

PART SIXTEEN

Edward Pickersgill Abused Other People's Relationships

COMRADES' PERSONAL LIVES ABUSED FOR FACTIONAL GAIN

Since the earliest days of the Collective, Edward Pickersgill has abused other comrades' social relationships. He has done this in order to benefit himself and the faction he was building around himself. He did not, as he and his virgin maiden have tried to claim, poke his nose into these relationships in order to help the people involved. Edward Pickersgill had other, more sinister motives.

During his interference in these relationships Edward Pickersgill and his "private eye", Michelle Landriault, worked hand in hand to round up every available piece of personal or political gossip they could. At his command the virgin maiden would hurry off and busy herself with uncovering "juicy morsels" of gossip for future factional use. Edward Pickersgill would later use this information as "evidence" to orchestrate the political downfall of any member of the Collective who refused to fall in line under his petty dictatorship.

He used backstabbing tactics in order to try to consolidate and maintain his tyrannical rule in the Collective. All this he did while playing the role of a "concerned comrade". Michelle Landriault's usual role was to play "confidante" to the women in these relationships and so obtain information which Edward Pickersgill would have found difficult to get.

Edward Pickersgill always promoted his relationship with Michelle Landriault as a model which should be emulated within the Collective. This was an illusion. To promote this relationship as a model was to promote dishonesty, backstabbing, sexual degeneracy, and bourgeois romanticism.

Edward Pickersgill also acted as if he was very knowledgeable and had a clear line to follow in the area of social relations. In fact this "counsellor" wouldn't have known a good relationship if he had tripped over it! The only clear line he had was the bourgeois line, the line of maximizing degeneracy!

Edward Pickersgill never gave any account of his own problems with social relationships or how he had come to terms with them. In hindsight, it is clear that the reason for his silence on this question was that he had not in fact made any attempt to come to terms with his problems and errors in this area. Faced with an inability to speak from his own experience, Edward Pickersgill simply gave advice from above without explaining, from his own perspective, the merits of the advice. Edward Pickersgill could not explain why his advice was good for one simple reason. The advice was not good.

Edward Pickersgill knew that to attempt to give explanations and examples would only have exposed his ignorance and his degeneracy. In this process he might have had to learn something, do self-criticism, and give up his rotten ways. Transformation of his own social practice on this question was not something which Edward Pickersgill was interested in.

Edward Pickersgill was interested in serving his own selfish ends and making political hay.

His basic approach on the question of social relationships was to smash any unity developing between the comrades in the Collective and promote splits, dissension and hard feelings. Why? Like all individuals or classes ruling the majority by suppression of their initiative and against their will, Edward Pickersgill feared the united strength of the majority. He was afraid that once the Collective became united, he would be overthrown. This was not an illusion. It was a reality — a reality which, in August 1978, fulfilled his worst fears and nightmares.

The fear which haunted Edward Pickersgill was the fear of being overthrown or of being seen as a less significant individual in the

life of the Collective. He was afraid of losing power. This is similar to the fear that the bourgeoisie feels when they see the workers united. They dread the day when the workers will rise up and overthrow them in bloody revolution. So they sow seeds of dissension among the workers using tactics such as racism, and discrimination between men and women.

However such attempts to sow disunity in a force united by proletarian class interests are futile. The Alive Production Collective is united around revolutionary politics. This unity has developed in hard struggle and cannot be dissolved by petty backstabbing, lies and slanders. Given this fact, all of Edward Pickersgill's scheming was a useless waste of time.

THE FOUR BASIC RELATIONS: A FACTIONALIST THESIS

Early in 1978, during the Mini-Cultural Revolution, Edward Pickersgill subjected the Collective to an erroneous "masterful thesis" about the nature of relationships within the organization. At a time when his own relations with comrades had degenerated to an all time low in terms of sexual promiscuity and debauchery, this opportunist was in desperate need of a theory to rationalize his actions. So he put forward a grandiose thesis which raised to the level of a political principle the separation of sexual relations from social relations.

Edward Pickersgill claimed that there were four basic relations within the Collective. He outlined political, economic, and social divisions within our work and then went on to include "sexual units". These he defined as something separate and distinct from social units although he did admit that there was a connection between the two.

In actual fact society can be scientifically divided into an economic base and a cultural superstructure. Politics are a part of the cultural superstructure. It is clear then that economic and political divisions are not equivalent. Social relations occur in both the economic base and the cultural superstructure. So to equate economic, political and social relations is to confuse a number of different concepts.

However the criminal aspect of this "masterful thesis" was contained in the separation of social relations from sexual relations when, in fact, these two are inseparably linked. This was straightforward political opportunism. The fact that this thesis was first presented at a Collective meeting not attended by any other leading comrades, is an indication of the depth of this opportunism.

What was Edward Pickersgill's motivation in putting forward this incorrect analysis of social relations? He consciously developed the thesis that social and sexual relations were two mutually exclusive types of relations, to serve his own rotten practice on the question of sexual social relations. Developing his thesis, it would have been easy for him to claim that there was nothing wrong with having sexual relations with somebody with whom you do not have a developed social relationship. So this "masterful thesis" was designed to provide support for his own promiscuity in sexual relations, if and when this fact became known.

In 1973, Edward Pickersgill attacked the healthy, monogamous relationship of two comrades on the basis that they were simply "fucking buddies". This derogatory term was used to describe the hypothetical situation in which a relationship was based purely on sexual relations and no developed social relationship was present. What did Edward Pickersgill see as the distinction between just "fucking buddies" and the theory of "sexual units"? Whatever fine distinction he saw but never explained, there is no real distinction. In 1973 Edward Pickersgill denounced something which he turned around to promote in 1978. On both occasions his motivation was

personal gain.

This thesis of "sexual units" was also designed to serve Edward Pickersgill's aim of creating splits and dissension in the Collective rather than promoting unity.

