

## A Letter From Edward Pickersgill's Lawyer

January 17, 1979

Dear (supporter's name deleted)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours very truly,  
(Lawyer's name deleted)

## PART NINETEEN

# A Refutation From The Alive Production Collective

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### THE SHARK PLAYS THE SHELL GAME

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

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

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

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

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

the shell game is that the pea is slipped off the table. The pea is under none of the shells.

It is a fact that the Alive Production Collective is structured as a democratic-centralist organization. It has been so structured, in a formally acknowledged pattern, since September, 1973. In the Alive Production Collective democratic-centralism is not an unspoken norm, nor is it a mysterious secret. All members and most supporters of the organization have been aware of this structure for years. The members and supporters have been encouraged to deepen the reality of democratic-centralism and have been living as integral parts of a consciously democratic-centralist structure for years.

It is also a fact that there are more members and supporters of the Alive Production Collective than would be necessary or normal in staffing a magazine such as Alive. If the only program that the Alive Production Collective carried out was the Alive Magazine program, then its members and supporters would be spending a lot of time twiddling their thumbs. That this is not the case is, of course, well known to Edward Pickersgill. This shark attempts to reduce our organization to the level of a staff in a further attempt at theft — an attempt to con revolutionary history away from the revolutionaries. The Alive Production Collective is an anti-imperialist group, structured such that it is not just "able to participate" but that it *does* participate in a wide frame of revolutionary work and organizing.

### OPPOSE THE FACADE OF MARXISM-LENINISM, SUPPORT THE REALITY

It is important that the exposure of Edward Pickersgill's facade, which he has set up under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, be kept distinct from opposition to actual movement in Canada towards an actual Marxist-Leninist party. Opposition to such great developments in their real form would be a bad trend. Opposition to any conjured up mimicry of Marxism-Leninism, as in Edward Pickersgill's August 1 document and his August 18 statement against "complacency", is a good trend.

Edward Pickersgill has assured by his misleadership that many worthwhile revolutionary successes that could have been realized by the Alive Production Collective have not been achieved. This deprivation in ideological development, in political work and in individual people's lives is a form of theft from the revolutionary movement. Acting destructively to anti-imperialism and showing that his way of being "like a fish in the sea" is to be like a shark, Edward Pickersgill viciously preyed on revolutionary people's good will.

Edward Pickersgill has also taken up more straightforward theft. He has directly destroyed successes that have been achieved, so that something which has been in hand at one stage has been gone at another stage. He has stolen political achievements of the Collective, he has stolen personal integrity from certain revolutionary individuals, he has stolen some of the bold anti-imperialist spirit from those who viewed him as a comrade, and he, as a single individual, has stolen material goods and money belonging to our organization.

Edward Pickersgill prided himself on his past experience in the ranks of the lumpen-proletariat, who he refers to as the "street-people". When preening himself in this way he often spoke admiringly about the skilful dishonesty of people on "the streets" where everything is "a con". Dishonesty has been Edward Pickersgill's personal philosophy in the revolutionary ranks where he has pursued the role of a con-man. From the Alive Production Collective alone, Edward Pickersgill embezzled \$18,000 (and that's a minimum figure).

Perpetrators of such destruction and theft are not referred to among the real proletariat by Edward Pickersgill's pet lumpen title: "con-man". They are called sharks.

Ordinary people also use the name "shark" against those who make themselves out to be "experts". It is interesting that one source of much of Edward Pickersgill's self-pride is his perception

that he has great expertise in everything he does.

As Mao Zedong notes: "They are no ordinary fish, but more likely man-eating sharks with sharp teeth — it is these sharks whose fins people eat."

### FACTIONALISM EXPOSED

The battle to expose Edward Pickersgill began on August 18, 1978. That evening the facts of his factionalism, conspiracy and sexual promiscuity inside the Alive Production Collective were revealed to most Collective members for the first time in a document from a leading comrade. The document, entitled "Getting A Point Out On The Table", reported on an August 16, 1978 telephone conversation between the leading comrade and another comrade who had spoken to Michelle Landriault just prior to her running from the Collective. "Getting A Point Out On The Table" is reproduced in full below:

"A few days before she left Michelle spoke with (comrade B). She told (comrade B) there were matters that were weighing heavily on her mind and about which she felt she should speak to someone, despite the fact she had 'been sworn to secrecy'.

"Michelle told (comrade B) that since facts had been revealed to her in January (to other APC members in February) about (comrade I's) pregnancy she had been trying to rebuild with Ed a fruitful relationship which included sexual relations. Michelle told (comrade B) she wanted this rebuilding to succeed very much and that she had been 'working very hard at it'. She told (comrade B) that she and Ed had been having sexual relations again as often as twice a week.

"A matter which she 'could not handle and was leading to the point of a breakdown', she said, was that during the same period of time (between January and the present) Ed and (comrade D) were also having sexual relations. Michelle said this was also as often as two nights a week and she said such relations had happened 'as recently as last Monday' (a week before Michelle left).

"The sexual relations between Ed and (comrade D), Michelle said, had been going on for 'well over a year'. She identified the beginning time as being 'when we all lived at (street address deleted)'. Michelle told (comrade B) that during that time Ed had approached Michelle saying that their sexual relations were on the rocks and asking what she would think if he approached (comrade I) or (comrade D) to ask them to have sexual relations with him. Michelle said that her response was that Ed could go ahead and ask. She also said 'he asked both and both said yes.' This seemed to contradict Ed's report in February that he and (comrade I) had sexual relations since 1975 but Michelle indicated that (comrade I) was approached and said yes first and that (comrade D) was approached simply because she was available."

"Michelle told (comrade B) that the initial meetings concerning (comrade I's) pregnancy were held amongst Ed, Michelle, (comrade I) and (comrade D) because Ed had been having sexual relations with all three women. At that time it was decided that certain matters ((comrade I's) pregnancy, Ed and (comrade I's) sexual relations) 'had to come out' but that other matters (Ed and (comrade D's) sexual relations) should not be made known or else 'they would smash up the Collective.' On that basis the people attending the meetings were 'sworn to secrecy'.

"Michelle also told (comrade B) that when she had first found out about Ed having other sexual relations she had gone to him and told him that if she was 'standing in the way' of an actual relationship she would step aside to allow it to develop. She said that she put this proposal forward honestly and that she meant that she'd step aside only from her relationship with Ed, not from the anti-imperialist work. Michelle told (comrade B) that Ed's response was to say 'nothing will ever stand in the way of me getting what I want.'

"Michelle also told (comrade B) that she had been seriously concerned about Ed making an approach to (comrade G) about having sexual relations with her. This concern came up, she said, when (comrade G) and (comrade H's) separation seemed to be being prolonged and Ed was 'beginning to get quite warm towards her.' Michelle said she felt nothing developed in line with her concerns about (comrade G).

"Michelle told (*comrade B*) that if she ever told the Collective about this, the people concerned would deny everything and that her story would be put down as 'ravings of a mad woman' paranoid after the January revelations. She said this didn't matter since she had evidence of the whole matter. She said she had made xeroxes of something someone had written. She didn't say who or what but she did say (*comrade D*) keeps a very thorough diary.'

"Michelle spoke to (*comrade B*) about two things that she said especially distressed her.

"The first was an awful feeling she had, during the time she was 'working very hard' to rebuild sexual relations with Ed, when 'at three o'clock in the morning some nights' (*comrade D*) would come into their room to go to bed 'obviously coming from that activity'. She coupled this with distress at knowing there were earlier periods of time when Ed was having sexual relations 'with all three of us.'

"The second thing was that in meetings with (*comrade D*), (*comrade I*) and Michelle, Ed had 'rated' these three women on their comparative sexual performance. Michelle told (*comrade B*), Ed's rating had been that (*comrade D*) was 'the best', (*comrade I*) was 'not bad' and Michelle was 'the pits' because all she ever wanted to do was talk about the kids."

The document concluded by pointing out:

"(*Comrade B*) said she didn't report earlier although she was distressed because Michelle said she didn't want (*comrade B*) to do anything. Michelle said she just had to talk to someone and she indicated that she'd do something about it. I didn't report earlier because I hoped that Michelle leaving and Ed's visit to Michelle would give rise to some addressing of the content of (*comrade B*) and Michelle's conversation.

"Obviously, analysis of this conversation, and investigation and analysis of the general facts should be forthcoming from the APC members after this report."

Edward Pickersgill replied to "Getting A Point Out On The Table" by immediately churning out two documents on August 18, 1978 entitled: "An Initial Response To Document By (*Comrade F*)..." and "Regarding The Question Of (*Comrade D*) And Ed".

The first response dealt mainly with the question of (*comrade D's*) diary and acknowledged the truth of (*comrade F's*) report. In the second response, Edward Pickersgill slyly attempted to blame the Collective for his problems by stating: "The line in the Collective that certain social relations (of the sexual kind mainly) were the affair of those concerned made it impossible to deal with this matter (*his promiscuity*) in an open way without bringing up a wider variety of individuals' sexual concerns." He went on to brand the question of these "certain social relations" as "untouchables" and "sacred cows".

This was pure sophistry. The Collective norm is that the practical aspects of members' sexual relations are the affair of those concerned. However, when a problem arises in those relations which negatively affects the Collective or individuals' participation in the anti-imperialist work, then discussion and resolution of the problem is encouraged within the Collective form. A more sinister aspect of the pig's sophistry was revealed later in an attack on (*comrade F*).

A question Edward Pickersgill failed to address was Michelle Landriault's fear that he had "designs" on (*comrade G*). The comrade had to clarify this matter in no uncertain terms herself. She wrote: "I have never had sexual relations with anybody except (*comrade H*) (*her husband*) in the APC. I have never been approached by anybody other than (*comrade H*) to have sexual relations within the APC."

#### THE VICIOUS SLANDERS COMMENCE

Edward Pickersgill followed up his two initial responses to "Getting A Point Out On The Table" with vicious slander. He directed his blows specifically at (*comrade F*) and a supporter of Alive's work. At the same time, he managed to slander the whole Collective. This vile attack was contained in a document released on August 18 entitled: "Stories Exchanged Behind Each Other's Backs

Lead To Conspiracy And Not To The Positive And Progressive Resolution Of Contradictions".

In his document, Edward Pickersgill first attacked (*comrade F*) for holding back with the goods on the pig "to see if Ed would face the facts". He then proceeded to mock the comrade's style of writing "Getting A Point Out On The Table".

First, to wait a couple of days before exposing and criticizing Edward Pickersgill was a correct and sensible policy to follow, especially considering the magnitude of the struggle. In making political criticism, it is absolutely wrong to impetuously launch an attack without weighing and considering all the factors involved. It is also wrong to wildly launch an attack without giving the comrade involved a chance to address his own mistakes.

Second, (*comrade F*) wrote "Getting A Point Out On The Table" away from the central Collective work place because Edward Pickersgill had a habit of reading over comrades' shoulders as they wrote. The comrade did not want to give Edward Pickersgill advance warning of the struggle in this manner and time to prepare a "brilliant defence".

Third, criticism of (*comrade F's*) style of writing his report by hand was nothing more than a petty diversionary tactic. This comrade, along with Edward Pickersgill, was one of the Collective members who often favoured making his views known in his own handwriting. In fact he had waged a defence against Edward Pickersgill in a series of handwritten wall posters just before the August 18 struggle broke open. Furthermore, considering the magnitude of the errors made by Edward Pickersgill, the pig's wailing about handwritten criticism was absurdly trivial!

Edward Pickersgill's sinister thinking was exposed by him, quite out of the blue, contending "for the record" that the struggle was "a matter of contradictions among the people". There was a general understanding that when people outside the Collective used this expression in a struggle against the Collective they were trying to hide what they actually thought — they thought the contradiction was between the enemy and the people and therefore antagonistic. Edward Pickersgill knew of this understanding very well yet he still went ahead and made his statement. This was akin to accusing the Collective of treating the struggle against him as an antagonistic contradiction, a false charge he levelled quite plainly later.

