of the Collective by Edward Pickersgill. She was in friendly contact with the Collective for a period of time after we informed her Edward Pickersgill had been overthrown. She expressed enthusiasm for what she heard about the new spirit in our organization. She said she felt warm to these political developments and proclaimed her interest in renewing her association with the majority of the Collective once again.

This friendship was such that she informed us when her baby was born and a regular communication was maintained.

This situation developed at the same time as the hard core of the faction tried to renew contact with this comrade. They told her various stories about us which weren't true — proclaiming that we were guilty of the very criminal acts they were carrying out. For example, they told her that it was the Collective members who were freely spreading the information about the split to the public!

The woman comrade stayed warm to us until Thursday, November 23. In a phone call on this evening the woman was very jumpy, a nervousness coming from the fact that she had succumbed to pressure to become more consolidated on the line of the hard core of the faction.

In this phone call the woman defended Edward Pickersgill, attacked our activity and told us not to phone her anymore. The woman did say she would be willing to consider contact with us if she saw evidences of the Collective putting out Alive Magazine again.

Excerpts from the official report on this phone call follow.

"The phone call began with friendly conversation as had all the previous calls. However the tone quickly deteriorated after the woman comrade was asked if she had had any more contact with Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault. After being encouraged to openly state her opinion and put forward what was on her mind the comrade finally began to state her position.

"She said, 'Well if you really want to know, my thinking is that you guys are barking up the wrong tree going after Ed. I'm sure that Ed made some mistakes in the past, and the reason he made those mistakes was because he was the person who took responsibility in the group for leading things. Now if other people didn't make any mistakes it was simply because they didn't do anything. They can't blame Ed for their problems. I know there's all kinds of people there who have problems, just like I do, but Ed's definitely not responsible for those. He wasn't the one who caused them. I know that.'

"Do you want to know what I think is wrong there? I don't think you can mix living and work. I think people have to stand on their own two feet. They're not taking responsibility for their own lives, so how can they ever take responsibility for doing anything in the work? How can they ever take responsibility for putting their ideas forward?'

"She continued, 'Ed is not more responsible for what went wrong in the Collective than you are, for not opening your mouth and saying something, for not standing on your own two feet, and for not seeing that the problem was that people have to have their own economic base. You can't babysit people and tell them how to run their lives. You do that and they turn around and tell you how rotten you are for trying to help them out — for trying to solve their problems for them.'

"One of the mistakes Ed made was trying to look after everybody. I think he worked damn hard over the years, to try and assist people as much as he could. I think he bent over backwards. That was the mistake he made. You shouldn't bend over backwards for people.'

"I'm saying that I think Ed made mistakes, but I think you guys are also making a mistake blaming him for all your problems, because he's not responsible for all your problems. I think you guys should stop crying on each other's shoulders and wasting your time. If you think what you're doing is right, then you should carry on.'

"The phone call ended with the comrade being asked if she wanted us to phone again. She replied, 'No, I don't want any more phone calls like this!'

THE HARD CORE FACTIONALIST PARTNER

A second significant matter was a series of events involving Michelle Landriault, one of the hard core factionalists. On December 13, 1978, she filed for a legal divorce from Edward Pickersgill. She named as co-respondent in this divorce, not the woman who had given birth to Edward Pickersgill's child, but the woman who had united with the Alive Production Collective in an anti-factional stance. This was done despite the fact that the liaison between Edward Pickersgill and the unnamed woman had been going on for at least three times as long.

Towards the end of December, Michelle Landriault spoke on the phone on a number of occasions to a supporter of the Collective. This person had been suggested as a good person to take over formal ownership of the house in Guelph which the Collective had paid for and was paying for but which was registered in Michelle Landriault's name.

Over the phone she launched charges against the Collective, she played herself as innocent and pure, and she put forward a stated

position of willingness to consider a written offer to buy the house at such a price that only her outstanding mortgage debt would be paid. This would have been a just arrangement which would have stopped anyone "re-couping", as an individual, the money the Collective had already paid for the house.