Within the Collective, where any couple had a sexual social relationship, Edward Pickersgill would always emphasize the sexual aspects of the relationship. He would constantly raise sex to a point of principle. This was a reflection of his own bankrupt line on this question.

Because of his distorted view of social relations within the Collective, Edward Pickersgill would try to foment dissension in the Collective on this basis.

He would characterize certain men as being incapable of talking to a woman comrade without thinking of sex. Where did such a bizarre idea come from? It came from the fact that this pig knew that this was his own attitude and assumed that others had the same things on their minds. This type of slander is bound to result in feelings of uneasiness between comrades, particularly between men and women comrades.

Edward Pickersgill would also characterize people in terms of his perception of them as physical beings. On one occasion he asked three women comrades why women did not find one of the men comrades physically attractive. Of course, this was just a base slander. The comrade in question is just an ordinary man, who the whole female sex would not find unattractive. Certainly, bourgeois women would find him unattractive because of his revolutionary politics, but other than that, the response would not be especially negative nor especially positive — just an ordinary response.

It is interesting that in his documents after August 18, 1978, Edward Pickersgill accused the Collective of asking him questions like the traditional joke: "Have you stopped beating your wife yet?"

Of course, the joke is that the question cannot be answered either "yes" or "no". If one answers "no", it is an admission that one is in the habit of beating one's wife and the habit is continuing. If one answers "yes", it is simply an admission that one used to beat one's wife.

Edward Pickersgill stated that these types of questions cannot be answered at all. However, his question about the man comrade was just this type of question.

The answer to the question "Have you stopped beating your wife yet?" is to say "I never did beat my wife." The answer to Edward Pickersgill's question was to similarly challenge the false starting premise of the question, by saying: "Women don't find this comrade unattractive."

What was Edward Pickersgill's motivation here? It was to retain his position as "dominant male" in the Collective by trying to neutralize the opposition. Naturally this kind of slander is bound to cause tension and awkwardness between comrades.

This masterful thesis on "sexual units" was finally dropped by Edward Pickersgill because he could get no widespread support for the idea. None of the comrades were enthusiastic about the whole concept and a number of comrades were quite vocal in their disagreement.

Yet again Edward Pickersgill was unsuccessful in trying to win Collective approval for his own perverse view of sexual social relations between comrades.

INTERNAL DISCIPLINE ABUSED

During 1971, Alive Magazine street sellers were under constant harassment from the police for selling Alive Magazine on the streets. This harassment intensified during 1972 and hit a peak in 1973. During this period of time the political analysis in Alive Magazine was developing. It was becoming a more overtly revolutionary publication. This was the reason for the build-up in police harassment.

In certain time periods during 1972 and 1973, the police were coming to the Collective work place or domestic places at least once a night. Most of this harassment took place between midnight and

3 or 4 o'clock in the morning. During this period the Collective became very skilled in working together to stave off police attacks. There was a high consciousness of active resistance to the police. Through this program of active resistance, the Collective was successful in actually beating back police harassment to the point where the Guelph police were scared of having to deal with Collective members.

Due to the increased external pressure on the Collective it became necessary for there to be more formalization and consolidation of the internal structure. Although there had been active leadership in the Collective since its foundation, it was not until 2½ years later, in the fall of 1973, that the first formal leadership structure was established.

At the same time there were a number of sharp struggles to develop a Collective consciousness of the need for strict internal discipline and norms of conduct. For the first time, members of the organization were expected to carry out certain specified duties and responsibilities, and to act in a disciplined manner. These were identified as actual responsibilities of all members, and as requirements for membership.

It was during these struggles that comrades first learned the need for a revolutionary leadership. The basic principle of following the leadership and giving those with the advanced consciousness the benefit of the doubt was also established at this time.

However, there was no consciousness among the membership of how to raise legitimate objections to decisions of the leadership. Comrades knew how to operate outside the organization. However comrades did not know how to operate correctly inside the organization.

During this period of time a number of Collective members had great difficulty coming to terms with the concepts of revolutionary leadership and democratic centralism. Nevertheless, these comrades retained their spirit to learn and were willing to try out proposals which at first seemed outlandish to them. In most cases these proposals were correct, and worked out fine in practice. So the comrades developed an openness to new ideas, a spirit of daring.

Those comrades who refused to accept the new structure and discipline of the Collective were forced to leave or were suspended during this period. For the first time in the history of the Collective, membership declined. Through this process the comrades who remained had it sharply carved into their minds that the struggle for discipline and internal organization was a serious struggle, and should be treated as such.

During this period of intense struggle inside the Collective, the question of sexual social relations was brought up for examination by Edward Pickersgill. All the couples in the Collective were made to explain the nature of their relationship and answer the question, "Is this a principled relationship?"

In this struggle one man comrade had his relationship viciously attacked by Edward Pickersgill. The relationship was labelled as "unprincipled" and the two comrades involved were crudely denounced as simply "fucking buddies". Unprepared for the struggle and unable to defend his relationship in anything other than emotional terms, the man comrade was forced into a position of "admitting" that the relationship was unprincipled and calling an end to it.

This left just two couples in the Collective. One of these was composed of Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault. The other couple was the only couple which had survived Edward Pickersgill's earlier attacks on sexual social relationships within the Collective.

Fast on the heels of the discussion on principled sexual social relations, came a reappraisal of the Collective's living arrangements.

At this time the Collective was small enough that all the members could live in one building. The building in which the comrades lived, contained two medium sized apartments and one

large apartment.

Edward Pickersgill put forward that there was a weakness in the way in which comrades were located in the three parts of the building. At night, when the police approached one part of the building, they would encounter just a small splinter of the defence force. However, even the large apartment was not large enough for all the Collective members to sleep in except in quite overcrowded conditions, especially if couples were to have their own bedrooms.