Edward Pickersgill followed up his accusation of antagonistic contradiction with a slander that (*comrade F*) was the "leading proponent in the Collective that these matters (*contradictions arising out of sexual relations*) are not to be dealt with outside of the ranks of those directly concerned".

This was simply lies. (*Comrade F*) had proved in practice over a long period of time that he was one of the most open and helpful people in the Collective when it came to discussing and attempting to resolve contradictions developing out of sexual social relations. Edward Pickersgill, in contrast, absolutely refused to discuss these matters except in the style of making dirty jokes behind a comrade's back. The slander that (*comrade F*) was not open to talking about sexual problems stemmed from his support of a Collective policy on sexual social relations hammered out some years earlier. The content of this policy has been dealt with fully in Part 16 of this issue of Alive.

The pig's slanderous insinuation that (*comrade F*) had engaged in sexual relations with an Alive supporter was most vile. It prompted (*comrade F*) to respond in a document entitled: "Point Of Clarification".

The document stated: "There have not been any sexual relations between myself and (*supporter's name deleted*). Nor has there been a specific mention or special case made of (*supporter's name deleted*) either in practice or in discussions with (*comrade B*). To indicate that this is so is innuendo and slanderous in style against me as an organizer and against those I organize. The only discussion I have had making a specific case of some perceived special relations with (*supporter's name deleted*) was initiated by Ed in recent weeks. At that time Ed said my talking with (*supporter's name deleted*) often made it seem to other people that I was developing something with her to challenge

(comrade B) and my relationship. Ed did say that he knew this was not the real case.

"This warning from Ed came at the same time as both Ed and I warned (comrade E) about making a special case of (supporter's name deleted) at (place name deleted)."

Edward Pickersgill also accused (comrade F) of contrasting himself with the pig in the vein of "Ed's promiscuous, but I'm not" and at the same time "letting sleeping dogs lie" and "hoping for the best" from Edward Pickersgill. This was patently absurd.

In February 1978, after the struggle surrounding exposure of Edward Pickersgill's sexual relationship with (comrade I), comrades wrongly analyzed that sexual promiscuity did not exist inside the Alive Production Collective and that Edward Pickersgill's relation with (comrade I) was monogamous. (Comrade F) was a full participant in making this analysis and fully believed it to be correct. This being the case, (comrade F) contrasting himself with Edward Pickersgill would have been more in the vein of "Ed's not promiscuous, but I am" — quite untrue, and surely a most peculiar statement with which to "assure (comrade B) that he is not and will not follow the same pattern as Ed and have sexual relations with anyone other than (comrade B)!"

As a final touch to his "conspiracy" document, Edward Pickersgill brazenly attacked the whole Collective for engaging in conspiracies. This assertion was utter nonsense! It reflected the pig's deeply ingrained arrogant attitude that because he did something everyone else must also do it. The last thing he would admit was that the things he did were wrong and other comrades just didn't do them!

### PIGGISH ARROGANCE EXPOSED

Edward Pickersgill's next two documents were a continuation and deepening of the lies and innuendo in his "conspiracies" document.

In his August 18 reply to (comrade F's) "Point Of Clarification", the pig attempted to shout his innocence of issuing slanderous innuendo about (comrade F) having sexual relations with an Alive supporter. He then had the gall to accuse (comrade F) of "reacting in a spontaneous fashion by accusing me of producing low-level documents" when the low-level slander and innuendo was as plain as the nose on your face. The point, of course, was that Edward Pickersgill made these slanders to throw the Collective off his scent by attempting to create a loathsome smell around (comrade F). The pig's attempts to isolate (comrade F) in the Collective to protect his own tail were entirely unsuccessful.

Edward Pickersgill's "Final Note For The Day" was simply a putrid pleading of his innocence of any major crimes coupled with development of his thesis that the struggle was one of contradictions among the people. The utter arrogance of the man was displayed in the last paragraph where, after ignoring the content of his own serious crimes, he presumes to teach the Collective a lesson in how to struggle!

Edward Pickersgill left his final stab in the back to the end of "A Final Note For The Day".

His first slogan called for an "intensely progressive assault on bad lines in the leadership". In practice Edward Pickersgill regarded himself as the "leadership" of the Collective and ignored the collective leadership structures. But when it came to criticism of the leadership, he always shifted the focus away from him onto other leading comrades. The August 18 struggle was no exception. By calling for an assault on the leadership Edward Pickersgill was actually calling for an assault on (comrade F) and other leading comrades.

The slogan: "Bombard The Collective Headquarters!" was a bastardization of Chairman Mao's famous big character poster which triggered China's Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Chairman Mao issued the call to "Bombard the Headquarters" of the bourgeois careerist Liu Shaoqi and his cohorts. Edward Pickersgill's call, in contrast, was devoid of any class content or any

specific reference to himself. His pretentious slogan instead called for criticism of all the leading comrades when it was he who was the hidden bourgeois who had committed all the crimes!

The slogan: "Down With All Sacred Cows!" reflected the pig's erroneous contention that his promiscuity was the Collective's fault, not his own. His bankrupt line of "logic" was that his degeneracy emanated from the Collective's "refusal" to discuss sexual problems openly. Absolute rot! Edward Pickersgill alone was responsible for his degenerate behaviour!

"Struggle To Overcome Complacency!" was issued because the Collective made the error of "holding Ed up as the perfect master capable of all good and incapable of weakness" ergo complacency towards his leadership must exist in the ranks. Absolute rot! No one viewed Edward Pickersgill as a "perfect master". Moreover, not only was there no widespread complacency towards his leadership, there was a long history of struggle in the Collective against his misleadership!

The final slogan was interesting. Here Edward Pickersgill parroted the call for a "new Long March" towards modernization in China by calling for a "new Long March" by the Alive Production Collective. In China the "new Long March" called for recently was preceded by an old "Long March" in the 1930's. The Collective, however, hadn't even made an "old Long March" before Edward Pickersgill called for a "new" one!

In contrast to Edward Pickersgill's arrogance, a reformed member of his faction wrote a document on August 18 which put forward an honest position on her involvement in social degeneracy.

She wrote in part: "I feel quite relieved that other members of the Collective now know something about the sexual relations between Ed and I in the past year. I have been quite mixed up about the question of whether the relationship was right or wrong. It should certainly be helpful to me to have this question in the picture as we sort out questions of the life of the Collective at this time and I think it should be helpful to other members too...."

"I think it will be good to have some discussion on sexual matters now and I agree that I have problems to sort out on this front in order to carry forward better as an anti-imperialist revolutionary."

The comrade later wrote, on August 19: "On the question of my sexual relations with Ed: I think that it was wrong for me to have sexual relations with Ed. It has taken me a long time to say this and even yet I don't think I really grasp how wrong it was. I have a tendency to feel defensive about the whole thing, which I will have to struggle against. From reading through the documents today, I can see a lot better that the attitude towards sex which I have developed in this society is too easy-going and leads to degeneracy. My intention was *not* to hurt Ed and Michelle's relationship which I perceived to be quite strong except for the sexual aspect. Obviously my assumption that I could have sexual relations with Ed and yet not harm Ed and Michelle's overall relationship was stupid and naive, to say the least. All through this relationship that I had with Ed I wondered whether it was right or wrong but I always let myself off the hook with rationalizations. It was wrong not to face up to my responsibility in that situation. It would certainly be helpful to me now if people would pay some attention to the errors that I made." (For a more in-depth account of this woman's participation in Edward Pickersgill's faction see Part 20 of this issue of Alive, entitled "Testimony From A Reformed Factionalist".)

### THE BARRAGE OF SLANDER CONTINUES

Edward Pickersgill opened his written barrage on August 19, 1978 with a further "couple of points" to defend his "good name" and attack (comrade F).

Many of the points in this wriggling attempt to avoid blame for innuendo have been dealt with already. It is interesting to note, however, that while the pig whined about his innocence in not stooping to innuendo and slander in bringing the name of one Alive supporter into the struggle, he continually dragged another Alive

supporter's name forward into the mud. Self-exposure is indeed the very best kind of exposure!

Sickened by Edward Pickersgill's vicious attacks and efforts to avoid blame for his crimes, Collective members joined the writing battle in earnest on August 19.

One comrade, in his first written statement, pointed out: "I for one am glad the news has come. If hasty judgements are made as a result of (comrade F's) document ('Getting A Point Out On The Table') I don't think this is a bad thing. Discussion will sort inaccuracies out. If people are only allowed to perceive a given set of facts then they must judge from those facts. If some facts remain hidden and are then introduced, then to me it is a case of crying over spilt milk. The point in this case is that the story had to come out sooner or later. That there was a reluctance to tell it demonstrated to me that there was a reluctance to come to terms with the situation. I would seriously suggest to Edward Pickersgill that if he is sincere about his errors and wishes to rectify them, he should tell all and undergo criticism/self-criticism. In other words follow the course he himself has expounded to the membership of the Collective on many occasions.

"A final point on this brief note: I would suggest Edward Pickersgill that you set your own house in order before launching attacks against conspiracies (comrade F) may or may not be engaged in. Your document of last night (August 18) (the "conspiracies" document) coming after the other two in which you responded to (comrade F's) news sounds most peculiar and leaves a rather sour taste in the throat." The comrade concluded by essentially pointing out the hypocrisy of Edward Pickersgill levelling charges of immoral activity at (comrade F) when he himself was guilty of participating in his "innovative 3-in-1 committee" (the "sex rating committee").

Edward Pickersgill responded to this sharp criticism by releasing his arrogant "Response To (Comrade C's) First Statement — Aug. 19/78".

First, the pig pontificated against "hasty judgements" and for class struggle in sorting out this "contradiction among the people" when the exact thing that Collective members had been waging against his rotten lines was intense class struggle.

Second, when his own guilt was staring him in the face he once again tolled the same old bell of blaming all his troubles on the Collective and its norms for dealing with "social/sexual relations".

Third, he indicated that launching attacks on innocent comrades was "part and parcel of setting my own house in order".

Fourth, he accused (comrade F) of promoting "morbidity" and "lack of enthusiasm" when he courageously exposed Edward Pickersgill on August 18, 1978.

Fifth, he denied all knowledge of his sexual rating of the women in his faction based on their performance in bed, despite the fact that this information came from his "dearly beloved" hard core factionalist partner Michelle Landriault.

Sixth, he peppered his scribblings with the most fawning cries of sincerity in making his criticisms and self-criticisms. Then he had the nerve to turn around and ask comrades who had been demanding that he "tell all" whether they were interested "in hearing all"!

Edward Pickersgill's arrogance knew no bounds!

A woman comrade summed up his reactionary behaviour up to this point in an incisive document written on August 19. She pointed out:

"Mao Zedong teaches on the question of criticism and self-criticism:

"To check up regularly on our work and in the process develop a democratic style of work, to fear neither criticism nor self-criticism, and to apply such good popular Chinese maxims as "Say all you know and say it without reserve", "Blame not the speaker but be warned by his words" and "Correct mistakes if you have committed them and guard against them if you have not" — this is the only effective way to prevent all kinds of political dust and germs from contaminating the minds of our comrades and the body

of our Party.'

"To date, Edward Pickersgill's documents can be basically characterized as an attempt to blame the speaker and ignore his words. Whether or not (comrade F) has made errors in the way in which he has presented this information is a question of very little significance when compared with the content of the information and its ramifications in terms of our political work. I do not agree with the criticisms of (comrade F) made by Edward Pickersgill. But more importantly I think they are of little significance at this point. Questions which actually have to be looked at are questions such as the conspiracy involving Edward Pickersgill, Michelle Landriault, (comrade I) and (comrade D); the question of leadership within the Collective; the contempt with which the members of the Collective have been treated by Edward Pickersgill; the effect this cultural degeneracy has had on our overall political work as an anti-imperialist cultural organization, etc.

"I am interested in actually dealing with these questions. I am not interested in any attempts to reduce this important political question to the level of a dogfight between Edward Pickersgill and (comrade F). Any attempts to do this are simply an attempt to avoid the actual issues at hand. This is not a question simply of sexual degeneracy and should not be treated as such. As I have outlined above the actual questions which must be looked at concern the whole political life of the Collective."

