

PART FOUR

Edward Pickersgill Had No Grasp of Revolutionary Ideology

Edward Pickersgill had a very low ideological level. He had no real grasp of revolutionary theory. His position as leader of the Alive Production Collective was recognized on the basis of his skills as a practical organizer and administrator, not as an ideologue. This position was, nevertheless, undeserved.

Although Edward Pickersgill had skill in coordinating certain aspects of the practical work internal to the Collective and in working with business contacts of Alive Press Limited, he was not overall a skilled practical organizer. Over the years he, as an individual, proved incapable of mobilizing people to take up revolutionary politics in a concrete, long-term way.

Without the ability to mobilize people for revolution, Edward Pickersgill could never be an actual revolutionary leader. In the widely read essay "The Foolish Old Man Who Removed The Mountains", Mao Zedong wrote of the importance of a correct political grasp in mobilizing the broad masses: "We must first raise the political consciousness of the vanguard so that, resolute and unafraid of sacrifice, they will surmount every difficulty to win victory. But this is not enough; we must also arouse the political consciousness of the entire people so that they may willingly and gladly fight together with us for victory."

The same theme was re-emphasized by Mao Zedong in "A Talk To The Editorial Staff Of The Shansi-Suiyan Daily": "To be good at translating the Party's policy into action of the masses, to be good at getting not only the leading cadres but also the broad masses to understand and master every movement and every struggle we launch — this is an art of Marxist-Leninist leadership. It is also the dividing line that determines whether or not we make mistakes in our work."

Edward Pickersgill never grasped that as a leader it was imperative that he develop a high ideological level. He never grasped the role of political line in rallying more and more comrades to the revolutionary organizations. He never realized that without strength in ideology and politics, his title of leader was only a mere formality; the revolutionary masses recognize as leaders only those who can lead correctly from a strong ideological base.

An early writing by Mao Zedong "On Correcting Mistaken Ideas In The Party", makes this point succinctly: "The leading bodies of the Party must give a correct line of guidance and find solutions when problems arise, in order to establish themselves as centres of leadership."

The correct political line of the Alive Production Collective has developed through collective struggle under the direct leadership of other members of the organization. These comrades did what Edward Pickersgill did not dare to do. They drew on the strength of the Collective as a whole, releasing the initiative of the ordinary members wherever they could, and always consulting with the lower levels, always gathering people's opinions.

In a speech to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, seven months before the liberation of the country, Mao Zedong put forward a view with which the leading members of our organization have acted in accord. This speech is popularly known as "Methods Of Work Of Party Committees". Mao stated: "Ask your subordinates about matters you don't understand or don't know, and do not lightly express your approval or disapproval. Some documents, after having been drafted, are withheld from circulation for a time because certain questions in them need to be clarified and it is necessary to consult the lower levels first. We should never pretend to know what we don't know, we should not feel ashamed to ask and learn from people below and we should listen carefully to the views of the cadres at the lower levels. Be a pupil before you become a teacher; learn from the cadres at the

lower levels before you issue orders. In handling problems, this should be the practice of all bureaus of the Central Committee and Party committees of the fronts, except in military emergencies or when the facts of the matter are already clear. To do this will not lower one's prestige, but can only raise it. Since our decisions incorporate the correct views of the cadres at the lower levels, the latter will naturally support them. What the cadres at the lower levels say may or may not be correct; we must analyse it. We must heed the correct views and act upon them. The reason why the leadership of the Central Committee is correct is chiefly that it synthesizes the material, reports and correct views coming from different localities. It would be difficult for the Central Committee to issue correct orders if the localities did not provide material and put forward opinions. Listen also to the mistaken views from below; it is wrong not to listen to them at all. Such views, however, are not to be acted upon but to be criticized."

Ideological writings of Edward Pickersgill have appeared in Alive Magazine under his own name, under the pseudonym of John Burnley, and under the title of the Lu Hsun Editorial Committee. Most of these articles were initiated and carefully scrutinized by the Collective. In this way Edward Pickersgill's skill as a writer was creatively utilized in our propaganda work.

Through the collective strength of the Alive Production Collective, Edward Pickersgill was able to express correct anti-imperialist politics in his writing. In practice Edward Pickersgill's low ideological level was recognized by some members of the Collective as a weakness which was compensated for by drawing on the ideological strength of the whole Collective. However, this weakness was never addressed directly within the Collective. Within the Collective, general consciousness of this problem remained low and there was no discussion of the significance of this weakness to our overall political program.

This weakness in the Alive Production Collective is a result of what Mao Zedong, in "Combat Liberalism", named as the sixth type of liberalism: "To hear incorrect views without rebutting them and even to hear counter-revolutionary remarks without reporting them, but instead to take them calmly as if nothing had happened."

It is good that Edward Pickersgill's low ideological level was dealt with in its specific manifestations by drawing on the strength of the Collective. However, those comrades who had a consciousness of this problem should have been addressing it directly in order to create an overall consciousness of it within the Collective. Then the Collective should have thoroughly investigated the cause of the problem, its effects on our political work, and solutions to the problem in a general and long-term framework. Instead we tried to avoid the problem and simply deal with its specific manifestations as they arose. This lack of courage led to the fact that this problem went unrecognized and untreated by the Collective as a whole for a long period of time.

Throughout the life of the Alive Production Collective, Edward Pickersgill failed to conscientiously study scientific socialism and consequently failed to integrate the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought with the concrete realities of the Canadian anti-imperialist revolution. This ideological blockhead conceitedly thought that his "skills" as a practical organizer would enable him to achieve whatever he wanted, regardless of the political content of his practice. Like all bourgeois careerists in the revolutionary ranks, he got his just reward! Thorough exposure and final downfall!

Mao Zedong exposed the type of character that Edward Pickersgill is, in the essay "Preface And Postscript To Rural

Surveys". He wrote: "Speaking specifically, people engaged in practical work must at all times keep abreast of changing conditions, and this is something for which no Communist Party in any country can depend on others. Therefore, everyone engaged in practical work must investigate conditions at the lower levels. Such investigation is especially necessary for those who know theory but do not know the actual conditions, for otherwise they will not be able to link theory with practice. Although my assertion, 'No investigation, no right to speak', has been ridiculed as 'narrow empiricism', to this day I do not regret having made it; what is more, I still insist that without investigation there cannot possibly be any right to speak. There are many people who 'the moment they alight from the official carriage' make a hullabaloo, spout opinions, criticize this and condemn that; but, in fact, ten out of ten of them will meet with failure. For such views or criticisms, which are not based on thorough investigation, are nothing but ignorant twaddle. Countless times our Party suffered at the hands of these 'imperial envoys', who rushed here, there and everywhere. Stalin rightly says that 'theory becomes purposeless if it is not connected with revolutionary practice'. And he rightly adds that 'practice gropes in the dark if its path is not illumined by revolutionary theory'. Nobody should be labelled a 'narrow empiricist' except the 'practical man' who gropes in the dark and lacks perspective and foresight."

Truly, Edward Pickersgill was one of the "ten out of ten" who met failure. Truly, this ideological blockhead spoke "nothing but twaddle". His path has never been illumined by revolutionary theory. He is a narrow empiricist proclaiming himself a man of practice. He is a practical man groping in the dark.

Inside the Alive Production Collective Edward Pickersgill had a long history of advancing pseudo-"Left" phraseology in order to protect his career as leader of the Collective. These pseudo-"Left" politics have not, however, been the dominant political line in the Alive Production Collective's external propaganda. Our collective work style in conjunction with the correct political line upheld by the majority of Collective members prevented these rotten politics from dominating our external propaganda. We have been careful on this point over the years, because as Mao Zedong notes: "Not to have a correct political orientation is like not having a soul".

At the same time we recognize that some of our ideological writings cannot but have suffered from this rotten line. We are committed to deepening our investigation of the effects of Edward Pickersgill's political line on our external propaganda work and will conscientiously root out any errors which we discover.

The position Mao Zedong presented in "On The Correct Handling Of Contradictions Among The People", is the position we adopt for ourselves. Mao stated: "Marxists should not be afraid of criticism from any quarter. Quite the contrary, they need to temper and develop themselves and win new positions in the teeth of criticism and in the storm and stress of struggle. Fighting against wrong ideas is like being vaccinated — a man develops greater immunity from disease as a result of vaccination. Plants raised in hothouses are unlikely to be hardy. Carrying out the policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend will not weaken, but strengthen, the leading position of Marxism in the ideological field."

Throughout the five years that he was formally recognized as the leader of the Collective, Edward Pickersgill has always promoted himself as a Marxist-Leninist ideologue and has worked hard to spread this illusion within the Collective. His skills as a writer and speechmaker have allowed him to expound at great length on any question. Edward Pickersgill worked hard to convince the Collective members that his powers of articulation alone meant that he had a good grasp of ideology. He tried to use smooth form to disguise a total lack of correct ideological content.

"Reform Our Study" is a report made by Mao Zedong when he launched the 1941 rectification campaign amongst Chinese revolutionaries. This initiative by Mao Zedong led to a great debate between proletarian and petty bourgeois ideology. It is appropriate

that this report strikes out at talk that is divorced from revolutionary ideology. Mao said: "We have achieved some success in our study of present domestic and international conditions, but for such a large political party as ours, the material we have collected is fragmentary and our research work unsystematic on each and every aspect of these subjects, whether it be the political, military, economic or cultural aspect. Generally speaking, in the last twenty years we have not done systematic and thorough work in collecting and studying material on these aspects, and we are lacking in a climate of investigation and study of objective reality. To behave like 'a blindfolded man catching sparrows', or 'a blind man groping for fish', to be crude and careless, to indulge in verbiage, to rest content with a smattering of knowledge — such is the extremely bad style of work that still exists among many comrades in our Party, a style utterly opposed to the fundamental spirit of Marxism-Leninism. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin have taught us that it is necessary to study conditions conscientiously and to proceed from objective reality and not from subjective wishes; but many of our comrades act in direct violation of this truth."

In an earlier speech "Be Concerned With The Well-Being Of The Masses, Pay Attention To Methods Of Work", Mao Zedong struck the same chord: "We are the leaders and organizers of the revolutionary war as well as the leaders and organizers of the life of the masses. To organize the revolutionary war and to improve the life of the masses are our two major tasks. In this respect, we are faced with the serious problem of methods of work. It is not enough to set tasks, we must also solve the problem of the methods for carrying them out. If our task is to cross a river, we cannot cross it without a bridge or a boat. Unless the bridge or boat problem is solved, it is idle to speak of crossing the river. Unless the problem of method is solved, talk about the task is useless."

Edward Pickersgill's low ideological level and pseudo-"Left" political line have adversely affected the life and work of the Alive Production Collective to a greater or lesser extent since its formation. The members of the Collective must bear responsibility for the fact that it has taken so long to expose the true nature of this renegade.

The low overall ideological level in the Collective is in part responsible for this. Edward Pickersgill worked hard to maintain this situation. Although Collective members constantly demanded that programs of theoretical study be undertaken, we allowed this renegade to disrupt these study programs. More persistence was needed in this struggle.

Without the depth of enthusiasm that would have led the comrades to fight for study, any ideological reading, discussion or study may not have been worthwhile. With this fighting enthusiasm, Collective study programs are now very worthwhile.

As Mao Zedong said, at the end of his report "The Role Of The Chinese Communist Party In The National War": "Complacency is the enemy of study. We cannot really learn anything until we rid ourselves of complacency. Our attitude towards ourselves should be 'to be insatiable in learning' and towards others 'to be tireless in teaching'."