Michelle Landriault was a double-dealer. Even as she was carrying on this series of phone calls, she was having communications with Edward Pickersgill, through which she arranged to have him take formal responsibility for the ownership of the house. She was so two-faced that she continued to encourage the Alive supporter to waste time and money for legal fees, making offers to her that were just to be rejected out of hand because even as she spoke, her deal with Edward Pickersgill had been finalized.

In one of these phone calls, Michelle Landriault said: "None of you have made any attempt to find out what the facts were from my point of view, in your search for truth — a search for truth, it was termed that way by a member of the Collective. You haven't done your investigation. You don't have all the facts. You're out in left field somewhere — or *Right* field, I don't know, but you're off base. You haven't checked into your facts totally yet. You're at a disadvantage. I don't want to keep you at that disadvantage. You have all insisted on maintaining that disadvantage by not talking to me. I feel sorry for you in a way because you don't have the full facts. I have sat here for four or five months. You're missing the facts. I know what the whole situation was — not after I left because I'm not interested in after I left, but before I left. I have all the facts. That's something that you people just don't have because you haven't been in touch with me."

We have not heard Michelle Landriault's facts. We have asked her point blank over the phone what facts she is talking about that she had and we did not. She has refused to tell us, saying that we had to meet her at her place at her convenience. We did not deign to make that trip hundreds of miles away, since she gave us no assurance we would not just be wasting our time.

We decided that such a trip would be a matter of Michelle Landriault wasting our time and would not lead to her revealing "key facts" presently unknown to us. She has proved to be a double-dealer on every other question we have discussed with her. Further, we don't believe there exist in the faction's possession any one or two single secret facts that can negate the massive volume of facts which we already have and which we outline in part, with this systematic presentation.

We have no wish to cater to Michelle Landriault's delusions of queenly grandeur by going to where she has sat for four or five months, desperate for an opportunity to hold court. We are not at a disadvantage and so any factionalist can spare all emotions of pity for us.

Since we have Michelle Landriault's statement of disinterest in our organization and in our on-going political work, there is no reason for us to pursue contact with her. Certainly, she would understand our view of her regarding our investigation if she had properly identified the quote about "searching" and "truth". The statement did not come from *one* of our members. It was contained in a statement of *all* of our members. The actual statement, made to Edward Pickersgill on September 7, 1978, was: "A very small part of any investigation seeking truth is to search out the words of liars."

As long as Michelle Landriault remains a liar we will not make a special point of seeking out her words. If Michelle Landriault is interested in taking up a revolutionary posture in the anti-imperialist ranks however we will be most interested in pursuing contact with her.

Michelle Landriault also raised charges that it was the Alive Production Collective who made matters public first, not she nor Edward Pickersgill. She cited as proof the letter sent as a reply to her lawyer on October 8, and a conversation her mother-in-law had in which she was informed of some details of Edward Pickersgill's activities.

We firmly assert that we only began to speak about this split outside our close ranks after it had been quite widely broadcast. We

blame Edward Pickersgill most strongly for such unwise broadcasting. It is he who has told the most people the most detailed information, without a doubt. He had hit a very wide spectrum in his busy storytelling before we discussed with anybody but even then we did not try to match him person for person. We knew we were always capable of making matters known through Alive Magazine and so outdoing even his busiest efforts at one stroke.

We are only taking the step of full public exposure because we have been provoked by Edward Pickersgill's going public so avidly. He has been more provocative since we warned him to cease and desist than he had been beforehand. These are the main issues on the question of going public.

As for smaller issues, nothing was put in the reply to the lawyer without a conscious attitude to tell only what Edward Pickersgill had already made public. That Michelle Landriault did not tell her lawyer what Edward Pickersgill had already broadcast to others is only a sign of her poverty in strategy. Further, nothing was said in any other conversations that Michelle Landriault has cited, or could cite, which was not already known due to Edward Pickersgill or unless it was necessary to directly answer false issues propagated by him.