Edward Pickersgill chose to ignore this document.

The pig chose instead to post his version of a verbal exchange between himself and (comrade F) during lunch at the main Collective work place on August 19. The version was entitled: "Some Thoughts Regarding Accusations Which (Comrade F) Levelled At Me..."

In a written comment added on the bottom of the original of this document (comrade F) indicated that he had not said that Edward Pickersgill was "doing a good job of putting one over on the comrades of the Collective". But he had said that Edward Pickersgill was trying to do a good job of putting one over on the comrades. The two statements are quite different. The first implies some success whereas the second implies an attempt to have success. In fact, as this issue of Alive proves, Edward Pickersgill had no success whatever in "putting one over on the comrades of the Collective".

The twisting lies of Edward Pickersgill were once again exposed.

#### "THE BOURGEOISIE MADE ME DO IT"

On the afternoon of August 19, some questions were posed to Edward Pickersgill by a leading comrade who had been sent to visit (comrade I) — a member of the faction who Edward Pickersgill had thrown out of the Collective some months earlier. The questions were as follows:

"Why was it that I was told to visit (comrade I) in (place name deleted) by you to check out her situation and possibility of her return to the Collective unarmed with the full knowledge of the conspiracy of silence surrounding your relations with (comrade I), (comrade D) and Michelle? Why was I sent on a mission with a half-cocked gun? Why was I not trusted to the extent that I was only half informed of the circumstances of the case? Why was I treated with utter contempt by you? Why was (comrade I) treated with utter contempt by you? Why was the Collective treated with utter contempt by you?"

Edward Pickersgill's answer to these questions was contained in the first part of his "Response To Two Documents By (Comrade J) Asking Questions Of Me".

This document was a classic example of Edward Pickersgill desperately trying to avoid an issue by making a big play on words and definitions using his favourite weaponry: a bourgeois dictionary. Not to be outdone, (comrade J) decided to outplay Edward Pickersgill at his own game and responded with a document entitled: "Clarification Of The Circumstances Surrounding My Visiting (Comrade I) in (Place Name Deleted)". It stated:

"There seems to be some contention about my use of the word 'told' in the question addressed to Edward Pickersgill 'Why was I

told....' One dictionary definition of the word 'told' is: 'communicated by speech or writing; expressed with words'. In this sense I was 'told' to visit (*comrade I*) in (*Place Name Deleted*). Another dictionary definition of the word 'told' is: 'commanded'. In this sense I was not 'told' to visit (*comrade I*). For the record I am quite willing to accept the word 'asked'. It is accurate.

"The decision-making process — Ed initiated the idea that I should attempt to contact (*comrade I*) during the course of a Lu Hsun Unit meeting. It is my recollection that Edward Pickersgill, (*comrade J*) and (*comrade F*) were involved in the final decision-making process of okaying the visit.

"The reasons put forward for my making the visit as indicated by Edward Pickersgill in his 'Response To Two Documents By (*Comrade J*)....' are accurate as they stand in Edward Pickersgill's document. I agreed with them at the point they were put forward.

"What I fail to understand is what 'threads of discussion' of 'relevance to (*comrade I's*) situation' could I possibly pick up in (*place name deleted*) coming out of discussions I had with her prior to her leaving, when, in the light of recent revelations, those very discussions were nothing more than a joke with me in the position of clown. Why do I say such discussions were a joke? Because I entered into them with only half the facts, tried to come to understand (*comrade I's*) situation with only half the facts, and tried to assist (*comrade I*) with only half the facts. If (*comrade I*) had adopted the attitude of what are you bothering to help me for, you're just a clown, what the hell do you know — I could understand that. She'd be right. What the hell did I know — only half the story. To allow me to enter discussions with (*comrade I*) under those circumstances in Guelph, knowing what you knew at the time Ed, I contend demonstrates utter contempt for me, (*comrade I*) and the whole Collective.

"Allowing me to enter in the discussion with (*comrade I*) in (*place name deleted*) under the circumstances under which I entered them, to me, is merely compounding the error. Send off the fool to try and understand and deal with a situation which, without full knowledge of all the facts, was impossible — ridiculous, hopeless, callous and utterly contemptible.

"You take issue with my use of the word 'utter'. Think on this. What if (*comrade I*) had spilled the beans? What if I had come upon this knowledge in the situation I was in over the past month — (*number deleted*) miles away from the Collective — and freaked out? Doesn't permitting me to embark on a mission where that could have happened, knowing what you knew, demonstrate utter contempt for a comrade? I contend that it does. If I had come upon the recent revelations in (*place name deleted*) and freaked out, there would have been one member of the Lu Hsun Unit down the tubes. Doesn't permitting me to go out on a mission without full knowledge of the situation in which there was a danger that an active member of the Collective could go down the tubes, and knowing what you knew of the situation, constitute utter contempt for the Collective. I contend that it does — utter contempt!"

Edward Pickersgill didn't deign to answer this document until August 20, 1978.

A second note that (*comrade J*) posted on August 19 posed the question to Edward Pickersgill: "The point in (*comrade F's*) document about rating (*comrade D*), (*comrade I*) and Michelle Landriault on their sexual performance — is this true or false? Did you make the rating in the '3-in-1 committee'? Please explain."

The pig's answer to this question was a masterful attempt to prove his innocence by passing the buck. In the second part of his document "Response To Two Documents By (*Comrade J*)....", Edward Pickersgill first "clarified" that his sexual rating was the "method of rating by the bourgeoisie". He then went on to state that: "In all honesty I did not offer that forward as my own 'rating', leaving the reader wondering which nameless bourgeois did make up the rating! This metaphysical garbage was Edward Pickersgill's method of avoiding blame for his crimes by pleading: "the bourgeoisie made me do it."

## EDWARD PICKERSGILL CHARGED AS A FACTIONALIST

The charge of factionalism was laid against Edward Pickersgill in writing on August 19, 1978 in a document entitled: "Let's Stop Beating Around The Bush And Get To The Political Questions At Hand".

The comrade who wrote the document started by pointing out that the political question at hand was that Edward Pickersgill for a long time had been engaging in degenerate sexual relations which negatively influenced his leadership in the Alive Production Collective. He added: "You have taken liberties with women comrades outside the acceptable social norms of society and truly unbecoming a progressive person. That they may or may not have enjoyed this type of activity is not the issue and your ... having these relations with such a *laissez faire* ... attitude is wrong."

The comrade went on to suggest that: "if you want to discuss this matter," why, "don't you go knocking door-to-door and solicit opinions from the masses. They seem to have a few ideas about social/sexual relations."

He continued: "Herein I charge you with the following and wish to hear your response.

"You have instigated a conspiracy in this Collective. This is a faction. In political terms it is often called factionalism. It is inexcusable. The only possible excuse that you could utter is that you did this for the benefit of the Collective and did not want to see it break up. Phooey! Who cares? The breakup of the Collective has occurred before and undoubtedly will happen again. I resent cliques. I most of all hate being used and made a fool of. You have lied to the Collective about promiscuity and taken on airs when the question ... came up over the relationship you had with (*comrade I*), by stating that these affairs concerned those involved and nobody else when you have been a leader in meddling in the social/sexual affairs of all members of the Collective.... You have appeared as a model in social/sexual relations and given nothing but contempt to those who have approached you about these relations. The evidence itself is outstanding — that of the '1 and 3 committee' only '1 and 1' remain, as members of the APC.

"Your role in leadership is in question. To this point you have written a couple of documents merely acknowledging your own degeneracy and then started in on another leading comrade.... You should look at your leadership role.... You're on centre stage for this one. Your actions have placed you there."

Edward Pickersgill responded to these charges in a document entitled: "Response To (*Comrade C's*) Document 'Let's Stop Beating Around The Bush....'" This document was priceless in that Edward Pickersgill ignored the first part of (*comrade C's*) document and then attempted to disprove two of the subsequent major points, and all in the spirit of: "I am in agreement with most of the points put forward in this document!"

(*Comrade C*) accused Edward Pickersgill of treating his document lightly. He stated: "You missed out a whole opening paragraph and I very much want to hear your views. Merely reading down a charge sheet won't do by saying 'I'm guilty', or 'inexcusable'."

In the remainder of his reply, (*comrade C*) contended that the Alive Production Collective was broken up in 1975 (Edward Pickersgill refused to admit that he broke the Collective up in this year at the insistence of the Bainzites).

He went on to point out: "You seem to be misinterpreting my witticism on the '1 and 3' and the 'innovative 3-in-one'. These are my terms for your faction. It is a case that Michelle Landriault is not here. (*Comrade I's*) case is almost academic and your own vocal opinion within the last few weeks is that (*comrade I*) is 'incurable'. (*Comrade I's*) and Michelle Landriault's leaving are coloured by your clique and leadership...."

Edward Pickersgill's response to (*comrade C's*) accusation that he had treated the comrade's charges lightly was contained in "Further To Exchange With (*Comrade C*) Regarding Stopping Beating Around The Bush".

This document, apart from its general superficiality and echoing

of (*comrade C's*) words, contained a most reactionary assertion. In it Edward Pickersgill openly stated: "It would be wrong however to take the position that the masses to whom you refer have an advanced consciousness on this matter (*sexual promiscuity*). They, too, are overwhelmed by the ideas and views of the bourgeois society and the Trotskyite vermin who serve it."

What brazen contempt for the working masses! Here was the supposed leader of a revolutionary organization saying that the masses embrace sexual promiscuity and are overwhelmed by the ideas of the "Trotskyite vermin" who serve the bourgeoisie! No! Absolutely not! The broad masses are disgusted by the sexual promiscuity promoted by the bourgeoisie. And they spit on the "Trotskyite vermin" whenever they dare to show their faces. It was Edward Pickersgill who embraced bourgeois social degeneracy and who danced to the tune of the "Trotskyite vermin".

## REJECTION OF EDWARD PICKERSGILL'S MISLEADERSHIP

During the course of August 19, 1978 a number of comrades stepped forward verbally and in writing to reject Edward Pickersgill's misleadership. This amounted to formalizing the rejection which had taken place in practice since "Getting A Point Out On The Table" was posted on August 18.

One comrade put the charges against Edward Pickersgill and rejection of his misleadership most graphically in a document entitled: "Some Of My Opinions On The Present Situation". He wrote:

"The main point I want to bring up is that ordinary members of the Collective have been lied to and treated with utter contempt under the auspices of democratic centralism. To explain — when it was revealed to the ordinary members of the Collective that (*comrade I*) was pregnant by Ed, we struggled hard to grasp the situation and come to an understanding which was acceptable to us in terms of our own views on the world. My perception was that the monogamous relationship between Ed and Michelle had deteriorated irretrievably and that it had been superceded by a new monogamous relationship with (*comrade I*). I could accept this in terms of my own position on special relationships between two people, i.e. that such relationships should be monogamous and principled.

"At that time, as part of our investigation into whether there was widespread promiscuity in the Collective, it was asked whether any other 'secret' sexual relationships were in effect which would support the idea of widespread promiscuity. The answer all round was NO. Thus as far as I and the majority of people in the Collective could determine, there was no concern on that front.

"In light of the admission by Ed that (*comrade F's*) document is essentially true, I must analyze why I and other members of the Collective had been lied to earlier this year, and what kind of political leadership have we been getting.

"A situation where one man has several sexual partners cannot be described as anything other than total degeneracy and is totally unacceptable in an anti-imperialist organization.

"A situation where four members of our Collective vow to keep secret an aspect of their lives which cannot be reconciled with the norms of the Collective shows utter contempt for the other members of the Collective and their ability to determine what kind of organization they belong to.

"A situation where the leading member of the APC is fully aware of this conspiracy and does not bring it to the 'leadership unit' or the Collective members for discussion and resolution shows an unwillingness to tackle what is clearly a problem in the Collective and a lack of confidence in the democratic centralist structures of the Collective to resolve such problems.

"That the question of (*comrade I's*) pregnancy was treated so seriously in terms of being a potential threat to the Collective's future existence, and that a similar yet worse situation was allowed to develop once again WITH THE LEADING MEMBER AT ITS CENTRE, seriously damages my respect for this individual and my

capacity to accept leadership from him in the future....