Edward Pickersgill, therefore, made the proposal that a stronger force could be put into the larger apartment each night if all the men slept in one large bedroom in barracks style conditions, and all the women slept in other bedrooms in similar barracks style conditions. It was proposed that these men's and women's dormitories should simply be sleeping places. Since there would be no room in the dormitories for personal belongings, things such as clothes, personal papers etc. were to be stored in other rooms.

This proposal was not well received within the Collective because it made no provision for couples. Edward Pickersgill quickly dealt with this objection by suggesting that some of the bedrooms in other parts of the building could be used by couples on the nights they wanted to sleep together. He put forward that this situation would be advantageous for the two couples in the Collective since it would enable them to put their relationships on a more principled basis. Since arrangements would have to be made ahead of time, sexual relations would no longer be engaged in on a spontaneous basis.

In the spirit of daring to try new things comrades agreed to this proposal. The problem of security was one which all the comrades were well aware of and this proposal seemed to answer some of the Collective's needs on this front. The proposal was also only in effect for a one month period initially. Edward Pickersgill strongly stressed the experimental nature of this program and stated that after one month the whole program would be reviewed.

After the proposal had received general Collective approval, a special committee of four was set up to work out the concrete details of the program. This committee included both Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault, a comrade from the other existing couple in the Collective, and the man comrade whose sexual relationship had just been broken up by Edward Pickersgill.

In this committee Edward Pickersgill began his dirty work. At first the revisions to the plan seemed innocuous. Later they became vile and vicious.

Edward Pickersgill made a new proposal that it would be better if the couples slept in the large apartment with other Collective members on the nights that they slept together, rather than having two people out of the apartment. So it was proposed that the women comrades from these two couples should share a small bedroom in the large apartment. This bedroom would also be used by the couples when they slept together. If Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault wanted to sleep together the other woman comrade would sleep in the smaller apartment. If, on the other hand, the other couple wanted to sleep together, Michelle Landriault would sleep in the smaller apartment. In this way a maximum of just one person would be out of the security force on any given night. Under this program it was necessary for the couple concerned to inform the other woman comrade that they planned to use the bedroom that night. The other woman comrade would then sleep in the smaller apartment.

Having in mind the importance of tight security, and realizing that this program was just experimental, comrades agreed to this proposal for the same one month trial period.

COMRADES ENVELOPED IN A NIGHTMARE

After the initial plan for more secure sleeping arrangements was agreed to by the Collective, Edward Pickersgill began his insidious backroom work to distort the whole concept. He slowly turned an acceptable arrangement into a vile nightmare. In the process comrades' personal lives were trampled underfoot and the Collective was shaken to its foundations.

Edward Pickersgill began his scheme by setting himself and his virgin maiden apart from other Collective members in this plan. These two acted as a faction inside the Collective. While all the other men comrades slept in the dormitory as agreed, Edward Pickersgill began to sleep on the living room couch, downstairs in the large apartment. Edward Pickersgill never once slept in the men's dormitory, even though there was a bed there for him.

As the program began to unfold, the other couple in the Collective made several arrangements to sleep together. Michelle Landriault readily agreed to all of these initial arrangements. She and Edward Pickersgill also engaged in much jocularity on these occasions, laughingly stating, "Well I guess we may as well sleep together too."

With these joking words, Edward Pickersgill and his virgin maiden would head into the smaller apartment for the night. This action defeated the whole thesis originally put forward to justify the revised plan, since it meant that two people were sleeping out of the large apartment anyway.

A situation quickly developed in which just one couple was making arrangements to sleep together. Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault then slept together by default on these occasions. During the whole time that the program was in place Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault never actually arranged to sleep together. They never once slept in the bedroom set aside for couples to use.

After the program had been underway for a couple of weeks, Edward Pickersgill and his virgin maiden called a Collective meeting to discuss the situation.

Edward Pickersgill opened the meeting by stating that the program was obviously not working since the other couple involved were not treating the discipline seriously. He accused them of taking the whole thing too lightly and not actually thinking twice before arranging to sleep together. He also pointed out that the couple was sleeping together about three times a week, and that this was too often to be having sexual relations.

The couple pointed out that they were not sleeping together only to have sexual relations. They were also spending the night together so that they could discuss their personal relationship and simply enjoy the warmth of being together.

Like a vulture, Edward Pickersgill jumped on this last statement and developed a whole masterful thesis around it. He claimed that the two comrades were treating each other like teddy bears and that this was no good. Raising this point to the level of political principle, Edward Pickersgill declared that it was a serious political error to treat comrades like teddy bears!

Although the comrades had all read Engels' book, "The Origin Of The Family, Private Property, And The State", no reference to this error of treating comrades like teddy bears was found! Likewise no reference was found in Mao Zedong's essay, "On The Correct Handling Of Contradictions Among The People". However, it is interesting to ask the question: if treating comrades like enemies is to go over to the side of the enemy, what is the political result of treating comrades like teddy bears?!

Edward Pickersgill was absolutely anti-people. This pig would need warm emotion between comrades to the level of the gutter with crude comments and be raised to the level of a major political error. Edward Pickersgill was an ideological buffoon.

Having debased the emotional content of this couple's relationship in such an unfeeling manner, Edward Pickersgill proposed a new revision to the program to deal with his perception that this one couple was still treating the discipline too lightly. He put forward that because of her liberalism Michelle Landriault agreed to sleep elsewhere whenever she was asked, even if this was not convenient. He stated that he, however, would have no such liberal tendencies. If he felt that the comrades were sleeping together too often, he would simply say "no".

So it was proposed that both Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault would have to be asked before any arrangement to sleep together could go ahead. It was also proposed that these

arrangements would have to be made by 9 p.m. on the evening in question.

In effect Edward Pickersgill was putting himself forward as the only person in the Collective who was not steeped in liberalism and so could actually provide the necessary Collective discipline needed in this program.