For the record, though, let us note that actually, in strict terms, it was Michelle Landriault who first made many of these matters public on August 15 by speaking openly about them in a train station. This is not an abstract question of a possibility of someone having overheard what she said. It is a hard reality that is known to us in no uncertain terms that relatives and total strangers standing nearby did hear Michelle Landriault's story of promiscuity and factionalism.

Other points from the official reports of the various phone calls with Michelle Landriault follow.

Among the lies that Michelle Landriault has promoted is the illusion that the Collective has refused to speak to her. In one phone call she stated, "I asked, 'Is anyone there interested in speaking to me?' I was told point blank, 'No one here wishes to have anything to do with you'."

She also continued to distort her own role in the faction, portraying herself as an absolute innocent. On the question of the sexual promiscuity she whined, "There was never a voluntary association. I am the involuntary partner in this whole association. I did not know the situation was going on until I brought it out into the open that I suspected it was going on and was told, 'Yes it is'. I said, 'Well it ends now.' I was told that it had ended. I was never voluntarily involved in that association at all."

This veneer of innocence and naivety was quickly exposed when one comrade suggested that one of her stated goals would be hard to achieve. She rapidly revealed her true reactionary class outlook and stated, "I'll get it any way I can."

Michelle Landriault's most barefaced lie was told over the phone in relation to the question of who owned the house which the Alive supporter was trying to buy. Although the house was already transferred into Edward Pickersgill's name Michelle Landriault stated, in answer to a direct question, "You're dealing with the right person. The house is in my name. Nothing has changed on that at all."

EDWARD PICKERSGILL IS A LANDLORD

The third matter of significance arising in the most recent events of the struggle concerns Edward Pickersgill's latest volley through his lawyer. This communication comes from the fact that a supporter of Alive was put forward to take the role of formal owner of a house in Guelph in replacement for Michelle Landriault.

Edward Pickersgill is now the legal landlord of this house, which is used by comrades of the Collective. In this role he has rejected the supporter's offer to buy the house. He has sent a most outrageous counter-proposal through his lawyer along with threatening to sell the house to complete strangers on the open market. In essence the counter-proposal says he is willing to accept two prices for this

house, one that will put \$4,500 in his pocket, and one that will put \$10,000 in his pocket!

The house purchase offer was designed by the Collective, although put forward by a supporter. The supporter very simply offered to pay the amount still outstanding on the house mortgages. The offer was below the amount originally paid for the house when it was bought in Michelle Landriault's name. It did not offer to pay the amount paid out in the original down payment or in the payments already completed month by month over a period of time. Any such money recouped in selling the house would remain in the pockets of the hard core of the faction and, in essence, would be theft of more money from the Collective. This would be theft in a roundabout way but it would definitely be theft. If the house is sold to strangers the Collective will lose property it has worked hard to get and Edward Pickersgill will receive as money, part of the wealth produced by our hard work. If the house is not sold to strangers the Collective will not have the same money in its hands but will have use of its building which is of equivalent worth.

Edward Pickersgill, however, has taken on the airs of a landlord, claiming the property belongs to him as an individual, which rightfully it does not. He has tried to use this question of legal ownership of the house as a diversionary issue in much the same way that earlier he made all kinds of noise about a vacuum cleaner. He has tried to use this issue as a threat in an attempt to bring the Collective into line with his narrow individualist perceptions — trying to get us to "behave" ourselves under threat of eviction and of losing more money. He feels this is a big threat because material goods mean so much to him. He feels that we are willing to sell-out for material gain because he is so willing himself.

We are not going to be diverted. Edward Pickersgill can try to put a gun to our head but we will neither be cowed from our stance in the ideological struggle nor be so stupid as to allow him to pull the trigger with impunity. He will be called to account for whatever he has done and whatever he does in future to harm the Collective and the interests of the majority of the Canadian people.