"My commitment is still to anti-imperialist revolution in Canada and I intend to participate in the struggle to build a worthwhile anti-imperialist movement in Canada!"

To this fighting document, Edward Pickersgill responded with a plea of wide-eyed innocence. "I was never asked the question: Were there any other 'secret' sexual relationships in effect which would support the idea of widespread sexual promiscuity in the Collective?", the pig wailed in his document "A Question I Would Like To Ask Of (*Comrade H*) Or Others". The comrades gave him his answer.

One comrade bluntly stated in writing: "The question was asked in front of (*comrade D*) and (*comrade I*) as we the membership tried to determine if your relationship was a good thing with (*comrade I*) or not. Was the relationship promiscuous or not? For most of this discussion you were consciously absent. (*Comrade F*) had a lot of discussion and presented Marxist-Leninist documents to read on the questions of monogamy and promiscuity. You did receive reports of our discussions and you were at the table when we ... recognized no promiscuity was evident. You took (*comrade J*) to task for wanting to know more of the details quite pompously saying that they weren't the issue. Your faction gave no evidence to the contrary. But the main reason I'm writing this reply is that even if you had been asked point blank you would have continued in your cover-up. I think your query is classic selective memory."

Commenting on the faction's refusal to admit to sexual promiscuity, (*comrade H*) noted: "Whichever way you look at it, those who did not put forward the evidence they had at hand laid the sandy foundation for the present situation. Those who posed the questions of whether promiscuity existed in the Collective, in my opinion, did as thorough an investigation of the facts as they could, given the conspiracy against them, and cannot be blamed for not fighting the degeneracy which was taking place unknown to them. I for one am not going to spend my energies struggling against a problem which I do not face, or think I do not face. Obviously the struggle which should have been waged at that time must be waged in the present, in light of the recent revelations...."

The essence of Edward Pickersgill's reactionary manoeuvrings were captured in a document written by a relatively new Collective member. The comrade stated to Edward Pickersgill:

"The facts outlining your rotten, degenerate line on women are shocking. This type of practice is unbecoming any human being let alone the leader of a political collective which upholds the spirit of Norman Bethune and Lu Hsun in its work.

"The question of social degeneracy, however, is *not* the main issue. And we should stick to the main issue in examining this matter. As Chairman Mao wrote: 'There are many contradictions in the process of development of a complex thing, and one of them is necessarily the principal contradiction whose existence and development determine or influence the existence and development of the other contradictions.'

"I've been involved in this work for a relatively short time. In that time I've struggled to achieve honesty in my participation in the Collective. I've not always succeeded in achieving this honesty, since, as you well know, I am prone to falling into the petty bourgeois pit of trying to 'save face'. I have learned, though, that honesty is a prerequisite for actual transformation. Self-criticism is the first step, and self-criticism must be sincere and honest.

"Your conscious cover-up of the facts in this matter is overwhelmingly dishonest. This is the main issue. Why didn't you unite with the majority of people in the Collective in this matter? Why didn't you unite with the 'second-in-command' in the Collective? If you had the least bit of sentiment to principledly resolve this matter, why didn't you ask (*comrade F*) for some advice? Why did you instead intrigue and conspire?

"At one point during the high tide of the mini-cultural revolution you asked me if I felt ashamed by an error I had made. I panically replied 'no'. You directed me to the dictionary definition of the word 'ashamed', and I learned that indeed it was correct for me to be

ashamed at my mistake.

"I ask you now Ed: Have you no shame?"

## REACTIONARY LAST STAND BEFORE TURNING INTO A WOOD LOUSE

In his document entitled: "Further Clarification Of Some Points Made In My Document Of Today In 'Response To (Comrade C's) First Statement,'" Edward Pickersgill made the point that (*comrade F*) in releasing "Getting A Point Out On The Table" did not follow democratic centralism. This charge was entirely unwarranted. The comrade followed democratic centralism by showing his report to the pig. Edward Pickersgill was the only person in the Collective above (*comrade F*) in authority and the only person to whom (*comrade F*) had a responsibility to show the report before putting it into general circulation.

The only other point worth commenting on in Edward Pickersgill's turgid "Further Clarification...." was contained in the last paragraph. Here the pig states in effect that he will transform his degenerate social practice but the Collective will toss him out anyway because it is a fascist organization. Or, alternatively, he won't transform. Either way Edward Pickersgill's position was incredibly reactionary!

In the August 19 document "After A Brief Conversation With (*Comrade B*)" Edward Pickersgill again re-iterated his earlier point that it was the bourgeois society, not him, that was responsible for the burden of his errors. In a revolutionary organization like the Alive Production Collective it is taken as a known fact that the bourgeois influence on comrades is at the roots of their bad lines. To put forward that position, solely, as self-criticism or as absolution from individual responsibility has never been acceptable inside the Collective. Edward Pickersgill knew this yet he persisted in sticking to that position which essentially stated: "We'll have to overthrow the bourgeoisie before I give up social degeneracy."

Edward Pickersgill's "After A Brief Conversation...." document also gave evidence that he was going insane.

He stated quite categorically that he issued his original document outlining (*comrade I's*) pregnancy and his role as the father "in the early stages of our mini-cultural revolution". Utter rot! He made the comrade pregnant in the early stages of the Mini-Cultural Revolution, but he didn't own up to the fact until the end of the "high tide" of the Mini-Cultural Revolution in February 1978.

The comment about issuing "my original document on the question of (*comrade I*) ... a bit carelessly" was a gem. Comrades simply refused to believe that Edward Pickersgill had started his sexual relationship with (*comrade I*) during the Mini-Cultural Revolution, it was just too outrageous. When the pig issued his second document indicating that the relationship began in 1975, it was just as outrageous but a little more believable. However, contrary to what Edward Pickersgill stated, comrades believed the whole affair to be very serious no matter when it began.

Edward Pickersgill's question: "Is three worse than two?" was also interesting. It is the Collective's position that any form or amount of sexual promiscuity is politically incorrect and socially unacceptable. Five, ten, fifty and five hundred are, of course, worsening degrees of sexual promiscuity but that is not the point. Sexual promiscuity is wrong, period!

"That Collective members did not know the full extent of (*Edward Pickersgill's social degeneracy*) is not a rationale for letting the matter slide in the hope that it would go away", was another completely invalid point. When the struggle to come to grips with (*comrade I's*) pregnancy, and the reasons for it, broke out in February 1978, Collective members expressly indicated on a number of occasions that answers were required to two questions: What effect, if any, did this relationship have on the political work of the Collective, and was sexual promiscuity widespread in the Collective? We further stated that if the answer to the first question was "none" and the answer to the second was "no", then the matter would be dropped. The factionalists gave these answers

and the matter was dropped. The mistake the Collective made was believing Edward Pickersgill and his factionalist cohorts. When the pig makes his statement, "it is my view that the current outrage should have been launched in the January-February period," we can only reply that it would have been if Edward Pickersgill and his factionalist friends had owned up to the full extent of their sexual promiscuity!

A final point on the question of Edward Pickersgill going nuts. It was interesting to note that the pig stated in his "After A Brief Conversation...." document that: "My criticism/self-criticism campaign will and must continue to deal with my errors but it must not be permitted to become a religious self-confession in which I blame myself for every sin under the sun in order to spare myself from the wrath of the priest." Then, in his very next document, he began to sickeningly flagellate himself for acting like an "armadillo type insect"!

## A WOOD LOUSE ENTERS THE STORY

Self-flagellation is no substitute for self-criticism. The Alive Production Collective has a norm opposing those "self-criticisms" which pile one vile epithet upon another under the slogan "Oh, what a rotten person I am." Edward Pickersgill's August 19, 1978 (Early Evening) document breaks this norm in a big way.

At this point in the struggle comrades were asking Edward Pickersgill to present concrete information about his factional mistakes. He responded by whipping himself with the well-known epithet "running dog", followed by an obscure epithet referring to a little insect "which resembles an armadillo" (the wood louse). Running dogs, armadillos and wood lice — Edward Pickersgill's document is more like a Dr. Dolittle story than a self-criticism by the "leader" of a revolutionary organization.

A comrade commented on this "wood louse" document the following day. He wrote: "Ed, I don't think you are an insect. You are a human being. You are being attacked by your comrades for the benefit of the Collective and more importantly for the benefit of anti-imperialist politics. You have attempted to conjure up a smokescreen. It is good that you now recognize this. I have no doubt that there will be other smokescreens. In this you or anyone else will be opposed."

"I sincerely await more meaty documents from you dealing with your leadership role and your degenerate experience. It just won't do to acknowledge the fact that you have engaged in this activity. I am interested in the who, what, when, where, why of the situation. It is not important to consider giving a 'leadership' view or a 'writer's' view. What is needed is your view."

The "meatiness" of the document was an issue at the time it was written. Following its posting on August 19, Edward Pickersgill plunked himself down in front of a TV and wasted away the rest of the evening. The more perceptive comrades raised the possibility that Edward Pickersgill was self-flagellating himself merely in order to get the Collective "off his back" for a few hours. Facts bear this analysis out.

Edward Pickersgill was quite aware of the errors he was making on August 18 and 19, 1978. He describes them with some precision in this document. He says it is "an obvious fact" that he is engaged in these disruptive activities. Yet, he never transformed. He states that rather than concentrating on his mistakes he attempted to snow Collective members under with "words, words & more words". The very next day he churned out volumes of words which persisted in failing to address the facts of his mistakes.

Edward Pickersgill was conscious of his errors in the struggle. He also consciously refused to transform. One can't but conclude, then, that he made these errors deliberately.

Perhaps the key point of this document is that Edward Pickersgill was preparing the scene for his exit from the Collective. "The possibility of the re-education" of an honest comrade is never a question; such a possibility always exists, and as long as the comrade remains honest in the struggle to transform, success is



achieved. Edward Pickersgill, though, is pointing to his own dishonesty and his contempt for the Collective when he raises the issue that re-education may not be possible in his case.

### "I AM THOROUGHLY UNCONVINCED BY YOUR SINCERITY"

Edward Pickersgill's document of August 19, titled "Response To (Comrade J's) Document 'Clarification Of The Circumstances Surrounding My Visiting (Comrade I) In (Place Name Deleted)', was the subject of a pointed comment on August 20. (Comrade J) wrote: "Ed: While your response to my document indicates some willingness on your part to face up to the abysmal way you have abused the Collective during the course of the development of the sexual relations with (comrade I), and (comrade D), the conspiracy of silence that ensued involving the faction of yourself, (comrade D), (comrade I) and Michelle Landriault, the repeated lying and manoeuvring in which you have engaged to avoid facing these issues and to facilitate pursual of your abnormal sexual relations, and the contemptible way in which you have attempted to shift the focus of the struggle away from yourself onto (comrade F) by means of a vile campaign of slander and innuendo involving (comrade F), (comrade B) and some of our external contacts — I ADMIT FREELY AND OPENLY THAT AS YET I AM THOROUGHLY UNCONVINCED OF YOUR SINCERITY."

(Comrade J) went on to examine that section of the document in which Edward Pickersgill arrogantly proclaims, "My comrades are beginning to achieve success in getting to the roots of my errors." The question is, if Edward Pickersgill was so conscious of the roots of his errors that he could presume to coach the other comrades, why didn't he lead in the struggle?

(Comrade J) stated: "Nowhere in the document is there any indication of your willingness to lead in exposing the roots of your errors. Instead there is intimation that it is the Collective's responsibility entirely to expose the surface reflections and the roots. At the risk of sounding cynical I want to emphasize that I do not consider this present struggle to be some kind of test with the Collective receiving a Bachelor's of Investigation at the end of it. You must start taking the lead in exposing the roots of your errors. You must start taking the lead in exposing the surface reflections of those roots. Otherwise transformation of your rotten social practice will prove impossible."

Edward Pickersgill's document ends with a promise to expand upon (comrade J's) criticisms of him "in a useful fashion to the Collective". This was never done!