The comrades agreed to this proposal because they accepted that Edward Pickersgill was honestly trying to enhance the situation by providing more discipline and would not use his authority here to try to block relations between comrades without good reason.

It was after this meeting that the situation began to deteriorate fast. Edward Pickersgill had begun making crude comments whenever the couple slept together from the very beginning. Now, however, the comments came fast and furious. Edward Pickersgill began to consistently refer to the bedroom available for couples to use as the "passion pit". Although Michelle Landriault also picked up this term, other comrades refused to use it.

Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault also began to consciously disrupt the program by making themselves unavailable between suppertime and 9 p.m. each evening. Only one of them had to disappear on any given evening to disrupt any arrangements the other couple wanted to make. When the missing party reappeared at 5 minutes past 9 it was pointless to try to set up an arrangement. The sneering response was always, "Sorry but it's too late now."

Over the next couple of weeks it became almost impossible for the other couple to sleep together. Edward Pickersgill and his virgin maiden were consciously keeping them apart.

By this time the one month review was overdue. Several comrades had drawn this to Edward Pickersgill's attention but he always had some glib excuse for postponing it. Finally the woman comrade from the persecuted couple approached Edward Pickersgill alone, demanding the promised one month review.

Edward Pickersgill treated this whole matter lightly, and told her in an offhand tone, "Oh, I don't think that's necessary. Everybody except you thinks the whole arrangement is entirely satisfactory. Anyway what makes you think that this whole program is temporary?"

The comrade was shocked by this response but patiently recounted to Edward Pickersgill the nature of the original proposal which contained a clear demand for a one month review.

Edward Pickersgill waved these words aside and turning on the comrade in a threatening manner, stated, "This program is not going to be changed to suit your individual whims. This is a Collective program."

The woman comrade was extremely intimidated by this whole process. She felt isolated and alone. Her sexual social relationship was under great pressure from Edward Pickersgill and now it seemed she was the only one who had any problems with the situation. According to Edward Pickersgill, her husband found the situation quite acceptable.

In fact, Edward Pickersgill had conjured up a nightmarish situation inside the Collective which affected the lives of all the comrades to one degree or another. Under this oppressive situation, healthy, monogamous, sexual social relations became a focus of attack by crude characterizations, lewd comments, slanderous statements and factional scheming. The attacks on sexual social relations between couples inside the Collective had now reached the point where couples were actually being blocked from sleeping together for no reason other than to cause them anguish.

Edward Pickersgill had manoeuvred himself into the position of being able to ask couples not to sleep together if it became necessary to do so. He abused this authority. He used this authority to block the development of healthy relations between couples within the Collective.

A NEW BORN BABY SNATCHED FROM ITS MOTHER

During this period of time Edward Pickersgill launched further

attacks against this particular couple on a new front.

At this time the couple had recently had their first child. This was naturally a source of great joy to both parents and their relationship was enriched by a whole spectrum of strong, new emotions. It was against this emotional backdrop that Edward Pickersgill launched his vile attack against their sexual social relationship. Just when the couple most needed the warmth and mutual support of the relationship, it was denied to them. The woman comrade's relationship with her new baby was also attacked.

When the baby was just a few weeks old, Edward Pickersgill put up a note in the Collective work place asking, "Is this child to be a Collective child, or this individual's child?"

At a seven hour meeting later that day, Edward Pickersgill launched a vicious attack against the woman comrade. He denounced the comrade for acting as if the fact that she gave birth to the child gave her a special right to determine how the child should be brought up. He cruelly tortured her by asking if she would be willing to separate from her husband and child, go to another city by herself and do Alive work there. The comrade repeatedly answered, "No" to this question.

While cruelly abusing the woman comrade at this meeting, Edward Pickersgill also attacked her husband by stripping him of his right to vote on any of the proposals made at the meeting. This was done on the basis that he was not objective about the situation.

After long hours of "analysis" from Edward Pickersgill about the need for comrades to be willing to give up anything for the revolution, including their new born babies, the woman comrade answered, "Yes" to Edward Pickersgill's question. She stated that she would be willing to leave her husband and baby and go to another city by herself to do Alive work. She only said this because she knew that Edward Pickersgill would accept no other answer.

After the comrade had answered, "Yes" to the question, Edward Pickersgill tortured her further by refusing to address her statement. He talked for over half an hour about a variety of general topics and then finally came back to the point at issue.

Edward Pickersgill told the comrade that he didn't think it would in fact be necessary for her to go to another city. He had simply asked the question to "test her revolutionary commitment".

Edward Pickersgill stressed, however, that the comrade would have to be watched closely to ensure that she did not take off with the baby. As a disciplinary measure the care of the child was taken out of her hands. She was put into a room alone and the baby was cared for in another apartment. Michelle Landriault cared for the baby during part of the day since she was, according to Edward Pickersgill, a "model revolutionary mother". Other comrades took care of the baby for the rest of the time.

For several weeks this pattern continued. The woman comrade was only allowed to even touch her child when either Edward Pickersgill or Michelle Landriault were present. Other than for these brief moments of contact, the separation was complete.

After a couple of weeks the situation eased up somewhat and the discipline was relaxed. The woman comrade was finally allowed to go out alone with the baby.

The first time that the woman comrade was allowed out alone with her baby she seized her chance and took off out of town with the child.

After a comrade left, her husband was subjected to even harsher use by Edward Pickersgill. Three weeks later the man comrade left also.

These two comrades did not run from revolutionary politics. They ran from an oppressive social situation. They spent a year away from the Collective during which time they struggled hard to come to terms with the whole question of social relations which Edward Pickersgill had so contorted and mutilated.

Throughout the year they were away, these two comrades kept up principled relations with the Collective. They continued to make contributions to Alive Magazine and to do distribution of the magazine. They also engaged in political study and discussion.