We also allowed ourselves to be fooled too often by Edward Pickersgill's lies. Too many of us were conned by the illusion he promoted of himself as a Marxist-Leninist ideologue. Even when the ideological level of certain comrades was developed to a higher level this did not lead to an active campaign to overthrow these illusions and recognize Edward Pickersgill's actual low level of ideology.

Too often we lacked revolutionary boldness. We were afraid to state our disagreements with this petty despot. If one member of the Collective dared to oppose Edward Pickersgill's bankrupt line others would often fail to rally to the correct line, fearing to stand in opposition to the petty despot. This was a result of the lack of unity among Collective members, a lack which Edward Pickersgill worked hard to develop. Too often we lacked the courage which Mao Zedong so accurately described: "He who is not afraid of

death by a thousand cuts dares to unhorse the emperor' — this is the indomitable spirit needed in our struggle to build socialism and communism."

This indomitable spirit was necessary to successfully wage struggle against Edward Pickersgill. This conceited bourgeois careerist was dedicated to winning arguments and saving face rather than upholding the truth and correcting his mistakes. He viewed the mildest criticism as an attack on his personal integrity. The speed and ferocity with which he turned on the critic was amazing. He acted like a cornered rat fighting for its life.

In the essay "On Correcting Mistaken Ideas In The Party", Mao Zedong denounces as individualism this tendency to "look for opportunities to retaliate". Mao explains: "Such retaliation arises from purely personal considerations, to the neglect of the interests of the class and of the Party as a whole. Its target is not the enemy class, but individuals in our own ranks. It is a corrosive which weakens the organization and its fighting capacity."

ULTRA-"LEFT" LINE ON THE REVOLUTION IN CANADA

The "Alive View" clearly presents the general political analysis of the Alive Production Collective. It states: "The primary class enemy in Canada is the U.S. monopoly capitalist class; this enemy is directly served by the sellout Canadian monopoly capitalist class."

Later on it clearly declares: "The ALIVE PRODUCTION COLLECTIVE's program is anti-imperialist revolution; its strategy is anti-imperialist cultural work; and, its tactics are production of ALIVE MAGAZINE, related anti-imperialist cultural projects, and united front work; both in Canada and internationally."

Given these clear statements on the basic political program of the Collective it came as a real shock to members of the Collective early in 1978 when Edward Pickersgill wrote an article for the magazine calling for proletarian revolution in Canada. This call for a one stage revolution in Canada stood diametrically opposed to the correct analysis of the Alive Production Collective which calls for anti-imperialist revolution in Canada.

Another leading member of the Collective pointed out that this call for proletarian revolution at this time in Canada was wrong. Edward Pickersgill asked why. The comrade replied that the Alive Production Collective's program is anti-imperialist revolution, not proletarian revolution in Canada. The comrade explained that in Canada to try to wage proletarian revolution before first defeating U.S. imperialism would be suicidal. The movement would be crushed almost immediately by U.S. imperialist troops pouring over the Canadian border. So it is necessary first to deal with the question of U.S. imperialist domination of Canada.

Unable to muster any intelligent defence of his bankrupt line Edward Pickersgill quickly resorted to the tactic of yelling insults at the correct comrade. He screamed, "What's the matter, are you scared of the dictatorship of the proletariat?"

The other leading comrade vigorously denied this charge and re-iterated the fact that the Alive Production Collective supports the building of an anti-imperialist united front, not proletarian revolution, as the immediate task in Canada.

Following this dispute Edward Pickersgill did not do self-criticism for his incorrect political line. Neither did he take up the correct line of calling for anti-imperialist revolution in Canada.

Instead this coward made adjustments to his rotten line rather than rooting out his mistake. He began to call for anti-imperialist revolution followed by proletarian revolution and failed to distinguish between these two forms of struggle and the fundamentally different conditions under which they apply.

This ideological blockhead began to use the phrase "anti-imperialist revolution followed by proletarian revolution" regularly in his articles. A number of comrades complained about the use of this phrase, pointing out its similarity to the incorrect Bainzite formula of "anti-imperialist socialist revolution". Comrades also pointed out that it is not a good tactic in building the anti-imperialist united front to constantly announce that dictatorship of

the proletariat is just around the corner. Any such proclamation is bound to alienate the patriotic elements of the national bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie and disunify the ranks of the united front.

Edward Pickersgill clearly had no understanding of the politics involved in the argument. If he had an understanding he should have tried to win others in the Collective over to his line. Instead of this, he turned the politics into a matter of stringing words together and became a confusion-monger.

Edward Pickersgill's incorrect analysis of the political situation in Canada was a reflection of an ultra-"left" political line. This ideological charlatan dogmatically called for immediate proletarian revolution in Canada in total disregard for the concrete reality of the actual situation in Canada which is dominated by U.S. imperialism.

Early in 1978, Edward Pickersgill upheld a political line opposite to the line of the Alive Production Collective. More than forty years earlier this incorrect political line was patiently refuted in an essay titled "On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism". Ten years before Edward Pickersgill was even born, Mao Zedong wrote: "The present situation demands that we boldly discard all closed-doorism, form a broad united front and guard against adventurism. We must not plunge into decisive battles until the time is ripe and unless we have the necessary strength.

"Here I shall not discuss the relation of adventurism to closed-doorism, or the possible dangers of adventurism as events unfold on a larger scale; that can be left for later. For the moment I shall confine myself to explaining that united front tactics and closed-door tactics are diametrically opposed.

"The former requires the recruiting of large forces for the purpose of surrounding and annihilating the enemy.

"The latter means fighting single-handed in desperate combat against a formidable enemy."

Mao Zedong hits even more sharply at the line later taken up by Edward Pickersgill, when he states the danger of not forming a broad revolutionary united front: "This would mean failure to single out the principal enemy and waste of ammunition. It would mean inability to close in and isolate him. It would mean inability to draw to our side all those in the enemy camp and on the enemy front who have joined them under compulsion, and those who were our enemies yesterday but may become our friends today. It would in fact mean helping the enemy, holding back, isolating and constricting the revolution, and bringing it to a low ebb and even to defeat.

"The advocates of closed-door tactics say the above arguments are all wrong. The forces of the revolution must be pure, absolutely pure, and the road of the revolution must be straight, absolutely straight. Nothing is correct except what is literally recorded in Holy Writ. The national bourgeoisie is entirely and eternally counter-revolutionary. Not an inch must be conceded to the rich peasants. The yellow trade unions must be fought tooth and nail. If we shake hands with Tsai Ting-kai, we must call him a counter-revolutionary at the same moment. Was there ever a cat that did not love fish or a warlord who was not a counter-revolutionary? Intellectuals are three-day revolutionaries whom it is dangerous to recruit. It follows therefore that closed-doorism is the sole wonder-working magic, while the united front is an opportunist tactic.

"Comrades, which is right, the united front or closed-doorism? Which indeed is approved by Marxism-Leninism? I answer without the slightest hesitation — the united front and not closed-doorism. Three-year-olds have many ideas which are right, but they cannot be entrusted with serious national or world affairs because they do not understand them yet. Marxism-Leninism is opposed to the 'infantile disorder' found in the revolutionary ranks. This infantile disorder is just what the confirmed exponents of closed-doorism advocate. Like every other activity in the world, revolution always follows a tortuous road and never a straight one. The alignment of forces in the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary camps can change, just as everything else in the world changes."

THE CORRECT PATH OF UNITED STRUGGLE

In his article "Left-Wing Communism — An Infantile Disorder", Lenin wrote: "The more powerful enemy can be vanquished only by exerting the utmost effort, and most thoroughly, carefully, attentively and skilfully making use *without fail* of every, even the smallest, 'rift' among the enemies, of every antagonism of interest among the bourgeoisie of the various countries and among the various groups or types of bourgeoisie within the various countries, and also by taking advantage of every, even the smallest, opportunity of gaining a mass ally, even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional. Those who fail to understand this, fail to understand even a particle of Marxism, or of scientific, modern socialism *in general*."

This policy of forming the broadest possible united front to strike out at the main enemy has been the consistent policy of truly revolutionary movements throughout the world. In 1977, a "People's Daily" article, entitled "Chairman Mao's Theory Of The Differentiation Of The Three Worlds Is A Major Contribution To Marxism-Leninism", addressed the question of the united front concept in detail. The article pointed out: "Those who correctly apply this policy can muster a mighty revolutionary army of the masses in their millions upon millions to concentrate the attack on the chief enemy and triumph in the revolution. Going against this policy can only drive to the side of the enemy those forces which could have been won over, swell the enemy's ranks, isolate oneself and consequently condemn the revolution to failure."

During the War of Resistance Against Japanese Aggression the Communist Party of China, under the correct leadership of Mao Zedong, upheld the principle of uniting the broadest possible united front to strike at Japanese aggression. The fundamental principle of the united front was the subordination of the class struggle to the immediate national struggle against Japan.

In his essay "On The Question Of Independence And Initiative Within The United Front", Mao Zedong wrote: "In a struggle that is national in character, the class struggle takes the form of national struggle, which demonstrates the identity between the two. On the one hand, for a given historical period the political and economic demands of the various classes must not be such as to disrupt co-operation; on the other hand, the demands of the national struggle (the need to resist Japan) should be the point of departure for all class struggle. Thus there is identity in the united front between unity and independence and between the national struggle and the class struggle."

Mao Zedong clearly pointed out that to subordinate the interests of the class struggle to the interests of the War of Resistance does not mean to deny the fact of class struggle. In his essay "The Role Of The Chinese Communist Party In The National War", Mao Zedong stated: "Classes and the class struggle are facts, and those people who deny the fact of class struggle are wrong. The theory which attempts to deny this fact is utterly wrong. We do not deny the class struggle, we adjust it. The policy of mutual help and mutual concessions which we advocate is applicable not only to party relations but also to class relations. Unity against Japan requires an appropriate policy of adjustment in class relations, a policy which does not leave the labouring people without political and material safeguards but also gives consideration to the interests of the rich, thereby meeting the demands of solidarity against the enemy. It is bad for the War of Resistance to pay attention only to the one side and neglect the other."

By subordinating the interests of the class struggle to the immediate national struggle in this way it is possible to unite with certain sections of the bourgeoisie. While the national bourgeoisie has class contradictions with the workers, it is nevertheless, opposed to foreign domination by imperialist powers. In Canada, therefore, the national bourgeoisie can be mobilized into the united front against U.S. imperialism.

In his essay "Current Problems Of Tactics In The Anti-Japanese United Front", Mao Zedong wrote: "The middle bourgeoisie

constitutes the national bourgeoisie as distinct from the comprador class, i.e., from the big bourgeoisie. Although it has its class contradictions with the workers and does not approve of the independence of the working class, it still wants to resist Japan and, moreover, would like to grasp political power for itself, because it is oppressed by the Japanese imperialists in the occupied areas and kept down by the big landlords and big bourgeoisie in the Kuomintang areas. When it comes to resisting Japan, it is in favour of united resistance; when it comes to winning political power, it is in favour of the movement for constitutional government and tries to exploit the contradictions between the progressives and the die-hards for its own ends. This is a stratum we must win over."