### A CLEAR CONSCIOUSNESS OF MISTAKES MADE

How conscious was Edward Pickersgill of the disruptive tactics he was employing on August 18 and 19, 1978? The answer is: entirely conscious. In his document of August 19 titled, "Re (Comrade C's) Reply To Ed's Question Arising From (Comrade H's) Note", he states: "I believe that I have been heading towards unleashing a 'moralistic, historical recounting of events and sad situations which so-called justify errors for which there is no justification'. Exactly! And he continued to head in this direction in the days and weeks that followed. Although he was conscious of his mistakes, he continued to make them.

Edward Pickersgill gave the Collective this timely advice: "I encourage my comrades not to wait for me to achieve success. Now that the ball is rolling push harder." This is exactly what we did. Edward Pickersgill had no intention of achieving success in the struggle to transform. All his analytical words of self-criticism never manifested themselves in his practice.

On August 20 a comrade commented on yet another of Edward Pickersgill's lofty pronouncements. (Comrade C) stated: "Given that this note was first seen by me at approximately 7 p.m. on Saturday evening, August 19, and that you have introduced no 'new evidence on the charges of my treating my comrades with utter contempt' to

this point, 1:35 p.m., Sunday August 20, I again question your sincerity." This questioning was entirely legitimate. Although Edward Pickersgill made reference to this promise in the documents he wrote on August 20, in practice he continued to treat the Collective and its members with utter contempt. This contempt was at the core of his degeneracy, factionalism and misleadership. It led him to run away from struggle rather than honestly work to transform.

(Comrade C) also incisively pointed out: "I know I am on the right track. I would be interested in hearing what you think is the 'correct track'. You appear to be coaching me and I don't think you know where the end zone is."

### EDWARD PICKERSGILL TRIES AND FAILS AGAIN

Even in the face of his own serious political errors, Edward Pickersgill continued to presume that he could teach the comrades in the Collective a thing or two. The opening paragraph of his August 20 document "Regarding (Comrade C's) August 20 Document Continuing The Exchange Re. Beating Around The Bush" is an excellent example of this. He might as well have pontificated on a subject he knew better than he knew Collective history — for example, professional ice hockey — because it would have been equally applicable to the issue at hand: his lack of honesty in approaching his mistakes. This cocky, condescending attitude was never checked and it led him to leave the Collective a short time later.

The logic and practice of people like Edward Pickersgill very well may be "try, fail, try, (sic) again, fail again until success is achieved." However Mao Zedong is completely misquoted by this petty demagogue. In his essay "Cast Away Illusions, Prepare For Struggle" Chairman Mao stated: "How different is the logic of the imperialists from that of the people! Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again ... till their doom; that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people's cause, and they will never go against this logic. This is a Marxist law. When we say 'imperialism is ferocious', we mean that its nature will never change, that the imperialists will never lay down their butcher knives, that they will never become Buddhas, till their doom.

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

"Classes struggle, some classes triumph, others are eliminated. Such is history, such is the history of civilization for thousands of years. To interpret history from this viewpoint is historical materialism; standing in opposition to this viewpoint is historical idealism.

"The method of self-criticism can be applied only within the ranks of the people; it is impossible to persuade the imperialists and the Chinese reactionaries to show kindness of heart and turn from their evil ways."

Where Chairman Mao describes the people's struggle with the word "fight", Edward Pickersgill uses the word "try". Where Chairman Mao says "fight again ... till their victory", Edward Pickersgill says "fail again until success is achieved." Edward Pickersgill certainly has a mixed up conception of the logic of the people. This wrong idea came from Edward Pickersgill's own social practice where, in one sense, the people's failure indeed led to his personal success as he worked to sabotage Alive's anti-imperialist program.

As in other documents Edward Pickersgill indicated his sharp consciousness of the effects of factionalism. He states, "The whole situation has resulted in a massive air mistrust (sic) and that very mistrust has played a role in the continuing conspiracy." To be aware of this factional cancer in the Collective and yet allow it to continue unchecked is downright criminal!

One thing about factions is that they always put their own

narrow interests above all else. Edward Pickersgill reveals this in so many words when he says that concern for the existence of the Collective was *not* the major reason why he decided to keep his faction's activities secret. He self-righteously says, "I have never been committed to the continued existence of the Collective or the Magazine, come what may and no matter what."

What Edward Pickersgill is actually getting at is that he had never supported the Collective's politics and organizational discipline, nor did he plan on starting to do so.

Edward Pickersgill goes on to state that "despite a fairly strong reluctance on our part in practice, we must face the responsibility to move forward into the posture of being acknowledged Communist revolutionaries — Marxist-Leninists." His faulty premise is that some Collective members' participation in a collectivized finance system somehow makes us "communists". In reality, there is much more to building a Marxist-Leninist organization than collectively organizing a group's financial resources to serve the political work.

There is no contradiction between our collectivized finance system and our basic political principles. In terms of our revolutionary lifestyle, we have developed numerous norms of behaviour to guide our conduct. Edward Pickersgill denies these facts in order to deny his own mistakes. He has in mind to excuse his errors by placing the blame on defects in the organizational structure of the Alive Production Collective. This line of argument is entirely fallacious.

The Alive Production Collective upholds Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought as the guiding beacon for its anti-imperialist revolutionary work. We must strive to apply this revolutionary theory to our practical work. Still, as yet our work is relatively unadvanced. In Canada as a whole, there is no genuine party of the proletariat.

Mao Zedong directed, "Discover the truth through practice, and again through practice verify and develop the truth." This is the process the Alive Production Collective undertakes in doing anti-imperialist revolutionary work. Today our organization's practical work is relatively undeveloped and our grasp of revolutionary theory is relatively weak. We must work hard to build up our revolutionary theory on the one hand and our revolutionary social practice on the other, and to make sure there is a balance between the two. Until we achieve success in this regard we can call ourselves anything we want, but one thing for sure is that we won't be Marxist-Leninists.

There are numerous outright lies and other wrong lines of reasoning throughout this August 20 document. The reader will note that many have been exposed in other sections of this issue of Alive. For example, Edward Pickersgill makes a big deal about denying that he ever had "sexual relations with three women at once, or even during the same periods". He also states that it has always been a case of Michelle Landriault and one other woman. These are outright lies. Part 20 of this issue of Alive provides convincing proof of this.

What's interesting in this section is that he makes the point of denying that he'd ever had sexual relations with three women at once or in the same period, but admits to having sexual relations with two women in the same period. Is this any less promiscuous than three women? What a ridiculous point on which to defend oneself!

Explaining his conspiracy of silence, the petty demagogue states, "I did not go to the other members of the Collective or to other members of the leadership because I lacked trust in their views on these matters and on their solutions to contradictions inherent in these matters." This was good judgement on his part. The other members of the Collective and other members of the leadership were revolutionaries. Counter-revolutionaries like Edward Pickersgill have every reason to mistrust the views of revolutionaries.

In an earlier document, Edward Pickersgill put forward the "masterful thesis" that for him to cease his promiscuous activity "is easier said than done". In a comment on August 20 a comrade

wrote: "All in all this activity should have stopped a long time ago. Saying that this is 'easier said than done' is pure sophistry. This action is not like trying to quit smoking or crying. All things are possible if we dare to scale the heights. This applies not only to the establishment of socialism but also to the destroying of bourgeois ideas and mannerisms."

The expression "easier said than done" is used in a purely sophist way by Edward Pickersgill, despite all his haughty protestations. In terms of Edward Pickersgill's political responsibilities to the Collective, he didn't even tell us about the promiscuity, let alone tell us he was going to give it up. This is the key fact. The expression "easier said than done" is meaningless in light of this fact.

Edward Pickersgill says, "It is correct for all Collective members to doubt my words and to mistrust my practice. It is my practice which will determine my intent and capacity to change, not my words." This is the Collective's longstanding line on the question of rectification of mistakes. The fact that Edward Pickersgill mouthed it in this document didn't transform his rotten practice. He remained solidly on the counter-revolutionary line.

The rest of Edward Pickersgill's document actually degenerates in quality. It's noteworthy that Edward Pickersgill says that while "the Bainzites have little influence or effect among the masses", the various Trot sects do. This is wrong. The Trotskyites are completely isolated from the Canadian people.

His listing of 9 points of reference for assessing "the effects of Bainzite Cleftism in our ranks" is a facile exercise in verbosity. It is simply a string of meaningless words written to impress himself.

Edward Pickersgill closes this document with the "masterful thesis" that "the theory of the thing will take longer and be harder to root out." Such pessimism! We're sure this issue of Alive Magazine will clear this matter up for Edward Pickersgill and give him great optimism for the future of the anti-imperialist revolution in Canada! The Alive Production Collective has a good line, in theory and in practice, on the question of the relations between the sexes.

#### ALL FORM, NO REVOLUTIONARY SUBSTANCE

In an August 20 document titled "Re. Ed's Response To (*Comrade J's*) Document 'Clarification Of The Circumstances Surrounding My Visiting (*Comrade I*) in (*Place Name Deleted*)', (*comrade J*) states: "You have taken the time to examine and respond to my documents which deal with one surface reflection of the utter contempt in which you have treated the Collective. Yet you have not addressed a document by (*comrade G*) to which a number of people added at the bottom the words 'I agree'. This is a very important document in my view which sums up many of the political issues arising out of the present struggle. I truly take this document to be my own in that I was part of the discussion in which the ideas presented in (*comrade G's*) document were brought forward. I agree with this document wholeheartedly. I do not think you can afford to ignore it."

Later that day Edward Pickersgill finally responded to (*comrade G's*) document of August 19. It is amazing how consistently Edward Pickersgill could make self-criticisms that sound so correct and then go ahead and do exactly the opposite. His response to (*comrade G*) is an excellent example of this. In it he does self-criticism for important errors, calls upon the Collective to further investigate the effects of his misleadership and vows to reinstate himself as a positive member in the anti-imperialist ranks. Excellent words. His actual practice was to scurry away from Alive's anti-imperialist work and continue his anti-Collective activities from afar.

In this light Edward Pickersgill's statement that his despicable actions were not a product of conscious intent is highly suspect. His high degree of awareness about the mistakes he actually made, his self-criticisms and his absolute unwillingness to transform are characteristics of a conscious pattern of disruption. This has to be our conclusion.

Despite his grandiose efforts to make self-criticisms that sounded realistic, time and again Edward Pickersgill's deep-going

contempt for the Collective overcame his attempts to be on his best behaviour. A snarky comment made in another of his August 20 documents well illustrates this fact. Addressing a point raised by (*comrade J*) he lectures on the value of this inner-Collective struggle. "Perhaps you would be well to consider," he wrote, "that in this struggle as in other struggle (*sic*), you can achieve a higher and higher level of competence as a People's Investigator." He adds, "I do not mean to take your point lightly" although that's exactly what he did!

What supreme arrogance to be treating other comrades' most serious criticisms in an all-knowing off-handed fashion! He avoided directly addressing the comrade's criticism of him and dealt with a secondary point that caught his fancy.

Edward Pickersgill's "People's Investigator" title is another reflection of his level of contribution in this struggle: all form and no content. He was enamoured with names, titles and slick words, but mocked actual revolutionary substance.

#### EDWARD PICKERSGILL UNDER PRESSURE

Under criticism from all Collective members, Edward Pickersgill was finally forced to acknowledge his openly provocative actions against (*comrade F*). A written comment by (*comrade J*) on August 20 summed up the Collective members' thinking on this matter: "It is necessary to deeply examine, thoroughly criticize, and initiate transformation of the appalling way you have abused (*comrade F*) since he had the courage to bring the matters revealed recently to the Collective's attention. I find the way he has been abused in the course of the struggle developing to be shocking in the extreme. I want to make it clear that ideas presented in any documents I have written in the course of the struggle thus far have been developed during the course of discussion with various comrades in the Collective under the leadership of (*comrade F*). (*Comrade F's*) serious attempts to come to understand, discuss, and present his ideas, about the obnoxious activities you have engaged in, have been resisted by you. You have thus far attempted to trample them underfoot in a flood of slander and innuendo while you wildly manoeuvre to escape the hot seat in the struggle. I offer this severe warning. Such activities on your part or on the part of anyone else directed against (*comrade F*) or anyone else will not be tolerated in this Collective. You should address the tactics you have used against (*comrade F*) since he presented his 'Getting A Point Out On The Table' document and criticize them in a thoroughgoing way."