These two comrades continued to uphold revolutionary politics in a very significant and practical way.

Despite the fact that these two comrades continued to uphold correct politics they were ostracized by the Collective and labelled as traitors who had run from struggle. Inside the Collective, Edward Pickersgill worked hard to build up Collective opinion against the couple in order to ensure continuing disunity and resentment inside the organization. He used the departure of these two comrades to drive further wedges between the comrades.

By the beginning of 1974, the Collective had lost half of the members it had had in the fall of 1973. Under Edward Pickersgill's reign of terror, some comrades had fled and others had been thrown out. Just at the point when Alive's political thrust was developing, Edward Pickersgill had turned around and decimated the Collective, cutting away the foundation of the actual political program.

Edward Pickersgill was a political saboteur.

ANY DISCUSSION THREATENED THE PETTY DESPOT

During the fall of 1973, Edward Pickersgill was working hard to undermine the unity and strength of any established sexual social relationships within the Collective. Why were these relationships the focus of his attack?

During the day Edward Pickersgill kept a firm hand on the life of the Collective. He worked hard to ensure that comrades did not get together, did not engage in discussion or exchange ideas. He was afraid of any such unity and comradeship for he knew that in this, lay the seeds of his destruction.

The comrades involved in established sexual social relations presented a problem for Edward Pickersgill. In their own rooms at night, these couples would take the time to relax, discuss their own personal relationship, and also discuss political questions. It was this discussion of politics which Edward Pickersgill found personally threatening.

Edward Pickersgill could find no legitimate excuse for criticizing this discussion of politics. Although it was agreed within the Collective that there should be no political discussion going on in private which comrades were not willing to bring to the whole organization, open political discussion between couples was seen as entirely acceptable and indeed a good thing.

There was no conspiracy of silence against the Collective from these couples, no development of small cliques. In fact Edward Pickersgill knew that political discussion was taking place within these relationships only because he heard reports on the conversations from the comrades concerned!

Edward Pickersgill began to become quite paranoid about the discussions occurring between couples at night. During the day he had effectively squashed discussion, keeping comrades apart and too busy to talk. He knew that any direct attack on exchange of political ideas between comrades would lead to a complete exposure of his reactionary line. So instead he directly attacked the sexual social relationships themselves.

It is clear then, that Edward Pickersgill worked to destroy the established sexual social relations within the Collective because as long as they remained intact they provided a form for open exchange of ideas between comrades which directly threatened his position. It was not the relationships themselves which threatened this petty despot, it was the unity and democratic expression of ideas which blossomed within these relationships which he feared.

Thus, the give and take in the struggle between Edward Pickersgill and the ordinary Collective members at the end of 1973, was not a matter of having or not having sexual activities nor sleeping or not sleeping together. The give and take was a matter of discussing or not discussing politics, developing or not developing deeper unity.

Edward Pickersgill worked hard to smash the established sexual social relationships within the Collective as part of his overall plan to stifle democracy and establish himself as an autocrat, a dictator

inside the organization.

PRINCIPLED POSITION DISTORTED

In 1975 the two comrades who had left early in 1974, began to discuss the possibility of moving back to Guelph and working more closely with the Collective again. They were willing to do this only on the basis of strict agreements between themselves and the Collective with regard to certain personal affairs.

During this period Edward Pickersgill went to see the couple and formally proposed that they should move back to Guelph. He outlined a "great and glorious" plan to them of how they could participate in a progressive publishing house to serve revolutionaries all over the world.

The comrades replied that this was fine. They were willing to do whatever work was necessary. However they stressed the need for a formal agreement between the Collective and themselves before they would be willing to move back into closer contact with the Collective again. This proposal dealt with several areas of concern.

On the question of sexual relations the proposal outlined that it was not a point of principle that the Collective should have a voice in this area of a couple's life. Likewise, it was not a point of principle that the Collective should not have a voice in the area of sexual relations. This was a matter of choice for the couple concerned.

On the question of living arrangements a similar outlook was called for. Namely, that for the Collective members to live all together in one place was not a point of principle. Again this was a matter of individual choice. The proposal pointed out that to make this a point of principle would be a serious restriction on the size of the organization anyway and was hardly realistic.

The third section of the proposal outlined that the question of collectivized child care was not a point of principle either. Again this should be a matter for individual decision.

The proposal stressed that it was not a point of principle that these three areas of sexual relations, living arrangements, and child care, should be or should not be under Collective control. This was a choice for the individuals concerned. Whichever choice they made should in no way affect their political relationship to the organization.

The proposal also stated that since this couple was making demands for individual control of sexual relations, living arrangements and child care it would not be fair for them to ask to participate in a collectivized finance system as they had done previously. The couple stated that they were willing to guarantee their own finances.

In conclusion the proposal noted that these four demands were not big points. The Collective would retain control of the individuals' political lives and part of their personal lives. Just four areas would be under individual control. The proposal put forward that, since these four areas were not monumental points, this would mean that the Collective still had control over at least 90% of the comrades' lives.

When Edward Pickersgill heard this proposal he appeared extremely enthusiastic about it. He praised it as an "excellent" and "principled" statement. He hailed it as a great basis of new unity. He even went so far as to admit that the Collective made definite mistakes in 1973 which forced these two comrades to run. He said that he would take the proposal back to the Collective.

Later Edward Pickersgill met with these two comrades again. He told them that the Collective had received the proposal extremely well and thought that it was excellent. In fact the Collective was so impressed by the proposal that they had voted to have it adopted as Collective policy.

After the couple returned to Guelph Edward Pickersgill began to totally distort the nature of the agreement which was made between the two comrades and the Collective. He began to promote that although he had agreed to the proposal at the time, he didn't understand the necessity for it.

Edward Pickersgill distorted the proposal made and promoted

that this couple wanted their living quarters, as well as their personal and family life completely separated from the Collective. He discouraged comrades from visiting their home on the basis that "they don't like other people in their house".