We must add that his threat on the house owning question is not considered by us to be anything but a minor irritant. We've been evicted by reactionary landlords before and it has never slowed us down, as Edward Pickersgill well knows. This is a commendable point on the Collective's record and a big negative point on the record of those reactionaries.

The letter sent by the supporter as a reply to Edward Pickersgill's lawyer follows.

— WITHOUT PREJUDICE —

"Re. Information coming from you on January 16 and 17, 1979.

"I received your letter of January 16, enclosed with your account — which has already been paid — our deposit cheque and a copy of a January 10 letter to you from (lawyer's name deleted), Michelle Landriault's lawyer.

"I have confirmed the main points in these letters with (lawyer's name deleted) by telephone — that is, on January 17, (lawyer's name deleted) told me that Michelle Landriault had reached an agreement with her 'ex-husband' whereby he takes the house to sell as he wishes. (Lawyer's name deleted) further informed me that his office will execute any documents to put C. Edward Pickersgill in a position to sell but the control of the sale and of the house itself, is in Michelle Landriault's name; C. Edward Pickersgill has control of maintaining or the sale of the house due to the existence of an agreement between the two of them in the divorce proceedings but Michelle Landriault will have to be made aware of what the offers are because she is ultimately going to be the signing authority. (Lawyer's name deleted) also said that our 'contact for purchase is (lawyer's name deleted).'

"I also received your information of January 17. With regards to the terms and conditions proposed by you on behalf of C. Edward Pickersgill, I can only say they are most bizarre and outlandish.

"I am unwilling to pay \$43,500.00 for (street address deleted). It is not worth that much money, according to the judgement of Michelle

Landriault's first mortgagee, the C.M.H.C. They say it is worth only \$38,000.00. I offered \$39,000.00 because I knew this amount would be needed to cover the outstanding debts to both Michelle Landriault's first mortgagee and her second mortgagee. That offer of mine still stands.

"Since the previous owner had the house on the market for three years before he sold it and since the general market is not as good now for house selling as it was when the previous owner did manage to sell, (date deleted), it may interest your client to know that my offer will remain standing, if he ever wants to get back to me on it.

"The alternative terms you have offered are distressing to me, in a certain sense. These terms show that C. Edward Pickersgill is not treating my offer with the same seriousness that I have about making the offer. I bear no ill towards Edward. However, his response shows he bears me some ill, at least to the extent of making me the butt of cruel humour.

"To respond. First, I would be unwilling to pay \$41,000.00 for (street address deleted).

"Second, for C. Edward Pickersgill to place in the realm of personal negotiations with me, matters to do with Alive Press Limited, of which both he and I are shareholders, is wrong. Even if I deemed it acceptable, I, as an individual, could no more effect the transfer of Alive Press equipment to C. Edward Pickersgill than he could effect such a transfer himself as an individual. In fact, perhaps he would have more potential than I in such a matter, since he holds more shares than I do — although in the overall scheme of Alive Press Limited, perhaps C. Edward Pickersgill's shares do not mean much.

"Further, to make matters most clear, I would not deem it acceptable that C. Edward Pickersgill take assets built up by the joint effort of a number of people in Alive Press Limited for his own individual benefit as assets in his personal corporation, Erin Graphics. In fact, this bears on why I am offering \$39,000.00 for (street address deleted). That house and piece of property were bought with a down payment and have been maintained with mortgage payments from funds built up by the joint effort of a number of people. If C. Edward Pickersgill or Michelle Landriault were to sell the house for more than the amount outstanding in mortgage debts, any money over and above that amount would be money wrongly taken from these people. If they sell the house to someone other than an individual from that group of people, they are similarly wrongly taking the material results of joint efforts away from those who have made the efforts. Of course, any mention of "taking away" is not meant to imply stealing in the legal sense but stealing in a most real, down-to-earth sense — stealing what morally belongs to others.