Edward Pickersgill responded shortly after (*comrade J's*) comment was posted. Considering subsequent events, the Collective has come to realize that the basic motivation for the document, titled "Criticism Of My Treatment Of My (*Comrade F*) During The Last Days, Months And Years", was basically dishonest. However, there are three interesting points to consider.

First, Edward Pickersgill reveals what an incredibly concise consciousness he had about his factional organization. He stated: "I have abandoned the struggle to resolve these contradictions within the actual organism and have created other organisms within which, essentially, I could have my own way and essentially, avoid the struggle which all of the other couples in the Collective have faced and continue to face." This is an excellent self-admission of the political opportunism at the core of Edward Pickersgill's social practice.

A second point of note comes out of an August 20 document by (*comrade C*) who stated: "In the discussions of monogamy and promiscuity held in February, 1978, you were not only contemptuous of the ordinary membership but also made fools of the other leading members of the Collective. You kept all the facts to yourself and allowed them to deal with this question on their own. The other leaders led; you passively misled. I do not make these remarks in the sense of 'switching allegiance' from yourself to (*comrade F*). Personalities and personal leadership mean nothing to me anymore. I am in the service of the anti-imperialist revolution."

Edward Pickersgill's reply was to commend the Collective for its

opposition to him! He wrote: "I know that the comrades of the Collective have not 'rallied to one leader in order to stand against the other'. The developing struggle and the care with which it has been unfolding has, in the main, been of the highest level and has stuck to the point at issue with courage and proud determination." This praise of the Collective's actions, however, did not go so deep as to make Edward Pickersgill willing to build a principled political association with our organization.

Third, at the end of his document, Edward Pickersgill stated, "I criticize now and will criticize for the rest of my life, my behaviour in practice and my theories which have guided that practice in this whole matter which has broken loose." This is a prime example of the petty demagogue's petty idealism. A maximum estimate would be that his self-critical attitude stayed with him for a matter of hours — hardly a matter of a lifetime! This promise was devoid of content.

#### MORE FACTIONAL SELF-ADMISSION

Further proof of Edward Pickersgill's crystal clear consciousness of his factional organization is found in his August 20 document "Some Thoughts Arising From Three Documents By (*Comrade D*)". He wrote: "What I did was institutionalize a faction which I had built up over a period of more than two years and through the misuse of my position in the Collective, ensure that no real solution could be found to the problems at hand. My practice predetermined the failure of the committee. My abdication of responsibility then continued from similar abdication in the months and years prior to that time and echoes hollowly down to this day."

Readers should remember this graphic admission and compare it with some of the pompous posturing Edward Pickersgill produced in the days which followed.

#### SOME SCHIZOPHRENIC HYSTERIA

Three complementary documents from Edward Pickersgill, dated August 20, fall into the self-deprecating category. They deal with the "writing trio" of Bob Harris, John Burnley and Edward Pickersgill in a truly schizophrenic fashion.

Bob Harris is a pseudonym for the Collective writing group which writes *Chains!* Edward Pickersgill's claim to represent this pseudonym is inaccurate, as pointed out in the introduction to this issue of *Alive*. In addition there are a couple of things of special importance in his document "Further Evidence Of The Effect Of My Abdication Of Leadership And Its Bad Effect In Our Anti-Imperialist Cultural Work" which deals with Bob Harris and *Chains!*

First, Edward Pickersgill's proposal for ending *Chains!* is extremely poor and is a real disservice to the readers of this novel. It reflects his cowardly, pessimistic approach to this whole inner-Collective struggle. Although Edward Pickersgill did fail to transform, *Chains!* will continue to be written by the Collective.

Second, Edward Pickersgill states, "I take the grinding to a halt of *Chains!* as some small evidence that I have not been willing to forge ahead and consciously misled my comrades and people in wider circles who are somewhat fanatical followers of *Chains!*" This is wrong. Obviously he has misled his comrades and the readers of *Chains!* In fact, the one thing he seems to be incapable of doing is making the decision not to try to mislead honest people.

The second document in this series, "Whatever Happened To John Burnley? I Slit His Throat And Cut Him Off At The Knees" raises Edward Pickersgill's schizophrenia to the level of hysteria. It is rife with inaccuracies and distortions. Edward Pickersgill says that John Burnley originally wrote a short story praising Hardial Bains. This is wrong. Before this short story was printed John Burnley had had two short stories published in *Alive Magazine*. Readers can view these stories on pages 9 and 13 of *Alive* 43, dated May, 1975. Edward Pickersgill doesn't even know the history of his own pseudonym!

As the hysterical pitch builds throughout the document, Edward

Pickersgill makes this outrageous comment: "For one person to be responsible for such an utter contempt for John Burnley and Bob Harris is akin to becoming Jack the Ripper or some other Hitlerite murderer." Of course, readers will know that Jack the Ripper lived before Hitler, not after. Maybe what Edward Pickersgill meant to say was "... is akin to becoming Hitler or some Jack the Ripper type murderer."

The disturbing thing about all this self-flagellation is that Edward Pickersgill is attempting to do self-criticism for his utter contempt of pseudonyms he views as his own. It is an entirely self-centred exercise. What about his utter contempt for the other comrades? He is so engrossed in this mindless self-deprecation that he loses sight of real people and fixes on pseudonyms. In his eyes these pseudonyms are different expressions of his ego. Even in the process of running himself down, Edward Pickersgill's arrogance stands paramount.

The last sentence of this document further indicates his deep-going contempt for his real (not imaginary) comrades. He states, "Let the situation never return when my words are viewed with a casual attitude and with complacency." Here it is. The major responsibility for Edward Pickersgill's degeneration and misleadership rests with the other comrades. His own basic dishonesty is overlooked.

The final document in this series "And Then There's The Mysterious Question Of Whatever Happened To The Editor Of Alive Magazine — One 'Edward Pickersgill'?" completes this strange exercise. The main fact missed in this document is that Edward Pickersgill was the editor of Alive Magazine in title only. In practice others were fulfilling this job. The "mysterious disappearance of the editor of Alive Magazine" was not felt at all. Not one reader complained about the dearth of articles appearing in the 1978 series of magazines under the byline "Edward Pickersgill".

In the overall these three documents emphasize how a person on a wrong line is actually alienated from the real world. Edward Pickersgill's documents of self-deprecation made no sense at all!

#### LOOKING AT THE "LOVE" LETTER TO MICHELLE LANDRIAULT DATED AUGUST 22, 1978

Edward Pickersgill has not developed "an extremely one-sided and singularly bad idea" of himself. Rather, he has been too full of himself, too individualistic, and too self-centred in the way the bourgeois society teaches.

Edward Pickersgill was not "turned on by the Collective members". He was overthrown in his position of Collective leader but constantly coaxed to transform in a new position as an ordinary member. It was criminal for him to use a term that implies the Collective is like a pack of jackals, always willing to turn on one of its own, when in fact a caring, responsible attitude was being maintained towards him.

Here's a beauty: Edward Pickersgill says he knows that the Collective's judgement of him "will most likely change again and in that change is a great danger that the complacency will again grow strong."

"I cannot permit a re-establishing of a complacent attitude towards my leadership in the Collective or whatever grows out of the Collective...if they acknowledge the thing you have said — that they and the work need me for a while yet."

Readers should remember that four days earlier Edward Pickersgill had been informed in no uncertain terms that he was no longer the leader or even a leader in the Alive Production Collective. Also remember that his false two-line struggle on "complacency" and his "Red North Collective", which was proposed to grow "out of the Collective", had both been rejected as smokescreen manoeuvres!

What overbearing conceit, groundless arrogance and false self-confidence!

Further, he praises Michelle Landriault for not emulating the great Chinese people and slanders the new socialist literature from

China as being "melodrama" in which one finds "dogmatically perceived roles"! Try as he might Edward Pickersgill can't conceal his hatred for revolutionary things.

Look at the off-handish manner he uses to refer to the magnificent struggle for socialism and the People's Republic established under the leadership of Chairman Mao Zedong: "China, or some other locale where socialism is already established."

Edward Pickersgill accepts Michelle Landriault's loving advice to "conduct struggle in Guelph as best can be done for the things which I, we, believe in." They believe in factions and counter-revolution. The best that can be mustered in favour of these rotten things can never stand against what is correct — conducting struggle as best can be done for the things that serve the Canadian people.

#### TWO HUMOROUS HIGHLIGHTS

Edward Pickersgill has proved to be a master of ignoring reality while giving importance to his malformed perceptions of reality.

In his August 23 document, he ignores the actual reasons it was suggested he take two weeks off and refutes some reasons he had conjured up. This is akin to being completely incapable of fighting any real person and so, throwing up a straw man, knocking it down and proclaiming one's great fighting prowess. However, in refuting points that were never made Edward Pickersgill still exposes himself. He offers all kinds of words about the correct levels of the "quality" and the "quantity" of struggle coming from an individual under fire. He, of course, in his own opinion, maintains these correct levels. How empty these words ring since he ran from the struggle!

In the August 23 document he also gives indication that ownership of a small business and a house were to be big issues for him in the fight that was to come.

The document of August 26 is quite hilarious. Melodrama from China be damned! Edward Pickersgill writes some of the most soapy, B-grade theatrics ever seen, in this piece. Just let these thrills stir your blood: One of them picked up a shotgun! He said they were serious! A final warning was given! They were poised to move! I found the whole experience quite terrifying! They are very very serious in what they are doing. That much is evident!

How ominous! How blood-curdling! Are they really serious? Oh no! What could be worse?

Ah, but the spell is broken by Edward Pickersgill himself. He says perhaps the guns were moved a bit earlier. He says other parts of the sequence of events he describes may be jumbled up — he doesn't remember. He said it wasn't a question involving guns. It was not. Our Collective members acted as though it wasn't a question involving guns.

A final point to bring this high drama down to earth: Edward Pickersgill did not protest against comparison to Bob Cruise, the local Bainzite chieftain. He was not so compared. His disbelief that we were prepared to actively defend ourselves was compared to Bob Cruise's disbelief on the same point. Both these characters have been awakened from their petty idealistic dreams at the hands of our organization despite their disbelief — Cruise was given a physical beating, Edward Pickersgill has been given an ideological beating in this issue of Alive.

However, even if Edward Pickersgill misunderstood these points at the time, he did not speak a protest — in fact, it was in remembering the beating that had been given Cruise that he settled completely into unprotesting silence.

#### EDWARD PICKERSGILL MAKES IT UP AS HE GOES ALONG

In his first document of August 27, Edward Pickersgill denounces the Collective for not picking up on "hints" he dropped. This is easy to refute.

He did not "hint" that he had a problem with masturbation. He announced full out that he did not have such a problem and that

"masturbation was a means of avoiding struggle". We might add that the announcement came unsolicited and "right out of the blue".

He also proclaims that a point in his favour is that he did not expel the second recruit to his faction as soon as he found out she was pregnant but waited a while to force her out of the Collective. With points in one's favour like this, who needs strokes against one's name?

Edward Pickersgill also makes distortions of history in this document. He makes a small foray into the land of fables concerning the early history of Alive and this continued in a big way in later documents. He also distorts the scenario when the announcement of a woman factionalist's pregnancy was made. The correct perspective on these matters from the time before the August 18 struggle has been given already in this issue of Alive. Thus we won't go into points of history in detail again.

In his other document of August 27, Edward Pickersgill distorts history in a major way under the banner that bourgeois legality should be the measure of reality for progressive people. That is, he says those who are asked by the organization to put their individual names on pieces of Collective property because of legal necessities, actually own the property; he says that the date that our organization took its present name is its founding date — even though it was founded one and a half years earlier.

Further, he turns truth on its head by saying the Collective lived as free-loaders on Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault when, obviously, the exact opposite was true.