He even went so far as to discourage Collective members from speaking to them, saying, "If you say the wrong thing, the woman comrade will just take off again without warning."

This program was designed to isolate the two comrades from the rest of the Collective and disrupt the new unity which was developing. Using cloak and dagger tactics Edward Pickersgill worked hard to isolate this couple, all the while maintaining that this isolation was the personal preference of the two comrades concerned.

In the long run this program was destined to failure. A strong principled unity based on correct politics cannot be torn apart by the intrigues and conspiracies of a two-bit reactionary like Edward Pickersgill.

REACTIONARY TOPPLED BY UNWAVERING RESISTANCE

The fall of 1973 was a significant period in the life of the Alive Production Collective. It was during the struggles at this time that Edward Pickersgill established his position as leader of the Collective and, rather than supporting collective leadership, set up the pattern of personal dictatorship which plagued the Collective until his overthrow in 1978.

During the history of the Collective there are five key periods when it would have been possible for the Collective to overthrow Edward Pickersgill. The first of these was in the fall of 1973.

At the beginning of 1976, after the split with the Bainzites, a second chance arose on the basis of Edward Pickersgill's misleadership on the question of the Bainzites. In practice, however, massive internal struggle was not possible at this time. Faced with vicious external attacks by the Bainzites, the Collective needed to present a unified front to the external world.

In December, 1977 a third opportunity to overthrow Edward Pickersgill came up. At this time he was under criticism for his physical abuse of one of the women comrades in his faction. Edward Pickersgill managed to divert the focus of the attack away from himself and onto the Collective. He called for major struggle inside the Collective to investigate why he was so isolated in his struggle with this comrade that he lost his temper and hit her. He did mild self-criticism for abusing the comrade, meanwhile launching vicious attacks against other comrades for abandoning him in the struggle. This whole struggle led up to the Mini-Cultural Revolution, a campaign of internal rectification which eventually resulted in his overthrow in August, 1978.

In February, 1978 the fourth opportunity arose with the first open disclosure of his secret sexual relationship with one of the women comrades. In this struggle comrades allowed themselves to be blocked in their investigations by Edward Pickersgill's threats and abuse.

In August, 1978 the comrades seized a chance and finally overthrew this renegade once and for all and rid the Collective of this blight. Despite some fast footwork by Edward Pickersgill, the comrades held firmly to the correct line and this criminal was forced to flee, with his tail between his legs.

Looking back then, it is clear that the fall of 1973 was a significant period in the life of the Collective. It was during this period that Edward Pickersgill was first able to establish his personal dictatorship over the life of the Collective. It was also the first time that Collective members missed an important opportunity to overthrow this renegade.

In the early struggles of the Collective, Edward Pickersgill learned the strengths and weaknesses of Collective members. During 1971, 1972, and 1973 he learned that comrades could not be broken in open, principled political struggle. He also learned that comrades could not be crushed by threats of physical violence and arrests from the police. However, in the fall of 1973 he learned that

comrades could be undermined by clandestine, factional schemes attacking their personal lives.

Having learned this vile, unprincipled means of attacking comrades, Edward Pickersgill continued to use this same vicious formula throughout the life of the Collective. As time passed, he became more skilled in covering his tracks and labelling others as the "criminal" and "instigator".

It is a credit to the Collective members that they have always stood firm in face of external attacks by the state and in face of principled, political struggle. However, we have fallen down in face of vile personal attacks from the renegade inside the organization.

We should have stood firm and fought back in 1973. If we had done so, Edward Pickersgill could have been exposed and purged from the organization almost five years earlier than he was. Similarly we should have stood firm in December 1977 and in February 1978. To submit to his tyrannical dictatorship was wrong.

The comrades in the Alive Production Collective should have stood firmer and more resolute from the beginning, taking up Mao Zedong's call: "Be resolute, fear no sacrifice and surmount every difficulty to win victory."

COMRADES USED AS PAWNS IN A REACTIONARY GAME

Throughout the later years of the Collective, Edward Pickersgill continued to interfere in the personal lives of comrades for his own individual gain.

With one couple, Edward Pickersgill used his classic tactic of isolating the victim and then moving in for the kill. He began by setting up a situation in which these two comrades, who lived alone, could only be contacted by Collective members directly through him. As before, the lie promoted was that these comrades did not want social contact with other Collective members. In fact this lack of communication was a situation enforced by Edward Pickersgill under the pretext of allowing them the elbow room to resolve various contradictions in their personal lives.

Having established these two comrades in an isolated situation Edward Pickersgill began to distort their position. He created the illusion that these two comrades were in search of material possessions to enhance their lives and were not interested in the frugal lifestyle of other Collective members. Edward Pickersgill painted the woman comrade as the main criminal on this front.

The fact is that this woman comrade did have a number of deep-rooted political problems to come to terms with. This was not a crime. It is a common experience with comrades. Comrades are all raised in a bourgeois society and find many of their attitudes and values unacceptable when they move forward into revolutionary work. These old attitudes must be struggled against and rooted out.

However, Edward Pickersgill viewed this as an opportunity to try to break up the couple's relationship. Instead of encouraging the comrade to assist his wife and give her support in this struggle, Edward Pickersgill was constantly advising the man to leave her.

Edward Pickersgill gave the line that because of her political problems this comrade should simply be written off. Time should not be wasted in struggling with her. He would even go so far as to say things like: "I don't know how you can stand living with her. I wouldn't last five minutes." "She's going to split you know." "What are you going to do when she leaves? Don't run after her, she's not worth it."

Drawing from his own degenerate experience, Edward Pickersgill tried to sow seeds of suspicion in the man's mind. This pig whispered, "Your wife has been a real slut. Did you ever think whether she's slept with all sorts of men and never told you about it?"