"Thus, although I wish C. Edward Pickersgill all the best in his efforts to build his personal corporation, wish him every success that we have had and continue to have, and although I greet him as an individual with full human warmth, I cannot say it would be correct to transfer material assets to him, simply because he asks for them.

"Third, the specific material assets that your client has asked for are presently worth over \$8,000.00 to Alive Press Limited and have only one year of contracted payments outstanding until they are fully owned by the company. So you can see, C. Edward Pickersgill's terms and conditions, as presented to me, in effect, say: 'I reject your offer of \$39,000.00. I will accept an offer of either \$43,500.00 or \$49,000.00'.

"Not too incredible really. I suppose everyone who buys anything knows that the dealer is always willing to sell for the asking price or more! However, even a half-way intelligent buyer views any deal as: the asking price or less.

"Hope to hear from you in this matter again.

"Formal salutations to you and best wishes to your client."

THE UNMASKING OF EDWARD PICKERSGILL

Nothing Edward Pickersgill has done since August 18, 1978 has

stopped us from pursuing a revolutionary course. Before August 18, he had a slowing effect on our work but could not stop us.

Nothing can stop anti-imperialist revolution in Canada.

To advance the anti-imperialist revolution we have overthrown a rotten element in our leadership. Now, we unmask him in the public eye. Rant and rave as you will, Edward Pickersgill, but you are not a revolutionary leader, as you have portrayed yourself to the Canadian people and people in other parts of the world. Threats, lies, slanders, or any other such things will not stop us. We will not be stopped in exposing this fraud that has been propagated about Edward Pickersgill.

What qualities are necessary for the development of a revolutionary leader? In coming to understand Edward Pickersgill this question is of fundamental importance. It demands an answer because for many years Edward Pickersgill touted himself as a revolutionary leader and we believed him.

An answer to the question has been given, at least in part, by the Communist International.

In 1935, Georgi Dimitrov delivered a speech to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International. The speech was given in reply to discussion of Dimitrov's brilliant report to that Congress entitled: "The Fascist Offensive And The Tasks Of The Communist International". In his speech Dimitrov outlined the main criteria used by the Communist International in selecting communist cadres.

"What should be our main criteria in selecting cadres?"

"First, absolute devotion to the cause of the working class, loyalty to the Party, tested in face of the enemy — in battle, in prison, in court.

"Second, the closest possible contact with the masses. The comrades concerned must be wholly absorbed in the interests of the masses, feel the life pulse of the masses, know their sentiments and requirements. The prestige of the leaders of our Party organizations should be based, first of all, on the fact that the masses regard them as their leaders and are convinced through their own experience of their ability as leaders and of their determination and self-sacrifice in struggle.

"Third, ability independently to find one's bearings and not to be afraid of assuming responsibility in making decisions. He who fears to take responsibility is not a leader. He who is unable to display initiative, who says: 'I will do only what I'm told,' is not a Bolshevik. Only he is a real Bolshevik leader who does not lose his head at moments of defeat, who does not get a swelled head at moments of success, who displays indomitable firmness in carrying out decisions. Cadres develop and grow best when they are placed in the position of having to solve concrete problems of the struggle independently, and are aware that they are fully responsible for their decisions.

"Fourth, discipline and Bolshevik hardening in the struggle against the class enemy as well as in their irreconcilable opposition to all deviations from the Bolshevik line.

"We must place all the more emphasis on these conditions which determine the correct selection of cadres, because in practice preference is very often given to a comrade who, for example, is able to write well and is a good speaker, but is not a man or woman of action, and is not as suited for the struggle as some other comrade who perhaps may not be able to write or speak so well, but is a staunch comrade, possessing initiative and contact with the masses, and is capable of going into battle and leading others into battle. Have there not been many cases of sectarians, doctrinaires or moralizers crowding out loyal mass workers, genuine working class leaders?"