He makes up "facts" with wild abandon. Neither Edward Pickersgill nor Michelle Landriault as individuals or in combination own or control a majority of Alive Press Limited shares — in fact, at the moment their combined vote would command 13% of the voting shares of the company and 5% of the total shares issued. On the other hand, the Alive Production Collective controls close to 75% of the shares of the company. Another fabrication is Edward Pickersgill's "fact" that Michelle Landriault has been an Alive Press Limited "owner" since the company's beginning. She only became a shareholder in January, 1971, six months after the company was started. A further fabrication is the treatment of People Media Graphics as a separate entity equal to Alive Press Limited. In fact, People Media Graphics is legally just a business name used by Alive Press Limited — the two are, in essence, the same thing. So much for: "the business of APL and PMG is thus, in fact (legally and in reality) owned and operated, overwhelmingly, by Ed and Michelle."

Also in this August 27 document, Edward Pickersgill put into writing for the first time his slander about a threat of assassination against him. He put it in an obscure form on that occasion but later makes it more openly and pointedly. Edward Pickersgill made this point about a physical threat to himself so frequently that the Collective became concerned about his devious plans. In the past, he has often told Collective members about a ruse that can be used to discredit an adversary, which he had learned on the street. The ruse is to spread lots of rumours about potential threats to oneself from another person who one is sure to name freely. After these preparations, one hires a common thug to give oneself a real beating, however to do so with care to avoid any permanent damage or disability. Then one goes around displaying one's marks and bruises as "proof" that the earlier rumours had come true.

On the question of the house ownership, Edward Pickersgill mixes things up thoroughly. The situation of a house bought with a down payment taken from Collective money and maintained with regular payments taken from Collective money, but (unfortunately) bought with Michelle Landriault listed as the owner — for legal purposes only — is compared to the situation where people connected to the Collective have bought and maintained houses using money from their own individual finances. This is obviously ridiculous.

Edward Pickersgill will no doubt shout loudly, as he already has done, that part of the money used to buy "Michelle Landriault's house" was borrowed from her father. We respond that this loan was completely forgiven by her father after only a small part of it

was paid off, thus it is not an issue; however, even the small part that was paid off came from collectivized finances.

### A PIECE OF SOPHISTRY FROM EDWARD PICKERSGILL

On August 28 Edward Pickersgill wrote a document to teach the Collective a couple of "ideological" lessons about idealism, dogmatism, complacency and hypertension. This document is pure sophistry and an exercise in obscuring real issues, from its beginning to its end. We will respond to three points in it.

One. All the emphasis Edward Pickersgill puts on the fact that his name is on some Alive Press Limited equipment contracts goes completely up in smoke when we say that it took only two short conversations to replace his name with that of another corporate director on all such contracts. So much for this point in this document and others.

Two. It is humorous to read Edward Pickersgill's words about what is "real" and then to read that he believes that a dog runs the danger of actually eating itself when it chases and chews on its own tail! Obviously, this is not a good grasp of reality but a complete mix up between reality and imagination or fantasy. We can affirm that the grasp of what is "real" that Edward Pickersgill displays on questions of ownership is at the same level as his belief that a dog can swallow itself!

Three. The level of contempt that Edward Pickersgill has for true revolutionary ideology is displayed in his mocking rewrite, at the end of his document, of Mao Zedong's axiom: "What we need is an enthusiastic but calm state of mind and intense but orderly work." Reactionaries are always forced to try to render Mao Zedong "more profound", because, twist as they might, they can't make his words do their bidding otherwise.

### MORE DISTORTIONS OF HISTORY

It is interesting to note that Edward Pickersgill said in his August 29 document that he was enthusiastic to answer the four questions put to him in writing by the Collective but that "the question of factionalism will require some reading/research."

He never gave us answers to three of the questions at all. The question on factionalism, however, was answered in a document he wrote less than three days later, without having done any reading or research! This is typical arrogance from Edward Pickersgill.

In his first document of August 31, Edward Pickersgill insults the comrades by calling them all factionalists, denigrates women and the Collective by quoting the reactionary saying, "Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned", and distorts points of Alive Production Collective history once again. His school master approach to dealing point by point with the Collective's August 29 statement is quite patronizing and revealing of his overblown arrogance.

He cautions the Collective in ways designed by his hope to save his own skin; he foresees a "less active, less intense" investigation; and, he hopes we will not "oppose such mistakes...dogmatically" (read: vigorously).

He insults the Collective's grasp of ideology by saying we grasp Mao Zedong's dictum "No investigation, no right to speak", only "to some degree".

He distorts history by referring to a debate in early 1973 over whether we were "communist, as individuals, and communist as an organization". Actually, the issue he speaks of was the question of membership in the Bainzite organization. The Bainzites were putting pressure on our members to join their organization and raised the question of whether being a member of the Alive Production Collective precluded holding membership in CPC(ML) also. The Collective discussed the question very simply, without trauma or "significant struggle", and put into effect a decision that Collective members could apply to join the Bainzite organization without necessarily jeopardizing their membership in our organization. The Bainzites were thus cut off in their ruse and none of our members joined the Bainzites.

Again Edward Pickersgill's lingering love for Hardial Bains' gang

can be seen. Obviously, a discussion of any issue concerning CPC(ML) has nothing in common with a discussion about communists and communist organizations, as Edward Pickersgill has implied it does.

Further, a contradiction imposed on the Collective by Bainzite pressures is characterized by Edward Pickersgill as an "internal contradiction". Most peculiar!

Note also that Edward Pickersgill, unable to get his false two-line struggle against "complacency" off the ground, tries to launch another false issue when he writes of the second contradiction of "more significance in the life of the APC" than his overthrow. In order to take up this new issue we were to set our sights on "dogmatism" existing generally throughout the organization from its very beginning up to date. A new, false issue is by no means more worthwhile than a correct issue that already exists.

Earlier, in one of his August 20 documents, Edward Pickersgill had cautioned one of the factionalists not to argue against the truth that those who have made major political mistakes should not presume to teach others. In his August 31 document he argues against this truth himself!

Edward Pickersgill tries to slip a significant lie in under the cover of a piece of major idealism in his comment on "paragraph seven" in this document. The major piece of idealism is his statement that his very real crimes against women who actually exist in the Collective are no more significant than crimes in the abstract against non-existent women, in a hypothetical organization with a lesser percentage of women members! One is reminded of the "confession of a terrible sin" by Jimmy Carter, spokesman for U.S. imperialism, who made the big revelation during his election campaign that he had "lusted after women" in his mind and this was as bad as taking lust into practice.

The significant lie is that no Collective member ever believed or ever said that promiscuity between Edward Pickersgill and his second factionalist recruit was less of an error because it began before our Mini-Cultural Revolution. Nor did anyone ever believe or say that this promiscuity was less of an error because it began while the woman was not a member of the Collective — just the contrary, we feel this makes it more of an error! We judged that there was no error because, at the time, we believed the lies we were told — that there was no promiscuity, just a healthy and principled, monogamous sexual social relationship.

In his other document of August 31, Edward Pickersgill tells a number of outright lies. He says the words of the Alive View "are the closest thing to a constitution that the APC has ever had". This is not true. In 1973, the Collective recorded all its stated principles and all its agreed norms in a single book that was maintained and updated on a regular basis. This book of norms and principles was studied by all Collective members at the time and since. The original copy of this book is still in our possession. Further, study of a vastly expanded statement of norms and principles is currently a part of the means of integrating new members into the Collective.

Another point of interest in the second August 31 document is that Edward Pickersgill makes his statement about his desire to develop as "a Marxist-Leninist" and to develop a "Marxist-Leninist" organization. He also announces his intentions to broadly publicize his planned split with the Collective and to try to fool people by portraying his facade of being "a Marxist-Leninist".

Edward Pickersgill tries to rationalize all the nonsense in this document by saying the Collective was debating whether he *could* be demoted (of course, he himself answers this non-issue with the greatest principle: "Yes. A firm yes!"), and by claiming that he had never been elected leader and so couldn't be elected to a lower position. Absolute trash!

We were not debating whether he *could* be demoted, we had already demoted him twelve days earlier — he certainly is a slow learner!

He was elected leader. He was so elected a number of times. In fact, on the first occasion, in the autumn of 1973, he had to fight hard to get elected. He was elected again on a number of occasions when the internal structure of the Collective was reviewed. A few

recent examples occurred in the summer of 1976, the autumn of 1977, and the first months of 1978.

Note, also, that Edward Pickersgill laid his decision to resign from Collective membership on the organization as a "fait accompli".

#### A KEY ATTEMPT TO PROMOTE WRONG IDEAS

The document written by Edward Pickersgill on September 1, 1978, to obscure the correct understanding of factionalism, is a key statement. In this document, Edward Pickersgill makes his biggest attempts to completely distort the history of the Alive Production Collective. He tries to rationalize all his political errors by taking up Trotsky's standard excuses. He plays up his own role in our work, falsely portraying himself as Alive's *raison d'être*.

Edward Pickersgill distorts the realities of two-line struggle, saying ruthlessness and dogmatism lead to success, rather than a principled stance and a correct line. He defies logic by proclaiming that the majority in an organization can be a faction despite the fact that a faction, by definition, is a minority group.

Edward Pickersgill takes the Alive Production Collective's shareholdings in Alive Press Limited as a group and claims they are his, as an individual — thus, claiming to control five fold more shares than he actually has. He puts struggles that actually happened in one stage at the end of November, 1973, into a false historical perspective, saying they happened in two stages — the first "at the end of 1972", and the "final, ruthless struggle" which, according to Edward Pickersgill, "took place in August of 1973". We have in our possession dated documents prepared and signed by Edward Pickersgill in the course of the actual November, 1973 struggle.

Why does he so thoroughly distort the dates, then? It is a well known fact that reactionaries make up their analysis first, then seek out "facts" to suit that analysis, while ignoring facts that contradict the analysis. If nothing suitable can be found, then the reactionaries are always willing to create suitable "facts" straight from the imagination. By a correct method, of course, facts are sought first, then an analysis is made to suit the facts, so as to accord with truth.

It is convenient to Edward Pickersgill to have this viciousness in Alive Press Limited precede his open assault on the Alive Production Collective starting in September 1973. This is why he places a November struggle in August. Thus he can claim our group turned on itself because of a lack of other victims, when actually it was an open assault which he made to advance himself as an individual.

Edward Pickersgill makes a big deal of "the heavy blows" the Collective has supposedly inflicted on itself over the years, resulting in the fact that it has been "devasted in numbers". In this, he goes completely against the good track record that our organization has of keeping people involved in a protracted way — more than 75% of those people who have ever been involved with the Alive Production Collective are still involved. This stands up very well against the record of other groups. It is significant that it is such a good "syndrome which has afflicted the APC ever since."

Edward Pickersgill tells the world: "Dedicated, to a large extent, to the needs and interests of oppressed youth, we did little or nothing to come to grips with the things which (*comrade K*) represented and so he left." What, then, would one imagine this comrade represented? Oppressors who were old aged, perhaps? No, this comrade was a youth — only 19 years old — and came from a solid working class background. An interesting question: just who does Edward Pickersgill identify as constituting the "oppressed youth"?

Edward Pickersgill speaks of "the tendency to turn on oneself in the absence of active pressure from external forces." This is incredible! From May, 1971, all during 1972 and through 1973 until the time period to which he refers, the Alive Production Collective was the focus of constant and ever increasing police harassment coordinated by the RCMP and resulting in numerous arrests. This is a well-known fact. Perhaps, though, Edward Pickersgill considers

the police to be part of the same forces as himself, thus such harassment would be pressure from internal forces.

Edward Pickersgill is willing to do self-criticism for creating a non-existent situation of many factions in the Collective but excuses the actual faction as "not a full-fledged faction" but "a single-issue formation," and as "relatively minor"! He then goes on to describe all the collectivized leadership groups in the history of our organization as more dangerous and more corrosive "factions". Amazing! No doubt, then, Edward Pickersgill will commend himself for all his attempts, successful and unsuccessful, to squash collectivized leadership.