The success of the Chinese Revolution stands as a concrete fact, proving the correctness of the united front policy, and proving the correctness of unity with the national bourgeoisie. In his essay "Some Experiences In Our Party's History", Mao Zedong outlined the Chinese Communist Party's policy towards the national bourgeoisie, explaining when, and under what conditions the national bourgeoisie can be united with. Mao Zedong wrote: "The national bourgeoisie is an opponent of ours. There is a popular saying in China, 'Opponents always meet.' One experience of the Chinese revolution is that caution is needed in dealing with the national bourgeoisie. While it is opposed to the working class, it is also opposed to imperialism. In view of the fact that our main task is to fight imperialism and feudalism and that the liberation of the people would be out of the question unless these two enemies are overthrown, we must by all means win the national bourgeoisie over to the fight against imperialism. The national bourgeoisie is not interested in fighting feudalism because it has close ties with the landlord class. What is more, it oppresses and exploits the workers. We must therefore struggle against it. But in order to win it over to join us in the fight against imperialism, we must know when to stop in the struggle, that is, the struggle must be waged on just grounds, to our advantage and with restraint. In other words, we must have just grounds for waging the struggle, be sure of victory, and use restraint when a proper measure of victory is gained. Hence the necessity of making investigations into the conditions of both sides, those of the workers and those of the capitalists. If we know only the workers and not the capitalists, we won't be able to hold talks with the latter. In this respect, it is also necessary to investigate typical cases, or to dissect one or two 'sparrows'; both methods, looking at flowers on horseback and getting off your horse to look at them, should likewise be used."

"Throughout the historical period of the struggle against imperialism and feudalism, we must win over and unite with the national bourgeoisie so that it will side with the people against imperialism. Even after the task of opposing imperialism and feudalism is in the main accomplished, we must still keep our alliance with the national bourgeoisie for a certain period. This will be advantageous in dealing with imperialist aggression, in expanding production and stabilizing the market and also in winning over and remoulding bourgeois intellectuals.

"You have not yet won state power but are preparing to seize it. Towards the national bourgeoisie a policy of 'both unity and struggle' should be adopted. Unite with them in the common fight against imperialism and support all their anti-imperialist words and deeds, while waging an appropriate struggle against their reactionary, anti-working class and anti-Communist words and deeds. It is wrong to be one-sided; struggle without unity is a 'Left' deviationist mistake and unity without struggle is a Right deviationist mistake. Both mistakes occurred in our Party and we learned bitter lessons from them. Later, we summed up the two kinds of experience and have since adopted a policy of 'both unity and struggle', that is, to struggle whenever necessary and unite whenever possible. The aim of struggle is to unite with the national bourgeoisie and win victory in the struggle against imperialism."

Edward Pickersgill was one of these "Left" deviationists of whom Mao Zedong speaks. His cry was, "No, class struggle is absolute. It cannot be subordinated to national struggle. We can't unite with

the national bourgeoisie. We cannot make concessions."

In his essay "On The Question Of Independence And Initiative Within The United Front", Mao Zedong wrote: "To regard concessions as something purely negative is contrary to Marxism-Leninism."

Further in the same article Chairman Mao stated: "When we make concessions, fall back, turn to the defensive or halt our advance in our relations with either allies or enemies, we should always see these actions as part of our whole revolutionary policy, as an indispensable link in the general revolutionary line, as one turn in a zigzag course. In a word, they are positive."

Mao Zedong clearly stated, in his essay "Unite All Anti-Japanese Forces And Combat The Anti-Communist Die-Hards": "Some people emphasize resistance alone and are reluctant to emphasize unity and progress, or even fail to mention them. This is wrong."

Edward Pickersgill upheld a closed-door attitude in regards to revolution in Canada. He did not want unity with the national bourgeoisie and other "impure" elements. He was for purity and absolute spotlessness in the revolutionary ranks.

Lu Hsun bitingly exposed such attitudes as nonsense, writing: "Your 'theory' is indeed much loftier than that of Mr. Mao Zedong and others, and, what's more, yours is high up in the sky, while theirs is down-to-earth. But admirable as such loftiness is, it will unfortunately be just what the Japanese aggressors will welcome. Hence I fear that it will tumble from the sky and slip to the filthiest spot on earth."

A 1977 "People's Daily" article on the three worlds theory also noted, "Chairman Mao's criticism of closed-doorism was warmly supported by the whole Chinese people. But the Trotskyites came out and attacked it."

By upholding closed-doorism, Edward Pickersgill placed himself in the company of such undesirable, counter-revolutionary elements as the Trotskyites. This reactionary upheld the line that struggle and unity are mutually exclusive. Edward Pickersgill's view was that unity could only be built by yielding and not by struggle. Since he was absolutely committed to the concept of struggle, he viewed unity as impossible. Mao Zedong made some interesting points which reveal the incorrectness of this line.

In his essay "Current Problems Of Tactics In The Anti-Japanese United Front", Chairman Mao stated: "Struggle is the means to unity and unity is the aim of struggle. If unity is sought through struggle, it will live; if unity is sought through yielding, it will perish. This truth is gradually being grasped by Party comrades. However, there are still many who do not understand it; some think that struggle will split the united front or that struggle can be employed without restraint, and others use wrong tactics towards the middle forces or have mistaken notions about the die-hard forces. All this must be corrected."

The 1977 "People's Daily" article on the three worlds, referred directly to the situation in second world countries. Since Canada is a second world country, these calls are directly applicable to our own situation.

The article states: "The proletariat in the second world countries must hold high the banner of national independence."

Later, the article pointed out: "United struggle is the only correct path for them to take in defence of their national independence and survival, even though this path is strewn not with roses but with thorns."

The Alive Production Collective has taken up this correct path although it is strewn "with thorns". We are not looking for an easy path. We are looking for the path which will lead to victory. This is the path of united struggle.

VACILLATION ON THE QUESTION OF THE NATIONAL BOURGEOISIE

In the summer of 1977 Edward Pickersgill wrote an article for Alive Magazine which incorrectly identified the classes in Canadian society that can potentially be united in the anti-imperialist united front. When another leading comrade addressed the fact that the

political analysis presented in the article was incorrect Edward Pickersgill went off the deep end. His hysterical ravings were directed at the other leading comrade but were witnessed by two other members of the Collective.

During 1973, Mao Zedong characterized well the type of reaction Edward Pickersgill took up: "Certain comrades make it their job to criticize other people. They won't allow others to criticize them at all. They resent criticism, as though their ancestral graves were being profaned! They are quick to brand others as elements hostile to the Party, socialism and Mao Zedong Thought."

Earlier, in 1945, Mao Zedong's political report to the Seventh National Congress of the Communist Party of China in part dealt with this same theme. In this report, well-known by the title "On Coalition Government", Mao cites a number of dictums, including "Correct mistakes if you have committed them and guard against them if you have not", and explains: "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."

Edward Pickersgill always went completely opposite to these teachings on the importance of accepting criticism well.

In the article he proposed for Alive Magazine, Edward Pickersgill obliterated the role of the Canadian national bourgeoisie in the Canadian anti-imperialist revolution with a single stroke of the pen. When confronted with this fact he began to pour forth ideological inanities at high volume. His first inanity was to state that *all* the bourgeoisie in Canada are sell-out bourgeoisie and that it will be impossible to unite with any of them to wage anti-imperialist revolution.

With this profundity, Edward Pickersgill was demonstrating the tendency that Frederick Engels mocks in his essay "On Authority": "These gentlemen think that when they have changed the names of things they have changed the things themselves. This is how these profound thinkers mock at the whole world."

It is well known that the question "What is the primary contradiction in Canadian society?" is at the core of the main differences and the biggest debates amongst Canadian revolutionaries. It is not necessary for us to go into all the ramifications of this issue. The exposure of Edward Pickersgill involves simpler issues. The primary thing is that Edward Pickersgill was giving an analysis exactly opposite to the analysis of the organization he was supposed to be leading. The Alive Production Collective supports the tactics of the united front in the Canadian anti-imperialist revolution. Edward Pickersgill was saying that a true united front which brings together otherwise antagonistic classes could not be built, that all that one could hope for is an alliance between the proletariat and those sections of society that would be the proletariat's permanent allies in any case.

Thus, whether one agrees with Alive's analysis or not, so long as one understands what Alive's position is, one can see how absurd Edward Pickersgill was being in breaking with the organization's line in an article proposed for publication rather than using the internal organizational structures to try to change the line. This is because he did not formally disagree. He did not understand the line of the organization so he could not disagree. He just made up his own line as he went along.

People like Edward Pickersgill who take such a superficial approach to the real world were exposed by Mao Zedong in his work "Reform Our Study": "Unwilling to carry on systematic and thorough investigation and study of the specific conditions inside and outside the country, province, county or district, they issue orders on no other basis than their scanty knowledge and 'It must be so because it seems so to me'."

In the discussion of his article, Edward Pickersgill was patiently opposed when another comrade explained the distinction between the sell-out bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie in Canada and the concept of the united front in its application to the Canadian anti-imperialist revolution.

The line that the comrade put forward accorded with the line of

the Alive Production Collective in taking a balanced approach, neither glossing over the actual nature of the national bourgeoisie as a fundamental class enemy nor denying their role as potential allies in a common fight against the immediate enemy, U.S. imperialism.

In a 1940 speech in Yanan entitled "Unite All Anti-Japanese Forces And Combat The Anti-Communist Die-Hards", Mao Zedong gave an excellent presentation of the importance of revolutionaries taking such a balanced approach. Mao said: "We Communists are the staunchest advocates of unification; it is we who have initiated and maintained the united front and who have put forward the slogan for a unified democratic republic. Who else could have proposed these things? Who else could have put them into effect? Who else could be content with a monthly allowance of only five yuan? Who else could have formed such a clean and incorruptible government? There is unification and unification. The capitulators have their idea of unification, they want to unify us into capitulating; the anti-communist die-hards have their idea of unification, they want to unify us into splitting and retrogression. Could we ever accept these ideas of theirs? Can any unification that is not based on resistance, unity and progress be considered genuine? Or rational? Or real unification? What a pipe dream! It is to put forward our own idea of unification that we are meeting here today. Our idea of unification is identical with that of all the people of China, of every man and woman with a conscience. It is based on resistance, unity and progress. Only through progress can we achieve unity; only through unity can we resist Japan; and only through progress, unity and resistance can the country be unified. This is our idea of unification, a genuine, rational, real unification. The idea of a sham, irrational and formal unification is one which would lead to national subjugation and which is held by persons utterly devoid of conscience."

The discussion over whether the article should be published in Alive Magazine or rewritten went downhill fast. Again taking up his line of low-level insults, Edward Pickersgill retorted to this clear, concise explanation with a vicious slander. He yelled at the comrade, "What's the matter, have you fallen head over heels in love with John Wood?" (John Wood is the owner of the W.C. Wood Co. and is one of the biggest Guelph-based bourgeoisie.)

In "The Role Of The Chinese Communist Party In The National War", Mao Zedong denounces such pseudo-revolutionary name calling: "It is wrong lightly to label people 'opportunists' or lightly to begin 'waging struggles' against them."

In a principled response to his low-level insults Edward Pickersgill was told of the Alive Production Collective's analysis of John Wood's class position. This analysis states that although John Wood professes "nationalistic" sentiment, in practice he is a sell-out bourgeois operating in the mainly U.S.-controlled Canadian home appliance industry. One clear indication of the sell-out nature of John Wood is the fact that he was involved in a defence contract for the U.S. armed forces making bomb casings for use in Vietnam. The case is quite clear cut. In contrast to John Wood, examples of actual local national bourgeoisie were cited.

Faced with clear, concise political analysis Edward Pickersgill was unable to defend his bankrupt line. His insults and screaming were no match for a correct political line. Faced with no alternative, he capitulated. However he continued to spread confusion and distortion around the question of the national bourgeoisie in Canada whenever he saw the chance.

It is interesting to note that in their recent propaganda opposing Alive, the Bainzites also thoroughly distort the nature of the sell-out bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie in Canada. They do not differentiate between these two sections of the Canadian bourgeoisie but simply refer to the Canadian bourgeoisie as if they comprise a single, homogeneous group which they refer to as the Canadian monopoly capitalists or the Canadian big bourgeoisie. The similarity between the Bainzites' line and the line upheld by Edward Pickersgill in this discussion is striking.