In an attempt to politically justify his despicable comments, Edward Pickersgill would add, "You'd be better off without her. She's holding you back politically."

When the man comrade refused to kowtow to this rotten

factionalist line, Edward Pickersgill proposed a series of discussions between the couple and himself. The couple agreed to this but the program never went ahead. Instead Edward Pickersgill developed an alternate program.

Under this revised program the man comrade would struggle hard with his wife on the points that needed to be made. Edward Pickersgill would then come in and speak to the woman in order to clarify the situation and answer any questions she had.

In actual fact, Edward Pickersgill would weasel into these discussions playing "Mr. Nice Guy" and grant the woman's requests like some kind of glorified fairy godmother. After these discussions he would refuse to give reports to the comrade's husband, who only ever heard reports from his wife on the "concessions" which Sir Galahad had granted. It should be added that none of these "concessions" were ever actually followed through in practice. They were empty promises designed to buy off the woman comrade.

Edward Pickersgill struggled hard to drive a wedge between these two comrades. First he began by trying to unite with the man against his wife. When this met with no success, he tried to unite with the woman comrade against her husband.

This couple was able to withstand Edward Pickersgill's attacks successfully because they relied on the Collective for advice and support in the struggle and did not rely on the petty tyrant himself.

This whole campaign was just one further example of Edward Pickersgill's constant scheming to stir up troubled waters in the hope of landing a big, factional catch.

CRIMINAL ABUSE OF COMRADES

With so many crimes already on his record, Edward Pickersgill went on to tackle yet another couple's relationship.

On this occasion the woman comrade from this couple approached Edward Pickersgill concerning her husband. She expressed concern that her husband was not treating political transformation seriously because certain Collective members were treating his errors in a joking manner. Too often he was being treated like a clown and seemed willing to settle for this lot in life, rather than seriously struggle for transformation. The woman comrade suggested that a more serious approach be taken towards her husband's errors and more concrete advice and assistance given.

Fast, as always, to seize on a chance to foment splits and dissension, Edward Pickersgill suggested, as a counter-proposal, that the couple should separate. He argued that these two comrades were holding each other back politically. He said that such a separation would enable them each to "stand on their own feet" and move forward.

Edward Pickersgill's counter-proposal came as a complete surprise to the comrade. At first there was great reluctance to accept this separation. Two or three more discussions were held before the comrade finally agreed on the basis that if it would give her husband a better chance to move forward politically, she did not want to stand in the way.

This separation was agreed to as a temporary measure only. However, when the woman comrade made moves to try to re-establish the relationship, Edward Pickersgill began to put up roadblocks.

After the first attempt was blocked on the basis that the man comrade was still not moving forward, Edward Pickersgill moved the man out of his bedroom and into a small, damp alcove in the basement where he had just a bed and a change of clothes. He was not allowed any reading material or even a light by which to see his way into bed. Edward Pickersgill defended this program on the basis that it would assist the comrade to move forward. He never explained how sleeping in the basement would help in this process!

The fact was that this comrade was being punished because his wife was still interested in re-establishing their sexual social relationship.

Some months later, the woman comrade again attempted to renew the relationship. On this occasion she presented written documents to Edward Pickersgill outlining a proposal for re-establishing the sexual social relationship.

Edward Pickersgill treated these documents with utter contempt and again blocked her initiative. He even stooped so low as to mock this woman's attempt to renew the relationship with her husband on the basis that she was physically incapable of having sexual relations.

Edward Pickersgill was hell bent and determined to keep this couple apart. Such a situation served his overall program of maximizing disunity and promoting factionalism. It served to keep the two comrades off balance and so in a weak posture to resist his rotten political line. It also served to warn other couples in the Collective that they had better toe the line or else they too would come under attack.

Edward Pickersgill also derived malicious delight from keeping the man comrade directly under his control as a "punching bag".

At this time Edward Pickersgill revised his analysis on this sexual social relationship in order to try to extend the separation indefinitely. Initially Edward Pickersgill had proposed that a separation would enable both comrades to make great strides forward in the political work since the woman comrade was personalizing her husband's mistakes too much, while the husband was too lax about his mistakes.

A few months later Edward Pickersgill revised his analysis. This time, this opportunist asserted that all the time the wife had been hiding her own mistakes behind her husband's political mistakes. This is in direct contradiction to his earlier analysis. A person cannot hide behind someone else's mistakes and at the same time personalize them. By becoming subjective about mistakes, a person steps into the political limelight.

Edward Pickersgill's analysis that the woman comrade was "hiding" behind her husband's mistakes is pure bourgeois sophistry! It was an attempt to sow confusion by changing horses in mid-stream. Where before the man comrade had been painted all rotten and the woman comrade as pure, now the woman comrade was being painted all rotten.

Despite Edward Pickersgill's constant interference this couple did finally re-establish their relationship against this opportunist's wishes. In a last flailing attempt to wreak havoc, Edward Pickersgill worked to ensure that this reunion involved the maximum amount of trauma possible.

The couple wanted to move slowly into re-establishing the relationship and take the time necessary for discussion. Edward Pickersgill, however, was pushing for immediate action. At one point he tossed the man comrade out of his room and threatened the wife that if they did not move in together the man would again have to sleep in a cold, damp room in the basement. Viciously Edward Pickersgill turned to the comrade and threatened, "If he sleeps in the basement, I'm going to tell him that it's all your fault. I'm going to tell him that you wouldn't have him and so he has to sleep in that cold, damp corner."

When the two comrades were finally given Edward Pickersgill's "blessing" to begin sleeping in the same room again, the husband was ordered to set up a single bed in the bedroom to go along with the couple's double bed. Edward Pickersgill's reasoning was that since it was inevitable that a man and a woman sleeping in the same bed would have sex, and since on some nights the woman comrade might not want to have sex, then the woman comrade should have the option of ordering her husband to sleep in the single bed. What twisted thinking this pig had!