Edward Pickersgill claims the Collective uses tactics among the people that should be used only in contradictions with the enemy. Yet he cannot cite one concrete example and we challenge him to find one example in the history of the Collective where such a line has been taken up by our organization.

According to Edward Pickersgill's outlook, which is very close to a child's fairyland imagination, the despicable, dirty intrigue, conspiracy, lies, slander, gossip and innuendo of his hard core factionalist partner, Michelle Landriault, through the years, make her a pure and innocent virgin maiden, dressed in a flowing white gown, who is the embodiment of "major resistance to social degeneration." Again, however, he is the undoing of his own spell, when he fully admits that Michelle Landriault "co-operated in the specific factionalism".

Then, dear readers, we discover that underlying all of the factionalism in the Collective is (yes, you guessed it) complacency. Is Edward Pickersgill, then, to be commended for making the first attack on the actual roots of factionalism when he tried to launch the false two-line struggle against complacency? He hopes so. We think not.

Further, we learn that not only was everybody doing it with regards to factionalism but also with regards to sexual degeneracy which we picked up "in the playgrounds and on the streets". All this, though, was hidden under a thin veneer of dogmatic rejection of promiscuity in words, even though there were no group norms against promiscuity (because there was no constitution!) but only "differing perceptions of various members." Quite a performance, eh? Not bad for making it up as you go along, eh? Again, we think not, Ed.

Next we are given the thesis that some Collective members are factionalists against their will and against their knowledge because the Collective is organized in units which Edward Pickersgill claims "have essentially been factionalist in nature, if not in sentiment." By this logic, every Communist Party in the world is nothing but a federation of factions because every one of them is organized on the basis of branches, committees and units.

The Collective's formal relationship with the Bainzite organization is a subject for more distortion by Edward Pickersgill. Note the way he refers to women comrades of the Collective in an off-hand slight: "our women". Also, he plays for sympathy: "At one point my body stopped working completely and at another point half of my face stopped working." This vague reference doesn't even apply to the time period of close association with the Bainzites through 1975. One incident happened *before* the close relations with the Bainzites began, the other took place *after* we split with the Bainzites. In November, 1974, Edward Pickersgill fell over and knocked himself unconscious when his head struck a porcelain toilet bowl and a concrete floor. After this incident he suffered Bell's Palsy in one side of his face for some months. In November, 1975, Edward Pickersgill blacked out in his home and was taken to hospital in an ambulance but signed himself out when he regained consciousness a couple of hours later. He describes the two incidents in reverse order.

After our organization broke all relations with the Bainzites, Hardial Bains described us as a splittist faction. It is exactly this analysis that Edward Pickersgill gave in his September 1 document by describing the Collective decision as a "regrouping of my factionalism at a later date in 1975", and by saying the Collective "closed ranks in defence of itself and its factionalist leader."

Edward Pickersgill slanders our organization by writing that we "are just waking up to the blinding effects of factionalism in the APC". We have long been conscious of the negative effects of factionalism and long opposed it in theory. We were blind only to the fact that a faction actually existed in the Collective. We have now faced that and it has not had blinding effects on us. We can see Edward Pickersgill and his ilk quite clearly for what they are. It is not we who have been asleep, either figuratively or literally. It is Edward Pickersgill who is not awake ideologically. It is he who has, quite literally, slept years of his life away.

It is a contradiction in terms to speak of an "historic inability to impose democracy". Democracy by its very essence denies the possibility of being imposed. That Edward Pickersgill made such a statement is indicative of his tyrannical practice and his perception that he is actually a "benevolent" despot.

In the last paragraph of this September 1 document, Edward Pickersgill again makes a trite attempt to mock Mao Zedong's axiom "a fall into the pit, a gain in your wit" by putting forward his own "shitty, witty" rhyme. Also, he makes his most point blank statement of open contempt for the Alive Production Collective, saying "the laws of the APC" are at odds with "the laws of the objective external world".

It is interesting to see the use of the phrase "and I say this with all due respect". In the past Edward Pickersgill has often promoted the use of this phrase in polemical documents. He explained that this phrase is automatically thought to indicate respect and formal friendship, although it can actually be a very strong slight — if no respect whatsoever is due, which is usually the opinion one side holds towards the other side in a polemic, then the phrase "with all due respect" does not mean much! There are many similar tricks of form that Edward Pickersgill uses deliberately because he knows we are conscious of their double meanings and he hopes to provoke us to unthinking response. In such an event he would proclaim complete innocence, hoping that to other people his documents seem to contain no obvious provocation.

However, other people can see that Edward Pickersgill is injuring us by saying our struggles against the forces of the state, the bourgeois cultural elite and opportunist "Left" political groups "should be mainly characterized as skirmishes". He adds insult to injury by saying "these *were* mainly characterized as skirmishes" by the Collective, when this is a newly expressed, individual opinion of his own about matters which have always been, and still are, upheld by our organization. This is the type of provocation that can be seen by all!

#### SECRET FACTIONS ARE PRIVATE NOT SECRET

In his second document written on September 1, 1978, Edward Pickersgill spins a lot of sophistry to explain away the fact that he kept his faction secret: it wasn't even really a secret, it was just privacy. Thus, the secret faction, according to Edward Pickersgill's rationalizations, was neither a faction nor was it secret.

Edward Pickersgill asks: If it is correct for a majority group to have a conspiracy of silence against a minority, who can logically say it is incorrect for a minority group to have a conspiracy of silence against the majority? We can say so. All we need as proof of Edward Pickersgill's reactionary world outlook is to apply the same logic to the bourgeoisie's concerns: if it is correct to have dictatorship of the proletariat, who can logically say it is incorrect to have dictatorship of the bourgeoisie?

Edward Pickersgill says: Let the best conspiracy win; split the majority to win a minority victory. We say: Be open and above-board; unite to win greater victories.

He slanders the whole, principled anti-factional campaign which had been actively waged by the Collective for more than two weeks by the time he wrote this document. He slanders the long-standing anti-factional consciousness which existed in the Collective for years before August 18, 1978. "What rights to privacy do groupings inside the APC have or need? That has never been so clear. It has never been dealt with in a proper way. What rights to

privacy did the four of us have last January? That was not clear then to us and is not clear yet."

What rights does a factional grouping have inside the Alive Production Collective? Absolutely no rights whatsoever, except one: the right to do self-criticism and transform. This was clear in January, 1978. It was clear in August, 1978. It has been clear ever since. It is still clear now. It has been clear throughout the life of the Collective. Is that "dogmatism on the question of secrecy and privacy", Ed? Well, it's a tough life for degenerate factionalists.

Readers will note that Edward Pickersgill has a really strong tendency to flog a dead horse in the hope that it will show some life. He goes on once again about the Collective's grave error in approving one degree of promiscuity but objecting to another degree. We've already put that horse out of its misery. Suffice to say, we never approved of any promiscuity, we approved of monogamy and we were told it was monogamy. We have taken note of Edward Pickersgill's contemptuous references to these women as his "mistresses".

We are warmed by Edward Pickersgill's humour when he says of the Collective's guidelines on privacy and opposing promiscuity: "such norms ... have not existed outside the narrow, dogmatic perceptions of myself and others." Given the record of Edward Pickersgill rooting through others' lives and others' belongings, and of his sexual degeneracy, it is safe to say that his mind is the one place where such Collective norms did not have any existence.

Edward Pickersgill says "nobody can show me a norm or point to a time in our history when we discussed and reached agreement on monogamy, the rightness or wrongness of engaging in relations with a mistress, or anything along those lines because these things were never hammered out in the APC, in theory or in conscious practice." We have to disagree. We can show him such a norm. We can point to such a time in our history. These things were hammered out in the Alive Production Collective in theory because of erroneous practice and they have since been developed correctly in conscious practice.

In the early summer of 1971, a teenage member of the Collective was criticized by our organization for pursuing a number of casual personal relationships at one time. The criticism was accepted, the wrong practice was rectified and a program of study into the classics of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought was initiated around this issue. A norm was instituted coming out of that study.

Thus, it is the case that a firmly stated position against promiscuity and in favour of monogamy was one of the first accepted norms of the Collective.

Edward Pickersgill, though, has neatly dropped this norm when he dropped the first year and a half of Collective existence from his scenario. A convenient trick of his selective memory, no doubt.

One proof that this early study was actually done is that individuals involved in it put up a fairly extensive list of readings from the Marxist-Leninist classics on the question of sexual social relations when the pregnancy in the faction was announced in February 1978. This was exactly the same reading list that was studied in the summer of 1971. Edward Pickersgill participated in this study neither in 1971 nor in 1978. In the summer of 1971 he was busying himself with secret promiscuous relations and Buckminster Fuller books.

Edward Pickersgill made a habit of ending his documents with mockery of Mao Zedong. Again, he finishes the second September 1 document by mocking Mao's well known phrase in such theses as: subjectivism will be with us even ten thousand years from now, or, contradictions between the new and the old will be with us even ten thousand years from now.

On September 2, 1978, Edward Pickersgill rounded out his self-justification nicely. The faction wasn't a faction. The secrecy wasn't secrecy. Now we learn that the promiscuity wasn't promiscuity.

A small point: the rock and roll group which put out the song "Anthem" was called *Happy People* and were famous for performing in mimes' "white face". *America* was Michelle Landriault's favourite rock group. Fact gets replaced with fancy at every step, even in small matters, in Edward Pickersgill's massive subjectivism.

We never received the document promised in the September 4 letter of resignation from the Lu Hsun Unit. It is more than five months overdue but we would still be entertained to see Edward Pickersgill explain how he touched bottom but wasn't part of the bottom strata. Perhaps he was sent to the bottom as an agent?

In Edward Pickersgill's document of September 6, one can read this masterful piece of double talk: "If there prove to be irreconcilable differences on some points of view regarding things such as 'business enterprises' they can be worked out quite easily." Irreconcilable, by definition, is a word that means things can't be worked out at all, never mind quite easily!

The idea put forward by Edward Pickersgill on September 6, 1978 that business affairs should be cleared up before political affairs are even addressed, goes exactly against a long standing norm of the Collective. If the political affairs develop well, contradictions on the business front usually go by the board. If political affairs result in a split, business affairs usually become correspondingly tangled. Thus, it is important to pursue the political affairs in any controversy because they are the prime determinant.

It is interesting to note that Edward Pickersgill's September 9 letter of resignation from the Collective was sent in an envelope marked on the outside with his address and the name "Bob Harris", a writing group's pseudonym. We don't seem to be able to get many ideas across to this blockhead but we'll again say: Edward Pickersgill is not Bob Harris.

In his September 30, 1978 letter, Edward Pickersgill raises a number of false issues. First he tries to say he and his wife have stolen only \$1651 but excuses this by saying two wrongs make one right and accusing others of stealing \$1690. The second amount he mentions was taken from a bank account in the collectivized finance system and put into use by those in the system. It has been fully accounted for to the satisfaction of those concerned.

Concerning: (a) the \$22, 782.66 that Edward Pickersgill alleged was owed to him by Alive Press Limited, (b) the predicted bankruptcy of the company, and, (c) the seizure of equipment by him, we have heard no more, neither from him nor from our former firm of accountants. Why have we heard no further? Because his bluff was called and he changed his tune to a new set of lying threats.

Regarding the play for sympathy on the topic of Michelle Landriault's health, Edward Pickersgill does a very poor job. He calls her ailment Cronin's Disease, the actual name is Crohn's Disease, but Michelle Landriault has not had it. All such intestinal problems that she had, originated because of bad nerves — no doubt arising from having to keep so many factional secrets.

Also, Edward Pickersgill has a very funny idea of our understanding of matters of value if he ever seriously thought that we considered a vacuum cleaner to be suitable recompense for \$18,000. It is humorous also that none of these legal threats by Edward Pickersgill have turned out to be anything but bluff. It is not so humorous that he makes further allusions to a danger of us causing him some "unforeseen accident". He does not understand political struggle whatsoever.

**EDWARD PICKERSGILL IS A SHARK  
PEOPLE EAT THE FINS OF SHARKS**