Mao Zedong's line, of course, bears no similarity to the

reactionary outlook of either Edward Pickersgill or the Bainzites. In the essay "Current Problems Of Tactics In The Anti-Japanese United Front" one can read the following position: "Our policy towards the three categories of middle forces described above is to win them over. However, this policy differs from that of winning over the peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie, and, moreover, it varies for each category of the middle forces. While the peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie should be won over as basic allies, the middle forces should be won over as allies against imperialism...."

"The winning over of the middle forces is an extremely important task for us in the period of the anti-Japanese united front, but it can only be accomplished given certain conditions. These are: (1) that we have ample strength; (2) that we respect their interests; and (3) that we are resolute in our struggle against the die-hards and steadily win victories. If these conditions are lacking, the middle forces will vacillate or even become allies of the die-hards in the latter's attacks on us, because the die-hards are also doing their best to win over the middle forces in order to isolate us...."

"Such is our policy of seeking unity through struggle. If in the ideological sphere we can put forward correct revolutionary theory and strike hard at their counter-revolutionary theory, if in the political sphere we adopt tactics suited to the times and strike hard at their anti-communist and anti-progressive policies, and if in the military sphere we take appropriate measures and strike back hard at their attacks, then we shall be able to restrict the effective range of their reactionary policy and compel them to recognize the status of the progressive forces, and we shall be able to expand the progressive forces, win over the middle forces and isolate the die-hard forces."

AN OPPORTUNIST LINE CHANGES AS OFTEN AS AN OPPORTUNIST VACILLATES

"Concrete analysis of concrete conditions, Lenin said, is 'the most essential thing in Marxism, the living soul of Marxism'. Lacking an analytical approach, many of our comrades do not want to go deeply into complex matters, to analyse and study them over and over again, but like to draw simple conclusions which are either absolutely affirmative or absolutely negative."

This quote from "Our Study And The Current Situation" by Mao Zedong goes to the heart of Edward Pickersgill's incorrect political analysis of the united front and the national bourgeoisie in Canada. Edward Pickersgill was an ideological quack who completely lacked an analytical approach and who made superficial pronouncements on matters of importance according to his whim from one day to the next. Objective reality was something he just sloughed off as he catered to whatever served his own narrow perceptions.

Edward Pickersgill seized his chance to sow further confusion on the question when a group of comrades were gathered for discussion. The leading comrade who had forced Edward Pickersgill to capitulate on this question earlier was absent from the meeting. This ideological quack saw a chance to spread confusion and inserted himself into this opportunity as neatly as a hand going into a tight fitting glove.

On March 21, 1955 in his "Speech At The National Conference Of The Communist Party of China", Mao Zedong spoke against factionalist leaders in the revolutionary organization, like Edward Pickersgill, who "schemed and conspired, operated clandestinely in the Party and surreptitiously sowed dissension among comrades, but in public they put up a front to camouflage their activities. These were precisely the kind of vile activities the landlord class and the bourgeoisie usually resorted to in the past. In the *Manifesto Of The Communist Party Marx and Engels* say, 'The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims.' As Communists, let alone as senior Party cadres, we must all be open and above-board politically, always ready to express our political views openly and take a stand, for or against, on each and every important political issue."

In this meeting Edward Pickersgill put forward the position that we should call off our highly successful propaganda attacks on the

W.C. Wood Co. and turn our attention to some "U.S. imperialist corporations". The program of propaganda attacks on the Wood Co. involved the distribution of three issues of *Alive* to the workers in the factory. These issues included an article on the 1959 strike at the company in *Alive* #102, a short story called "Fighting To Win" in *Alive* #108, and an analysis of the effects of these two articles on the workers and management at Wood's in issue #110. All of these handouts caused major panic among the management at the Wood Co. The workers, on the other hand, read all three issues of *Alive* with great enthusiasm and interest. A great deal of warmth was created for *Alive* among the workers at the Wood Co.

This program was, to a certain extent, an experimental propaganda program which concentrated its focus on one or two specific issues at one place. The results of the program confirmed Mao Zedong's teaching in "Rectify The Party's Style Of Work". Mao said: "It is necessary to master Marxist theory and apply it, master it for the sole purpose of applying it. If you can apply the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint in elucidating one or two practical problems, you should be commended and credited with some achievement. The more problems you elucidate and the more comprehensively and profoundly you do so, the greater will be your achievement."

The stated opposition to continuing this program is interesting in light of Edward Pickersgill's initial enthusiastic response. Edward Pickersgill wrote a poem entitled "On The Job At Woods" under the pseudonym of Larry Peterson (*Alive* #110, page 16) which praises the program at Wood's.

This poem is interesting in several respects. First of all it is one of the few poems which Edward Pickersgill wrote in recent years. Having not written a poem for a number of years he finally decided to write in praise of a program which he later attacked. The contortions of a political opportunist are truly amazing!

It is also interesting to note that although the poem recounts in glowing terms the experience of handing out magazines to the workers Edward Pickersgill was never in fact involved in that program.

Edward Pickersgill was impetuous in setting practical programs and arrogant about claiming credit in a quick sum-up poem, however, at the same time he was very jealous to guard his posture of non-participation in practical work. The essay "On Correcting Mistaken Ideas In The Party" by Mao Zedong exposes this arrogant laziness: "Some comrades, disregarding the subjective and objective conditions, suffer from the malady of revolutionary impetuosity; they will not take pains to do minute and detailed work among the masses, but, riddled with illusions, want only to do big things."

While, to use Edward Pickersgill's own words, "emerald skies of the morning" beckoned the other comrades to their "life work", the poet himself was asleep in bed. His participation in this program was conducted from a prone position with his eyes closed, in an unconscious state. Presumably this is one stage below being an armchair revolutionary!

The attack on the Collective's highly successful program against the Wood Co. amounted to open sabotage of a correct program. The program exposing John Wood was an excellent model of how to do propaganda against the sell-out section of the bourgeoisie in a direct, down-to-earth, understandable way. In this, it served as a general model which is applicable all over Canada and overseas.

The revolutionary organization we have is not large in numbers or great in influence. Thus, much of our strategic thrust has been a matter of creating models for revolutionary education and propaganda work. These models can be applied in depth wherever they have been successful as we build our organization in the next period of our work. In the context of the years when our strategy was one of experimentation, the experience at the W.C. Wood Co. was a model that achieved important results. That experience was one that pointed the way to achieve maximum results from a propaganda blow.

Stalin wrote of this approach in "Concerning The Question Of The Strategy And Tactics Of The Russian Communists": "The

most important function of strategy is to determine the main direction which ought to be taken by the working-class movement, and along which the proletariat can most advantageously deliver the main blow at its enemy in order to achieve the aims formulated in the programme. A strategic plan is a plan of the organisation of the decisive blow in the direction in which the blow is most likely to achieve the maximum results."

Edward Pickersgill saw that we had had a success at the W.C. Wood Co. and began to panic. Immediately he went into top gear to try to sabotage the program and turn success into failure.

In this particular discussion Edward Pickersgill's line won a temporary victory. This opportunist had chosen to move when other leading comrades who could best expose his bankrupt line were absent. It is interesting to note that the comrade who had previously argued this point with the ideological quack was not even given a report on the discussion. Edward Pickersgill was a master of dishonesty!

"I believe we should do things honestly, for without an honest attitude it is absolutely impossible to accomplish anything in this world." This quote from Mao Zedong's "Rectify The Party's Style Of Work" can be applied directly to oppose Edward Pickersgill.

The comrades who heard the proposal to ease up on the Wood Co. began to back off as Edward Pickersgill launched attacks on various comrades without warning. He viciously launched a groundless personal attack on one comrade present, labelling this person a "worker chauvinist" because the comrade supported continuing the propaganda attack on the Wood Co.

On April 23, 1975 Mao Zedong warned: "Not many people in our Party really understand Marxism-Leninism. Some think they do, but in fact they know very little. They consider themselves always in the right and are only too ready to lecture others. This is in itself a manifestation of lack of knowledge of Marxism-Leninism."

Edward Pickersgill fancied himself a knowledgeable ideologue but in fact he knew nothing. He considered himself always in the right and was only too ready to lecture a leading comrade of the Collective on "falling head over heels in love with John Wood" and to lecture another comrade on the "worker chauvinist" nature of any attack on John Wood. There were no depths to which this opportunist would not sink in order to sabotage the program of the Collective and serve his own selfish ends.

Edward Pickersgill promoted a closed-door policy as opposed to a united front policy. He branded the national bourgeoisie as absolutely negative and promoted a break with this strata, rather than a principled unity with conscious struggle. In this fanaticism, the ideological quack set himself up for the opportunist mistake of letting the sell-out bourgeoisie off the hook. Further he committed this mistake under the "Left" guise of "going after some U.S. imperialist corporations".

Edward Pickersgill's political line accorded exactly with that exposed by Mao Zedong in "Combat Bourgeois Ideas In The Party": "Left" opportunist mistakes, as we said before, are a reflection of petty-bourgeois fanaticism within the Party; they occurred in times when we broke with the bourgeoisie."

Edward Pickersgill took the campaign against the W.C. Wood Co. out of the context of the existing Collective strategy of experimentation and counterposed it to be a brilliant new tactical thrust which was couched in the most "Left" terms but in reality was obscure and unspecific. Joseph Stalin in "Concerning The Question Of The Strategy And Tactics Of The Russian Communists" expounds on the error of such a method. Stalin wrote: "There are also times when tactical successes, brilliant from the point of view of their immediate effect but not corresponding to the strategic possibilities, create an 'unexpected' situation, fatal to the whole campaign."

Edward Pickersgill's vacillating position on the national bourgeoisie stands exposed. When it suited his purposes he simply closed his eyes and denied their existence. On another occasion however he misidentified a sell-out bourgeois as a national bourgeois despite the fact that the identification of this bourgeois had been clearly explained to him in a previous discussion. On the

basis of this misidentification this opportunist launched a campaign in support of the sell-out bourgeoisie in Canada. This opportunist would support any analysis which served his own immediate purposes.

This ideological blockhead had no interest in identifying a correct analysis of any given situation. All he wanted to do was to identify the analysis which best served his own selfish interests.

LETTING THE BAINZITES OFF THE HOOK

In issue #84 of *Alive* an article entitled "It Is Important To Distinguish Between Revolutionaries And Enemy Agents And To Treat Each With A Different Attitude", appeared under the name of the Lu Hsun Editorial Committee, on this occasion nothing more than a pseudonym for Edward Pickersgill. The original draft of this article contained a number of serious political errors. When these errors were pointed out this ideological blockhead resorted to his usual method of defence. He began to yell and scream and insult the comrades.

Edward Pickersgill thought his personal opinion, whether correct or incorrect, decided everything. Mao Zedong teaches: "The correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything."

In the original draft of the article this ideological quack promoted the line that enemy agents are among the people. Although Mao Zedong clearly defined the difference between "contradictions between the people and the enemy", and those "among the people", Edward Pickersgill ignored this fact and charged ahead to develop his own "masterful thesis" on this question.

This imbecile's "analysis" maintained that, because these enemy agents mingle with the people, they are in fact among the people. These wrong ideas were patiently opposed when other comrades explained that proximity to something does not mean that you become part of that thing. A wolf standing in a flock of sheep does not become a sheep. A man standing in a women's changing room does not become a woman. A factory owner standing on the shop floor does not become a worker. Nor did the fact that Edward Pickersgill was a member of the *Alive* Production Collective mixing with committed revolutionaries make him a committed revolutionary! These things are obvious to anybody but an imbecile. As Stalin concisely said, on November 7, 1942: "The logic of facts is stronger than any other logic."