On the first night they were together the couple didn't bother setting up the single bed for the simple reason that they didn't see it as being an absolute necessity. The next day, the first question Edward Pickersgill asked the woman comrade when he saw her, was whether her husband had set up the single bed or not. She replied, "No."

Edward Pickersgill went into a fit of crazy anger and loudly

proclaimed, "That really makes me mad. I feel like just killing him!"

Later, when the husband came into the Collective work area and met Edward Pickersgill, he was viciously attacked. He was threatened with another separation from his wife and ordered to immediately go to his house and set up the single bed. This he did.

Needless to say, the main function of this single bed was to act as a throwing zone for clothes and odds and ends.

After the reunion, Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault persistently asked the woman comrade questions about her sex life.

Edward Pickersgill would say things like, "You two have been together for three nights now. How's it going?"

Always he investigated the nights rather than investigating how the reunion of these comrades was affecting their participation in the political work. This was a reflection of Edward Pickersgill's degenerate line that all sexual social relations are first and foremost sexual relations.

Whenever asked questions about her sex life the woman comrade would militantly reply, "Things are going just fine, thank you!"

After a while Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault picked up on the fact that the woman comrade regarded her sex life as her own affair and wasn't willing to confide in them. They stopped asking these nosey questions, but maintained their perverted attitudes inside the Collective, right up until their faction's overthrow.

CREATING PROBLEMS TO DIVERT REVOLUTION

In the recent struggle Michelle Landriault has raised the illusion

PART SEVENTEEN Edward Pickersgill Abused The Second Recruit To His Faction

THE FACTION CHIEF'S SECOND RECRUIT

The evil alchemy by which Edward Pickersgill turned revolutionary comrades into faction members was first practiced in a big way with his second recruit to the faction. This comrade was the next woman inside the Collective with whom Edward Pickersgill pursued sexual activity after Michelle Landriault. This woman was drawn into the conspiratorial circle after Edward Pickersgill manipulated her into sexual activity with him.

This comrade's actual position in the Alive Production Collective and her contributions to the Collective have been distorted and covered up by Edward Pickersgill. Her history as a Collective member has also been obscured and trampled on by the faction chief.

Edward Pickersgill often proclaimed that he knew this comrade better than anybody else in the Collective because he had pursued more "struggles" with her than had anybody else. In fact, the "struggles" he waged with this woman were mainly unprincipled in nature and the waging of unprincipled struggles with a person cannot lead to a clear understanding of that person.

Edward Pickersgill did not know this woman better than other members of the Collective. On the contrary, the other members of the Collective knew her better than Edward Pickersgill knew her.

This comrade herself believed that Edward Pickersgill knew her better than anybody else in the Collective. She accepted that his distorted view was the truth and she rejected the Collective's clearer view of her real strengths — her real weaknesses and her real strengths.

The Collective was hampered greatly in its struggle to develop a really complete view of this comrade because we were denied access to one fact — the fact that she and Edward Pickersgill were engaged in an illicit sexual relationship. Using the fact of this illicit sexual relationship as a card in his hand, Edward Pickersgill convinced this

that Edward Pickersgill spent long hours helping comrades to solve problems in their social relationships. As a result, she claims he never had time to attend to his own sexual social relationship with her.

It is true that this pig spent a lot of time poking his nose into other people's affairs. However, he certainly was not solving problems. Rather he was stirring up trouble, creating splits and handing out rotten advice, all the while promoting himself as the best problem solver in the Collective! He even had the audacity to claim personal responsibility for saving several of the comrades' marriages!

Michelle Landriault should stop and think. Is the claim she makes really true? Did Edward Pickersgill really have no time to devote to his own sexual social relationship with the virgin maiden? If so, she should thank her lucky stars that he was so busy interfering in other people's social relationships that he had no time to deal with his own. That is probably one of the few things that the relationship had going for it!

For years Edward Pickersgill has trampled on comrades' personal lives in a vain attempt to consolidate support for his faction. Fearing the united strength of the Collective, he embarked on a program designed to split and disunify the organization.

Edward Pickersgill promoted himself as the best problem solver in the Collective. In fact he was the best problem creator.

While other comrades were out to create problems for the U.S. imperialists and work towards their final overthrow, Edward Pickersgill was working to create problems for the anti-imperialists. Objectively he was standing firmly on the side of U.S. imperialism.

woman that because he shared this secret with her he knew all aspects of her life better than anybody else in the Collective. By this lie, which reduced the comrade's whole revolutionary life to merely a sexual matter, the faction chief convinced her that his distorted view was in fact reality.

This comrade believed that the person who knew about her illicit sexual relationship knew everything about her and that those who did not know about these sexual relations, that is, the rest of the Collective, did not know anything about her. So, this woman clung to Edward Pickersgill's distorted view of herself and rejected all attempts by the other members of the Collective to help her struggle to gain a more balanced view of her strengths and weaknesses.

Now, with new facts on the table, the Collective has been able to look more clearly at the question of this comrade. We have been able to more completely come to know the distortions and the reality.

THIS WOMAN WAS A COMRADE

Edward Pickersgill promoted in the Alive Production Collective that this woman, who he eventually recruited into his faction, originally moved to Guelph from out of town "with terror in her heart". It is true to some extent that she did have terror in her heart later in her life in the Collective. However, this was not the case when she first arrived. In fact, the opposite was the case.

This comrade had travelled a great distance on the basis of the warm relationship she had developed with comrades in Guelph. She came with enthusiasm and ambition in her heart, not "terror".

To come to know something of "terror in the heart", we must ask how this comrade was treated after she arrived in Guelph and what was her reaction to this treatment.

In Guelph, this woman was subjected to Edward Pickersgill's arrogance, spontaneity and ideological distortions as were other