"Our leading cadres should combine the knowledge of what they must do — with Bolshevik stamina, revolutionary strength of character and the will power to carry it through."

A petty cynic, like Edward Pickersgill, will of course throw up his hands at the mention of communist cadres. He will self-righteously howl: "What has this got to do with me? How can you compare me with a communist cadre? I'm not even a member of a communist party!"

However, a comparison can be made. The criteria set out by Georgi Dimitrov for selecting cadres can be applied to any

revolutionary organization. They describe traits which are necessary for the development of revolutionary leaders. So, what of Edward Pickersgill? How did he match up to the Communist International's main criteria for selecting cadres?

WHAT WAS EDWARD PICKERSGILL?

A cadre should be absolutely devoted to the proletarian cause. Edward Pickersgill, in contrast, had absolute devotion to a completely different cause — his own factional cause in line with the counter-revolutionary cause of the bourgeoisie.

A cadre should be loyal to the Party. The Alive Production Collective is not a communist party, but Edward Pickersgill couldn't even be loyal to this lower level organization. Far from being loyal, Edward Pickersgill attacked his organization repeatedly and tried to liquidate it.

A cadre should have ability independently to find his bearings. The thing Edward Pickersgill could never do was find his bearings on the revolutionary road. He could not find these proletarian bearings even with the help of his comrades, let alone independently.

A cadre should not be afraid of assuming responsibility in making decisions. When faced with making a decision affecting the very life of the Alive Production Collective, Edward Pickersgill always capitulated. In terms of assuming responsibility for the decisions he did make, he only took responsibility for decisions which were proved over time to be correct. Responsibility for his decisions which were proved incorrect he delegated to anyone except himself.

A cadre should be disciplined. Self-discipline, following Collective discipline and Edward Pickersgill were mutually exclusive.

A cadre should have the closest possible contact with the masses. Edward Pickersgill, in contrast, could not even maintain close contact with his comrades in the Alive Production Collective, let alone the broad masses. Edward Pickersgill had vile contempt for his comrades and the masses.

A cadre should show Bolshevik hardening in the struggle against the class enemy. Edward Pickersgill chose the wrong class to fight against. He became hardened in his fight against the proletariat and progressively softer in his attitude towards the bourgeoisie.

A cadre should possess Bolshevik stamina. In contrast, Edward Pickersgill took up the indolent lifestyle of a bourgeois.

A cadre should have revolutionary strength of character and the will power to carry it through. But Edward Pickersgill was nothing more than a perverted degenerate with the thoroughly contemptible weakness of character of the most vacillatory sections of the petty bourgeoisie. Edward Pickersgill's will power only extended as far as satisfying his own interests. The only things he was capable of seeing through were his factionalist conspiracies and consummate preoccupation with petty fetishism.

Edward Pickersgill was no revolutionary leader!

So, what was Edward Pickersgill? He was a counter-revolutionary traitor, conspirator and double-dealer. He was arrogant, cruel, perverted, deceitful and thoroughly cowardly. Through his actions, Edward Pickersgill has placed himself outside of the ranks of the Alive Production Collective. By his deeds, he has placed himself outside of the revolutionary ranks in Canada and internationally. In his social practice, Edward Pickersgill has taken up the limp banner of the petty bourgeoisie and in his aspirations he has tied himself to the falling star of the bourgeoisie.

The account to follow will describe Edward Pickersgill's negative traits and will show by numerous examples how these were reflected in his social practice. We will expose Edward Pickersgill's degeneracy and perversion and show how these obscene characteristics were linked to his insidious scheming and factionalism. We will take the mask off of Edward Pickersgill and show how, by deceit, he portrayed himself as a proletarian revolutionary to us and the outside world. Above all else, the following account will prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that Edward Pickersgill most definitely was no revolutionary leader!