Edward Pickersgill developed his "masterful thesis" still further. He stated that the contradiction between the Canadian people and the Bainzites is a non-antagonistic contradiction "among the people". This inane "analysis" was vigorously opposed by the other comrades who explained that as agents of a foreign imperialist power, i.e. the Soviet Union, the Bainzites are clearly not "among the people". The contradiction between the Bainzites and the Canadian people is an antagonistic contradiction and will be dealt with as such when the Canadian people take up the stage of armed struggle.

The ideological quack refused to recognize this analysis and continued to whine that the Bainzites were "among the people" because they mingled with the people.

Edward Pickersgill pompously conjured up these "masterful theses" and then stuck to them no matter how often it was proved to him that his theses were in contradiction with reality. This method was very common with this ideological blockhead. Edward Pickersgill was a theorist in Canada who went completely opposite to the methods Mao Zedong called for in China. In the speech "Rectify The Party's Style Of Work", Mao said: "What kind of theorists do we want? We want theorists who can, in accordance with the Marxist-Leninist stand, viewpoint and method, correctly interpret the practical problems arising in the course of history and revolution and give scientific explanations and theoretical elucidations of China's economic, political, military, cultural and other problems. Such are the theorists we want. To be a theorist of this kind, a person must have a true grasp of the essence of Marxism-Leninism, of the Marxist-Leninist stand, viewpoint and

method and of the theories of Lenin and Stalin on the colonial revolution and the Chinese revolution, and he must be able to apply them in a penetrating and scientific analysis of China's practical problems and discover the laws of development of these problems. Such are the theorists we really need."

Edward Pickersgill was caught in a dilemma in the argument over his article because he was unable to defend his position and unable to terrorize the other comrades into submission. Unwilling to change his line, he finally compromised by saying he would not use the phrase "among the people". In the published version of the article the phrase "among the people" is replaced by the phrase "in the ranks of the people". Edward Pickersgill accepted this compromise because he said that the phrase "in the ranks of the people" could be read either the way he wanted it to be read or the way the other comrades had in mind. This bourgeois academic saw ambiguity as a satisfactory solution to this political contradiction.

In "The Debate On The Co-operative Transformation Of Agriculture And The Current Class Struggle", Mao Zedong states: "If you don't go among the cadres and the masses, or if, when among them, you are always taking them to task instead of consulting and exchanging views with them, saying 'What do you think of my ideas? Please tell me your opinions', you won't be able to sense the political climate, your nose will become insensitive and you will catch cold politically. Once your nose is stopped up, you can't tell what the climate is at a given time. Today Comrade Chen Yi said that one must be able to grasp a thing when it is in the bud. A person must be most slow-witted if he fails to see what is widespread and abundant."

On the question of contradictions among the people, and, the Bainzites, Edward Pickersgill failed to see what was abundantly clear. Edward Pickersgill never sought the opinions of the revolutionary cadres or the masses. He was insensitive and he caught his death of cold politically. This ideological quack was most slow-witted!

MORE ON EDWARD PICKERSGILL AND THE BAINZITES

Edward Pickersgill's poor grasp of the nature of the Bainzites, despite the *Alive* Production Collective's wealth of negative experience with these KGB agents, is a clear indication of his thoroughgoing ideological weakness.

This lack of grasp of the actual nature of this band of KGB agents was exposed on a number of occasions since the Collective's split with the Bainzites in 1975.

One of the major articles in *Alive's* public polemic against the Bainzites was printed in *Alive* #62, dated December 4, 1976. Titled "What Is The Trouble And Who Is The Troublemaker In The Anti-Imperialist Revolution?", this article was published more than a full year after *Alive* publicly made known its sharp political disagreements with the Bainzites. The way in which this article developed is a clear exposure of this ideological blockhead's poor grasp of the actual nature of these KGB agents.

Edward Pickersgill wrote up the first draft of the article and arrogantly presented it to the Collective for what he saw as "routine approval". He was extremely confident that he had written an ideological masterpiece.

This style had nothing in common with the modesty called for in a revolutionary leader. This modesty was outlined in a speech by Stalin on January 28, 1924: "Only later did I realize that this simplicity and modesty, this striving to remain unobserved, or, at least, not to make himself conspicuous and not to emphasise his high position, this feature was one of Lenin's strongest points as the new leader of the new masses, of the simple and ordinary masses of the 'rank and file' of humanity."

When the Collective decided that the article which Edward Pickersgill had prepared on the Bainzites needed considerable reworking he personalized the criticism and acted like a scolded schoolboy. He went into a dismal sulk and refused to participate in the re-drafting of the article, merely muttering "okay" in sour tones when the Collective members asked what he thought of the

changes they were making.

If he had been an actual revolutionary, Edward Pickersgill would not have taken the criticism personally nor would he have shown such a fear of having his mistakes openly identified. Mao Zedong, in "Some Experiences In Our Party's History", outlines the correct approach to errors: "Communists should not be afraid of making mistakes. Mistakes have a dual character. On the one hand mistakes harm the Party and the people; on the other they serve as good teachers, giving both the Party and the people a good education, and this benefits the revolution. Failure is the mother of success. If there is nothing good about failure, how can it be the mother of success? When too many mistakes are made, there is bound to be a turn-about. That is Marxism. 'Things turn into their opposites when they reach the extreme'; when mistakes pile up, light is not far off."

The article by Edward Pickersgill about the Bainzites went through two more drafts before it reached a point where the Collective was satisfied with it. This process produced an entirely new article in the sense that almost every sentence of the original was changed in the process.

This article, which in its first draft was meant to be a masterful ideological stroke for Edward Pickersgill, ended up in print as a solid piece of Collective writing. Not only should Edward Pickersgill *not* receive credit for this anti-Bainzite article, it should be noted that he did nothing at all to assist the rest of the Collective in preparing the article for publication.

So much for this bourgeois academic's grasp of the nature of the Bainzites. Like an absent-minded professor, Edward Pickersgill's ideas are completely abstracted from his own experience. Despite long hours recounting his experiences with the Bainzites, in the course of which he promoted that this was the primary political event in his life, Edward Pickersgill had no understanding of these KGB agents. What a charlatan!

"Combat Bourgeois Ideas In The Party" is the title of a 1953 speech by Mao Zedong. In this speech, Mao cautions: "Rash advance and conservatism both disregard the actual state of affairs, both are subjectivism."

On the question of the Bainzites, Edward Pickersgill gave full blossom to his subjectivism. In his proposed article for *Alive* 62, he made a rash advance and in his proposed article for *Alive* 84 he expressed conservatism.

In the same 1953 speech, Mao Zedong states: "Both dogmatism and empiricism are forms of subjectivism. No revolution can triumph unless theory is integrated with practice. The problem was solved in that rectification movement. We were right in adopting the policy of learning from past mistakes to avoid future ones and curing the sickness to save the patient."

In his rash argument in the draft of an article offered for *Alive* 62, Edward Pickersgill put forward dogmatic denunciations of the Bainzites that amounted to little more than a string of standard rhetorical phrases. This draft did not explain the facts of the organizational relations between *Alive* and the Bainzites but it did whitewash Edward Pickersgill's role in delivering the Collective into Bainzite clutches. Thus, facts and sound ideological analysis both gave way to dogmatism in this piece of writing from Edward Pickersgill.

In his arguments in favour of analyzing the Bainzites as being "among the people" because they were mingling with the people, Edward Pickersgill was putting forward an extremely empiricist position.

This ideological blockhead promoted himself as a great anti-Bainzite when he did not even grasp the most simple facts about these KGB agents.

Edward Pickersgill's incorrect view of the Bainzites and the two superpowers, which groups like the Bainzites serve, made him operate less like a member of our organization and more like the type of ally Stalin described in "Foundation Of Leninism": "To fight imperialism with such 'allies' in one's rear means to put oneself in

the position of being caught between two fires, from the front and from the rear. Therefore, ruthless struggle against such elements, their expulsion from the Party, is a prerequisite for the successful struggle against imperialism."

ON THE NORTH OF CANADA

Edward Pickersgill's grasp of anti-imperialist revolutionary theory was weak. This weakness continually reflected itself in his inability to explain even some of the most basic aspects of the *Alive* Production Collective's political line.

"There are many Party members who have joined the Communist Party organizationally but have not yet joined the Party wholly or at all ideologically. Those who have not joined the Party ideologically still carry a great deal of the muck of the exploiting classes in their heads, and have no idea at all of what proletarian ideology, or communism, or the Party is."

This quote from Mao Zedong about members of the Chinese Communist Party also sums up Edward Pickersgill's approach to his membership in the *Alive* Production Collective. He carried the muck of the exploiting classes in his head. He had no idea at all of what proletarian ideology or communism were. He certainly did not know what the revolutionary organization should be.

In a discussion with friends of *Alive* held in late 1977, Edward Pickersgill was asked a number of questions. When asked to explain the *Alive* Production Collective's position on the development of Canada's north, he was unable to give an answer and gave way to another Collective member. This was a revealing development for two reasons.

First, the question of the development of Canada's north had been collectively considered earlier in the year; the outline of the position was put forward in the short story "Unity In Struggle" published in *Alive* Magazine #72 (April 9, 1977). Edward Pickersgill neither participated in the development of the position put forward in this short story, nor, obviously did he even read the story! Once again the ideological blockhead went directly against Mao Zedong Thought. Mao exhorted revolutionaries to "read and study conscientiously and have a good grasp of Marxism."

Second, this is not a tough question. It is a question frequently asked of Collective members and supporters when they are doing propaganda work. This is because there is much opposition in Canada to U.S. imperialist development of the north, especially from the oppressed Native People who live in the north. The fact that Edward Pickersgill couldn't answer this question is indicative of the fact that he hadn't participated in practical propaganda work very much, and had isolated himself from the concerns of the masses of Canadian people.

In his "Talks At A Conference Of Secretaries Of Provincial, Municipal And Autonomous Region Party Committees", Mao Zedong warned that when a leader in a revolutionary organization pursues a path isolated from the masses, he pursues a path fraught with dangers. Mao stated: "Go down to the grass roots and study the problems there. I hope that the comrades on the Central Committee and the leading comrades in charge of the provinces, municipalities and autonomous regions and of the central departments will all do this. I have heard that many leading comrades no longer do so, which is not good. The central organs are miserable places where you can get no knowledge at all. If you are seeking knowledge, you won't find any by staying put in your office. The factories, the co-operatives and the shops are the real sources of knowledge. If you stay in your office, you will never get a clear idea of how factories, co-operatives and shops are run. The higher the office, the less the knowledge. To tackle problems, you must go down personally or invite people to come up."

Edward Pickersgill would have done well to heed this important essay. Mao Zedong later projects the demise of characters like Edward Pickersgill: "Keep in close touch with the masses. Alienation from the masses and bureaucracy are sure to bring punishment upon one's head."

ACTIVE OPPOSITION TO MARXISM-Leninism-MAO ZEDONG THOUGHT

Edward Pickersgill has never, in practice, supported Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. In the past five years he has mouthed words of support for Marxism but has always acted in practice to discourage members of the Collective from deepening their grasp of the science of revolution. He has mouthed support only because objective reality forced him to do so. As Lenin said: "The dialectics of history are such that the theoretical victory of Marxism obliged its enemies to *disguise themselves* as Marxists."

However, in the early 1970's, during the first years of the Collective, this bourgeois careerist actually expressed his anti-Marxist reactionary views directly.

In political struggles which took place in 1971 amongst those core people who worked on the production and distribution of *Alive Magazine*, Edward Pickersgill actively opposed the reading of Marxist-Leninist classics. At the time this ignoramus was infatuated with U.S. guru Buckminster Fuller. Other comrades were pursuing individual study programs and small group discussions on many basic texts by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong. Though the Collective had only a small membership at the time, it could be broken down ideologically into three categories along the same lines as Mao Zedong outlined in "Combat Bourgeois Ideas In The Party": "We must unfold a struggle in the Party against bourgeois ideas. Ideologically, the Party membership falls into three categories: some comrades are firm and unwavering and are Marxist-Leninist in their thinking; quite a number are essentially Marxist-Leninist but infected with non-Marxist-Leninist ideas; and a small number are no good, their thinking is non-Marxist-Leninist."

Edward Pickersgill was no good, his thinking was non-Marxist-Leninist. He actively encouraged his comrades to put down their books by Lenin and pick up the trash that he was pouring over. Fortunately the other comrades did not follow this rotten lead and continued to develop a theoretical basis which has proven indispensable to the Collective's political development.

Edward Pickersgill feared the potential power being created amongst the ordinary Collective members through studying Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. As a leader he had the negative characteristics described by J.V. Stalin in "Lenin: A Speech Delivered At A Memorial Meeting Of The Kremlin Military School". Stalin explained: "Theoreticians and leaders of parties, men who are acquainted with the history of nations and who have studied the history of revolutions from beginning to end, are sometimes afflicted by a shameful disease. This disease is called fear of the masses, disbelief in the creative power of the masses. This sometimes gives rise in the leaders to a kind of aristocratic attitude towards the masses, who, although not versed in the history of revolutions, are destined to destroy the old order and build the new. This kind of aristocratic attitude is due to a fear that the elements may break loose, that the masses may 'destroy too much'; it is due to a desire to play the part of a mentor who tries to teach the masses from books, but who is averse to learning from the masses."

In his attacks on the Marxist-Leninist classics Edward Pickersgill went so far as to attempt to use Mao Zedong's good name to attack V.I. Lenin. In arguing that his comrades shouldn't be "wasting their time" reading Lenin, he noted that even Mao Zedong wrote about this in his essay "Oppose Book Worship". When it was pointed out to this blockhead that Mao Zedong supported the study of Marxist books in this essay, but warned that the study must be integrated with a country's actual conditions, this ignoramus quickly backtracked on this slander. He even admitted that he hadn't read the essay in question and that he had assumed he knew what it was about just by mulling over the three word title.

In light of this it is interesting to note that the first section in Mao Zedong's essay "Oppose Book Worship" is entitled, "No Investigation, No Right To Speak". Clearly this ideological blockhead had

never read Mao Zedong's essay. If he had ever read it he would have begun to get the feeling that Mao Zedong was addressing Edward Pickersgill's own errors directly. The section in question includes two slogans which apply exactly to this misleader's case: "You must investigate! You must not talk nonsense!"

Edward Pickersgill's campaign against the study of Marxist-Leninist classics at this time was an attempt to tie other comrades up with domestic chores which he was not prepared to do. Michelle Landriault had complained to her husband about having to do so many domestic chores. This "loyal" husband worked to free his virgin maiden from this "plight" by shifting the weight onto other comrades who were already working long hours in factories, which neither he nor his virgin maiden ever did!

In "The Right Deviation In The C.P.S.U. (B.)" Stalin asks the rhetorical question: "Is it not obvious that factional pettiness can sometimes produce in people a typically liberal blindness and narrowmindedness?"

The practice of Edward Pickersgill's faction in the *Alive Production Collective*, starting from the faction's earliest beginnings, gives Stalin's question a resounding answer of "Yes! It is obvious. Factionalists are the most petty, the most blind liberals and the most narrow-minded!"

Although Edward Pickersgill was not successful in getting people to give up the reading of Marxist-Leninist classics, he was successful in getting the other comrades busier and busier with all sorts of little chores. These chores had nothing at all to do with the editing and production of *Alive Magazine*. That "glorious" work was reserved for Edward Pickersgill himself. Rather, the other comrades became busier in "support" functions and were thus able to find less time for both study of revolutionary theory and work on *Alive Magazine*.

This was an early reflection of Edward Pickersgill's bankrupt line that practice is everything, while theory is nothing. Edward Pickersgill worked to develop a situation where comrades worked constantly from morning to night and were never given time for discussion or study.

"Dogmatism and empiricism alike are subjectivism, each originating from an opposite pole.

"Hence there are two kinds of subjectivism in our Party, dogmatism and empiricism. Each sees only a part and not the whole. If people are not on guard, do not realize that such one-sidedness is a shortcoming and do not strive to overcome it, they are liable to go astray."

Mao Zedong's words, presented in "Rectify The Party's Style Of Work", expose Edward Pickersgill's subjectivism. Edward Pickersgill's practice of enshrining three words by Mao Zedong, "oppose book worship", is a typical example of the extreme dogmatism that this quack fell into whenever it seemed to suit his purpose. Edward Pickersgill's view that practice is everything, theory nothing, is an expression of the depth of his empiricism, which he kept in stock to alternate with his dogmatism.

Edward Pickersgill's approach is one-sided. He did not strive to overcome it. He did go astray.

In the same essay, Mao Zedong goes on to expose Edward Pickersgill's type even further. He warns of the danger of such rotten characters dressing themselves up in a disguise of the-most-correct — in theory and in practice.

Mao warns: "However, of the two kinds of subjectivism, dogmatism is still the greater danger in our Party. For dogmatists can easily assume a Marxist guise to bluff, capture and make servitors of cadres of working-class and peasant origin who cannot easily see through them; they can also bluff and ensnare the naive youth. If we overcome dogmatism, cadres with book-learning will readily join with those who have experience and will take to the study of practical things, and then many good cadres who integrate theory with experience, as well as some real theorists, will emerge. If we overcome dogmatism, the comrades with practical experience will have good teachers to help them raise their experience to the level of theory and so avoid empiricist errors."

NOTHING IDEOLOGICAL OR POLITICAL ABOUT THIS FACTION

"Such is our optimism. It is based on scientific grounds. Provided that we know more about Marxism-Leninism and the natural sciences, in short, more about the laws of the objective world, and make fewer mistakes of a subjectivist kind, we are sure to attain our goals in revolution."

In the above quote Mao Zedong emphasizes the undeniable necessity for revolutionaries to improve their scope of knowledge and their ideological grasp. Over the years since the formation of the Alive Production Collective, Edward Pickersgill has done virtually nothing to improve his grasp of revolutionary ideology. He has been an extremely intransigent ignoramus on this whole question.

Edward Pickersgill never attended an ideological study session inside the Alive Production Collective. He was always full of petty excuses about all the important tasks he had to do and how he was too busy to study. On other occasions he would try to hide these excuses behind a thin veneer of altruism, claiming that he would "hold the fort" and so enable other comrades to study.

Everybody else in the Collective attended study sessions whenever they were not blocked by Edward Pickersgill, which was very infrequently. These comrades had a genuine thirst for knowledge about Marxism-Leninism. These comrades took up Zhou Enlai's call, from August 1973, when he quoted Mao Zedong in stating: "We hope that through sustained efforts 'the vast numbers of our cadres and the people will be able to arm themselves with the basic theories of Marxism'."

During his years in the Collective Edward Pickersgill only led one study group. This was a study group for external political contacts of Alive, and Edward Pickersgill's main contribution to this group, which was supposed to deal with "On Correcting Mistaken Ideas In The Party", was long-winded tales about his life with the Bainzites. He had lots of stories to tell but little or no political analysis to give.

On one occasion Edward Pickersgill went so far as to threaten to lead a study group internal to the Alive Production Collective. This group was to study the same document as the external group he led. Less than an hour before the first meeting of this group was scheduled to begin, the blockhead abandoned the whole program on the basis of some trumped-up attack on another comrade. He launched a surprise attack on this unsuspecting comrade and used the contradiction which followed this as an excuse to cancel the initial meeting of the group. Having cancelled this first meeting, he simply refused to organize any other meetings of the study group despite numerous requests from other comrades.

These comrades wanted to study because they wanted to more and more come to know the outlook of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and to apply the Marxist method to their day to day lives. Edward Pickersgill blocked them because of his fear that such a practical application of revolutionary method might become more pronounced in political matters in the Alive Production Collective.

Mao Zedong taught: "The naked eye is not enough, we must have the aid of the telescope and the microscope. The Marxist method is our telescope and microscope in political and military matters."

A line which Edward Pickersgill frequently used to defend his own unwillingness to sit down and engage in collective discussion or collective study was that "telling is not teaching". Using this slogan the ideological quack would explain that since genuine knowledge can only be gained through direct experience then simply telling someone about something will teach the person nothing. On the basis of this concoction, Edward Pickersgill "reasoned" that it was a waste of time to try to tell anybody anything.

The correct line on this question is that while telling a comrade something does not mean that they will learn it at once, telling is certainly a part of the learning process. Having heard something in

advance of actual direct experience is often invaluable in the process of summing up experience and moving practice to a higher level. Often correct knowledge can be arrived at only after many repetitions of the process leading from practice to knowledge and then back to practice. Of course, if what one has been "told" is another person's direct experience with exactly the same thing that one is trying to get done, being told may change the course of one's own direct experience. How else can one learn from history's mistakes without repeating them? How else can one repeat the lessons of successful revolutionary developments in history?

Mao Zedong discusses this question of direct and indirect experience in his essay, "On Practice". Here he says: "All genuine knowledge originates in direct experience. But one cannot have direct experience of everything; as a matter of fact, most of our knowledge comes from indirect experience, for example, all knowledge from past times and foreign lands. To our ancestors and to foreigners, such knowledge was — or is — a matter of direct experience, and this knowledge is reliable if in the course of their direct experience the requirement of 'scientific abstraction', spoken of by Lenin, was — or is — fulfilled and objective reality scientifically reflected, otherwise it is not reliable. Hence a man's knowledge consists only of two parts, that which comes from direct experience and that which comes from indirect experience. Moreover, what is indirect experience for me is direct experience for other people. Consequently, considered as a whole, knowledge of any kind is inseparable from direct experience."

By denying the role of telling in the learning process Edward Pickersgill was in effect denying the role of indirect experience. This is an incorrect position and was used by the quack to try to defend his own laziness. He had such contempt for his comrades that he couldn't be bothered to even talk to them, much less hear their ideas and share experiences with them.

With regards to political study and ideological foundation, Edward Pickersgill, in his factionalist outlook, and the rest of his faction proved to be exact replicas of Trotsky and his faction who were denounced in "Violation Of Unity Under Cover Of Cries For Unity". This essay, written by Lenin in 1914, states: "It is the worst kind of factionalism, for there is *nothing* ideologically and politically definite about it."

BORED WITH LEARNING, BORED WITH TEACHING

Mao Zedong directed leading revolutionary comrades to pursue study actively: "All secretaries of the provincial, municipal and prefectural Party committees and the leading comrades of the central departments should exert themselves and, on the basis of raising their level of Marxism-Leninism, turn themselves into experts versed in both political and economic work."

Edward Pickersgill not only refused to attend or lead Collective study sessions. He also refused to study any Marxist-Leninist classics on his own.

On average this ideological ignoramus read one essay by Mao Zedong every year but would rarely touch anything written by Marx, Engels, Lenin or Stalin. For example he never read Lenin's works, "What Is To Be Done?", "One Step Forward, Two Steps Back", or "Imperialism, The Highest Stage Of Capitalism". He never read the "Communist Manifesto" by Marx and Engels or Stalin's works against trotskyism.

Edward Pickersgill read "Quotations From Chairman Mao Zedong" completely five or six times and he also read a number of articles in the collection "Five Articles By Chairman Mao Zedong". In this book he read "Combat Liberalism", "In Memory Of Norman Bethune" and "The Foolish Old Man Who Removed The Mountains". During the Mini-Cultural Revolution he read "On Correcting Mistaken Ideas In The Party" and proceeded to distort the ideas in this article and use these distortions to launch vicious attacks against a large number of Collective members. This was the article on which he based his "anti-putschist campaign".

Edward Pickersgill never read "Serve The People". Presumably the title of the article just didn't interest him!

While Edward Pickersgill was working with the Bainzites he studied Stalin's book "Marxism And Problems Of Linguistics". He read this because Hardial Bains said that it was of great relevance to anyone in revolutionary cultural work. It is interesting to note that he only studied works by Stalin when he was directed to do so by Bains. Since he discussed what he read with the Bainzites only, it is safe to say that he had a very distorted view of Stalin's actual analysis.

In general Edward Pickersgill had no interest in reading any of the Marxist-Leninist classics. In fact, he used to have a member of his faction do reading for him. By this arrangement, his co-factionalist would read works he suggested and mark up significant passages and key quotes for him as she did so. The chief factionalist would then use these quotes at random in his writing. The woman who performed this reading function for Edward Pickersgill was, ironically, a comrade who he consistently proclaimed to have a very poor grasp of ideology.

Although Edward Pickersgill always proclaimed his merit as being a person with a great deal of practical experience, he took the opposite path from that advocated for experienced people by Mao Zedong. In "Rectify The Party's Style Of Work", Mao notes: "Those experienced in work must take up the study of theory and must read seriously; only then will they be able to systematize and synthesize their experience and raise it to the level of theory, only then will they not mistake their partial experience for universal truth and not commit empiricist errors."

Whenever Edward Pickersgill was asked about the fact that he did not read any important theoretical works he would throw up the smokescreen that Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and even Mao Zedong were hard to read. He attacked Lenin in particular with this charge. Anyone who has read works by Lenin knows that this attack is nothing but groundless slander of the lowest kind.

It is interesting to note that Edward Pickersgill always praised works by Enver Hoxha as easier to read than any by the five great teachers of Marxism-Leninism. This ideological ignoramus gave forth this analysis without concrete investigation. He had read just a couple of works by Enver Hoxha and even these only at the urging of other comrades. These included, "The Ideological Character Of Gossip", "Socialism Is Built By The Masses, The Party Makes Them Conscious", and also some passages on criticism and self-criticism. He never read any of Enver Hoxha's writings on women or youth, subjects that were dealt with in Collective study sessions.

On other occasions Edward Pickersgill was a little more straightforward when asked why he did not study the classics. He would simply reply that he was "bored with learning and bored with teaching". This statement can be found in Edward Pickersgill's documents written after August 18, 1978. The statement is a contemptuous twisting of Mao Zedong's dictum: "Our attitude towards ourselves should be 'to be insatiable in learning' and towards others 'to be tireless in teaching'." The obvious question which comes up is: how could he be bored with something he never did? How could this ignoramus be bored with learning and bored with teaching when these were two things he worked hard to avoid doing?

Clearly Edward Pickersgill was bored with something else. He was bored with revolution and bored with progressive politics. Presumably his boredom is now relieved as he wallows around in a mire of counter-revolution and reactionary politics!

Edward Pickersgill knew well that there was a general, unacceptable low level of ideological understanding in our organization. He knew that if the ordinary members began to rectify this weakness they would come to know and criticize his false leadership all the more systematically and unerringly. Thus, Edward Pickersgill spread an atmosphere against study and against raising the general ideological level.

Joseph Stalin denounced such behaviour in his work "Against Vulgarising The Slogan Of Self-Criticism": "I am referring to the bureaucratic elements who batten on our weaknesses and errors, who fear like the plague all criticism by the masses, all control by

the masses, and who hinder us in developing self-criticism and ridding ourselves of our weaknesses and errors."

Edward Pickersgill's concoction about how difficult it is to read works by the five great teachers of Marxism-Leninism provided massive misleadership on the question of individual study. Comrades in the Collective were afraid of embarking on any kind of individual study program fearing that they would understand nothing that they read. Hand-in-hand with criminal misleadership on this question, the ideological blockhead actively sabotaged any attempts to engage in collective study. Thus he attempted to prevent all ideological study within the Collective, be it collective or individual study. His attempts met with some success but those determined to study pressed on regardless. No petty despot can block a comrade with a real thirst for revolutionary knowledge.

Edward Pickersgill did not study revolutionary ideology. As a result he could never explain everyday phenomena or political matters by using ideological reasons and explanations. This tendency manifested itself very strongly when Edward Pickersgill tried to justify and rationalize his faction and his factionalist outlook. In the documents written by the chief of the faction after August 18, 1978, he could not give an ideological argument to defend his practice or even a political definition of factionalism. This performance is testimony to the absolute denial of theoretical study by Edward Pickersgill.

This performance also accords with the performance by Trotsky and other factionalists as exposed by Lenin in "The New Faction Of Conciliators": "The conciliators give no ideological reasons in explanation of the phenomenon in question. They do not point to any organizational or to any other distinguishing features of the groups which could give rise to this phenomenon. Nothing, simply nothing, absolutely no explanation, except that they refer to factionalism as a vice and to non-factionalism as a virtue. The only difference between the conciliators in Paris and Trotsky is that the former regard Trotsky as a factionalist and themselves as non-factional, whereas Trotsky holds the opposite view."

LIN BIAOIST METHOD OF STUDY

In the "Report To The Tenth National Congress Of The Communist Party Of China", Zhou Enlai stated: "Lin Biao and his handful of sworn followers were a counter-revolutionary conspiratorial clique 'who never showed up without a copy of Quotations in hand and never opened their mouths without shouting "Long Live" and who spoke nice things to your face but stabbed you in the back'."

Edward Pickersgill practiced the Lin Biaoist method of attempting to study Mao Zedong Thought by reading "Quotations From Chairman Mao Zedong". He also shouted "long live" and stabbed you in the back although it was only rarely that he spoke nice things to your face.

"Quotations" is intended to be used as a reference guide to the key concepts in Mao Zedong Thought. Having identified a quote which deals with the topic of interest, the reader should then go to the original essay in Mao Zedong's work and read the quote in the context of the whole essay. The key thing is to be able to understand and apply the concepts contained in Mao Zedong's works, not to be able to repeat verbatim phrases out of context.

Mao Zedong underlines this idea in "The Role Of The Chinese Communist Party In The National War": "The theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin is universally applicable. We should regard it not as a dogma, but as a guide to action. Studying it is not merely a matter of learning terms and phrases but of learning Marxism-Leninism as the science of revolution. It is not just a matter of understanding the general laws derived by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin from their extensive study of real life and revolutionary experience, but of studying their standpoint and method in examining and solving problems."

Not Mao Zedong's correct method of study but Lin Biao's superficial method was Edward Pickersgill's practice throughout the life of the Collective. He learned to dogmatically mouth certain

revolutionary phrases in an attempt to blur the fact of his ideological ignorance.

During 1976 Edward Pickersgill began to popularize Mao Zedong's quote: "What we need is an enthusiastic but calm state of mind and intense but orderly work."

This quote is found at the end of the section on methods of thinking and methods of work in "Quotations". Edward Pickersgill popularized the quote verbally and also as a poster in one of the Collective's work rooms. In December of 1977, when asked by some of the comrades to explain the context of the quote, he was speechless. He was even unable to tell the comrades which of Mao Zedong's essays he had lifted the quote from or even what section of "Quotations" he had found it in. The other comrades quickly traced the quote to the essay "Problems Of Strategy In China's Revolutionary War".

It is interesting to look at the paragraph from which the quote comes. The section reads: "The extent of success in a struggle against 'encirclement and suppression' is closely related to the degree to which the tasks of the preparatory phase have been fulfilled. Relaxation of preparatory work which is due to underestimation of the enemy and panic which is due to being terrified of the enemy's attacks are harmful tendencies, and both should be resolutely opposed. What we need is an enthusiastic but calm state of mind and intense but orderly work."

In this section Mao Zedong refers specifically to the problem of panic. At the time this quote was investigated one problem which faced the Collective was the problem of certain comrades panicking in face of difficulties. Edward Pickersgill had mindlessly repeated this quote for months but was unable to apply it to a concrete problem at hand. Such hot air is worthless. Knowledge which cannot be applied to deal with concrete conditions is useless.

"The movement is developing, new things have yet to emerge, and they are emerging in an endless stream. To study this movement in its entirety and in its development is a great task claiming our constant attention. Whoever refuses to study these problems seriously and carefully is no Marxist."

Mao Zedong's quote, from "The Role Of The Chinese Communist Party In The National War", exposes Edward Pickersgill well. What use is knowledge which cannot be applied? It has no use.

Another aspect of Edward Pickersgill's smokescreen around the phrase "intense but orderly work" is that he twisted this quote to promote his personal view that work is primary and study is a luxury. For the ideological quack, quotes from Mao Zedong served merely as a smokescreen behind which he tried to hide his ignorance.

Throughout the life of the Collective, Edward Pickersgill was constantly calling for other comrades to search out quotes for him to use in his writing. If a comrade came to him suggesting that a certain work by one of the five great teachers of Marxism-Leninism would serve as useful reference material for some article he was writing, the blockhead would simply tell them to find him the relevant passages. The comrades would diligently search out the material and present it to him for perusal. The blockhead would simply read the marked passages, refusing to investigate the overall context of any of the suggested quotes. He would then drop quotes from these marked passages into his articles.

In Alive #123 an article entitled "Canadian Imperialism & Humpty Dumpty" appears under one of Edward Pickersgill's pseudonyms, John Burnley. The first draft of the article contained very weak political analysis on the question of imperialism. For this reason one of the comrades suggested that he read Lenin's work "Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism" and come to understand the nature of imperialism more clearly. The blockhead protested on the grounds that the book was too long for him to read. He insisted that the concerned comrade simply search out Lenin's concise definition of imperialism for him. This the comrade did.

Having received this quote on a silver platter, what did this ignoramus do? He simply dropped the quote in at the end of the

article (see page 4, Alive #123). He did not even attempt to improve the overall analysis in the article on the question of imperialism. The other comrade did, however, rewrite weak sections of the article before it was printed, although this was unknown to Edward Pickersgill.

On another occasion this ideological ignoramus called for a concise definition of fascism which he could drop into an article he was writing. A definition was quickly found in "The United Front Against War And Fascism" by Georgi Dimitrov. Interestingly enough this was a booklet which Edward Pickersgill had been loudly promoting as an excellent document which all the comrades should read. Obviously he had failed to do even the slightest amount of study himself. Otherwise he would have known that the concise definition of fascism is found on the first page of this document!

In his "Report To The Seventeenth Party Congress On The Work Of The Central Committee Of The C.P.S.U. (B.), January 26, 1934", Joseph Stalin exposed those who violate discipline and don't fulfil organizational responsibilities that have been set out collectively. Edward Pickersgill violated Alive Production Collective norms on serious study as a basis for correct educational work and organizing tasks. He thought our organization promoted a fine style of work for ordinary members only, whereas he, as the leader, could pursue a lazy Lin Biaoist style. He thought that others should not pursue their own study but should do *his* study for him.

Stalin spoke firmly against "people who have become big-wigs, who consider that Party decisions and Soviet laws are not written for them, but for fools. These are the people who do not consider it their duty to fulfill the decisions of the Party and of the Government, and who thus destroy the foundations of Party and state discipline. What do they count upon when they violate Party decisions and Soviet laws? They presume that the Soviet Government will not venture to touch them, because of their past services. These overconceited big-wigs think that they are irreplaceable, and that they can violate the decisions of the leading bodies with impunity. What is to be done with executives of this kind? They must unhesitatingly be removed from their leading posts, irrespective of past services. (Voices: 'Quite right!') They must be demoted to lower positions and this must be announced in the press. (Voices: 'Quite right!') This is essential in order to bring those conceited big-wig bureaucrats down a peg or two, and to put them in their proper place. This is essential in order to strengthen Party and Soviet discipline in the whole of our work. (Voices: 'Quite right! Applause!')

Edward Pickersgill presumed we would not venture to touch him. He thought he was irreplaceable. He thought he had impunity to violate the decisions of our organization. The reality of Edward Pickersgill's demise since August 1978 proves the correctness of unhesitatingly removing these big-wigs from their leading posts. We have put Edward Pickersgill in his proper place at the same time as strengthening the revolutionary discipline in the whole of our work.

Edward Pickersgill had to be completely overthrown rather than simply taken down a peg or two because he categorically refused to do self-criticism. The question of study and education in our organization is closely linked with the question of self-criticism. Stalin, in his work "Against Vulgarising The Slogan Of Self-Criticism", teaches: "There is only one conclusion: that without self-criticism there can be no proper education of the Party, the class, and the masses; and that without proper education of the Party, the class, and the masses, there can be no Bolshevism."

ABSTRACTED FROM WHAT HE HAD READ

Edward Pickersgill, the ideological blockhead, was always desperately running around trying to find "good quotes" for the articles he wrote. He was too lazy to actually read any of the Marxist-Leninist classics himself. Instead he worked hard to gain credibility for his own writing by parasitizing off hard study done by other comrades.

Near the end of 1977 a manuscript of quotes from Stalin entitled "Stalin And Culture" from the respected 1930's journal "International Literature", was submitted by an Alive supporter to Alive Magazine. It was suggested that this manuscript could be published in its entirety as a special issue of Alive.

The quack hoarded the manuscript of Stalin's quotes. He used it only to pull single quotes from for use in his "Against Cleftism" columns. These quotes from Stalin appear in "Against Cleftism" columns in issues 95, 96, 97 and 102 of Alive Magazine.

To Edward Pickersgill this Stalin manuscript was like a christmas present. He now had all the quotes from Stalin he could ever dream of and didn't have to read any actual works by Stalin to appear knowledgeable. To Edward Pickersgill, this was as good as a second "little red book" of "Quotations From General Secretary Stalin". He used all these quotes out of context and never went back to read any of the actual works of Stalin from which they came.

Edward Pickersgill was directly responsible for leading the technical unit of the Alive Production Collective. He was full of self-praise for his abilities in technical work and as a "skilled technician on the writing front", or a "revolutionary hack writer". According to him, these were his main strengths as a revolutionary.

Edward Pickersgill never grasped the difference between someone with a wooden mechanical approach and a skilled technician. He had a wooden mechanical approach. A skilled technician in revolutionary propaganda work must have a good ideological grasp and must have a correct political line. Mao Zedong states: "Ideological work and political work are the guarantee for accomplishing economic work and technical work, and they serve the economic base. Moreover, ideology and politics are the commander, the soul."

Edward Pickersgill does not have the guarantee of a skilled technician. He has an incorrect ideological outlook and an incorrect political line.

One interesting aspect of Edward Pickersgill's use of quotes from the classics was that he invariably made mistakes in transcribing these quotes. He would transcribe words wrong, miss out words and even miss out whole sentences. It is hard to imagine some of the errors being anything but deliberate. In many cases the omission of words or sentences distorted the meaning of the quotes entirely. The distorted version produced often served the ideological quack's own political goals admirably. However, the Collective members quickly learned to deal with this problem by carefully proofreading all these quotes against the original texts from which they were excerpted.

The ordinary comrades of the Collective showed initiative in circumventing Edward Pickersgill. As this initiative developed more and more into a thoroughgoing democracy in our organization, it gave rise to a freedom to express views and criticize weaknesses. It was this democracy that spelled Edward Pickersgill's doom.

This accords with the call Mao Zedong made to his organization: "The Chinese Communist Party demands that all its leading bodies and all its members and cadres should give the fullest expression to their initiative, which alone can ensure victory. This initiative must be demonstrated concretely in the ability of the leading bodies, the cadres and the Party rank and file to work creatively, in their readiness to assume responsibility, in the exuberant vigour they show in their work, in their courage and ability to raise questions, voice opinions and criticize defects, and in the comradesly supervision that is maintained over the leading bodies and the leading cadres. Otherwise, 'initiative' will be an empty thing. But the exercise of such initiative depends on the spread of democracy in Party life. It cannot be brought into play if there is not enough democracy in Party life."

Edward Pickersgill's Lin Biaoist line on the question of study was never overturned. Despite criticism, advice and encouragement from the other comrades, this blockhead arrogantly continued along his own rotten path.

Edward Pickersgill's line on study reflected itself most graphically in a meeting between him and the other members of the Alive Production Collective after the struggle against factionalism broke out on August 18, 1978.

In the room where the meeting was held a quote from Mao Zedong which the comrades saw as extremely relevant to the current struggle was posted on the wall. It read: "Shirking responsibility, fearing to shoulder it and forbidding people to speak out as if one were a tiger whose backside no one dares touch — ten out of ten who adopt this attitude will fail. People will always speak out sooner or later. You think that people really won't dare to touch the backsides of tigers like you? They bloody well will!"

Edward Pickersgill asked where this quote was from, inquiring if it was from Volume Five. One of the leading comrades present replied that the quote was from Mao Zedong's "Talk At An Enlarged Working Conference Convened By The Central Committee Of The Communist Party of China" given on January 30, 1962.

It was pointed out that this speech had been reprinted in issue #121 of Alive Magazine.

This illustrates how abstracted Edward Pickersgill was from the few things he had read. When the issue of "Xinhua" containing the January 1962 Talk by Mao Zedong arrived, Edward Pickersgill immediately took it out of circulation. He kept it for himself, not allowing others to read it. This went so far that another leading comrade had to make a photocopy of the article before he was able to read it.

When the decision was made to publish the "Talk" in Alive, Edward Pickersgill continued to hoard it, making sure he was the one to typeset it from beginning to end. It is interesting how little the content of the "Talk" sunk into his brain, despite him keeping it entirely to himself.

At the meeting in August 1978, Edward Pickersgill asked for a photocopy of the quote on the wall. Instead he was offered a copy of the magazine so that he could study the entire speech. Sheepishly he accepted.

In the next series of documents the Collective received from Edward Pickersgill was one entitled "What Kind Of Organization Is The APC?" and dated August 31, 1978. This document included a number of long quotes from Mao Zedong's January 30, 1962 speech. These quotes were not used to enhance the analysis in the document but merely dropped in to try to provide a revolutionary veneer to the document. The quotes were simply strung together by such imaginative phrases as "and, further" or "and then".

Yet again, Edward Pickersgill was simply mouthing words of Marxism-Leninism to try to cover-up his own reactionary line!

"STUDY" AND "WASTING TIME" AS SYNONYMS

Edward Pickersgill consciously suppressed study and discussion of revolutionary politics. To this philistine, "study" and "wasting time" were synonyms. Throughout the life of the Collective Edward Pickersgill has worked hard to suppress all initiative taken on the front of collective or individual study.

"The Role Of The Chinese Communist Party In The National War", written in October, 1938, shows that these actions by Edward Pickersgill were overtly counter-revolutionary, for as Mao Zedong states: "No political party can possibly lead a great revolutionary movement to victory unless it possesses revolutionary theory and a knowledge of history and has a profound grasp of the practical movement."

Edward Pickersgill's active suppression of study groups can be graphically proved by looking back into the history of the Alive Production Collective and the various groups which have worked closely with Alive. One study group which met twice weekly for one and a half years was crushed by Edward Pickersgill who demanded that the comrades stop wasting their time and get down to some "real" work. One study group set up inside the Alive Production Collective was called to an end after two months on the same ridiculous basis.

More recently a study group set up inside the editorial unit of the Collective was stopped by Edward Pickersgill after just one session. This study group was designed to cause a minimum of disruption to the on-going work. It involved short 40 minute sessions including 20 minutes of reading and 20 minutes of discussion. The idea was to try to allow the comrades to familiarize themselves in a general way with various works from the Marxist-Leninist classics.

This program of general study in the editorial unit accorded with the call given by Mao Zedong in the October 1938 essay cited above: "The spreading and deepening of the study of Marxism-Leninism present a big problem demanding an early solution which is possible only through concentrated effort."

Edward Pickersgill's reason for calling a halt to the editorial unit study group was that it would lead to uneven development inside the Collective. He told the editorial unit to wait until the technical unit was ready to embark on a study program before going ahead. Needless to say, the technical unit under the leadership of the ideological blockhead was never ready to begin a study program.

Edward Pickersgill's constant cry was that "practice is everything, study is nothing". He put forward the dogmatic view that comrades can learn all they need to know through practice. There is no need for theoretical study.

Edward Pickersgill's view goes against Mao Zedong, again quoted from his October, 1938 essay, who advised: "Generally speaking, all Communist Party members who can do so should study the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, study our national history and study current movements and trends; moreover they should help to educate members with less schooling. The cadres in particular should study these subjects carefully, while members of the Central Committee and senior cadres should give them even more attention."

Edward Pickersgill's total refusal to study as an individual made it necessary for him to dogmatically oppose all study. He knew that ideological study by the other comrades would inevitably have meant more rapid exposure of his own political bankruptcy.

Edward Pickersgill also knew that if there was a study program inside the Collective his low ideological level would make it impossible for him to lead any such study groups. The blockhead's petty bourgeois pride could not tolerate this situation.

Edward Pickersgill led a vicious campaign of suppression against any comrade who embarked on a program of individual study in face of the lack of any collective study. He accused these comrades of seeking "self-cultivation" and of "individualism". He mocked these comrades for always "having their heads buried in some book". This ideological ignoramus went still further and accused these comrades of "hiding in the library". This was always an interesting accusation, since all the books owned by the Collective were arranged in libraries in various work rooms. The "library" in fact constituted various collections of books in a number of different work rooms. The concept of "hiding in the library" is, therefore, hard to envisage in concrete terms.

Edward Pickersgill went so far as to actually seize personal copies of various books from comrades who were engaged in individual study. This petty despot would grab these books, claiming that the comrades were wasting their time reading when they should be doing "real" work. By "real" work he meant practical work under his direct control. The blockhead never used any of the books he seized but simply ensured that they were read by nobody.

One book Edward Pickersgill seized from a comrade contained a couple of the comrade's personal photographs. Although this ideological blockhead had the book for over a year, he never found the photographs! The comrade to whom the book belonged had marked special passages in it and had made notations in the margins. Edward Pickersgill found this to be very valuable in his efforts to leech off others' knowledge, so useful, in fact, that this parasite refused to give the book back even though he was asked to do so. Interestingly enough the book was "Quotations From Chairman Mao".

Clearly Edward Pickersgill's plan in seizing these books was not

to improve his own ideological level but to ensure that none of the other comrades improved their own political understanding. He was simply out to disarm the revolutionaries!

Weakening the revolutionaries in this way, Edward Pickersgill was giving aid to U.S. imperialism. We must grasp Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought to defeat the imperialist enemy. In "The Role Of The Chinese Communist Party In The National War", Mao Zedong emphasizes the necessity for a broader circle of revolutionaries coming to know theory: "So far as shouldering the main responsibility of leadership is concerned, our Party's fighting capacity will be much greater and our task of defeating Japanese imperialism will be more quickly accomplished if there are one or two hundred comrades with a grasp of Marxism-Leninism which is systematic and not fragmentary, genuine and not hollow."

WISHING PEOPLE WOULD AVOID VOLUME FIVE

Perhaps the most blatant example of Edward Pickersgill suppressing the study of Marxist-Leninist classics in the Collective occurred when Volume V of the Selected Works of Mao Zedong was first published. The Alive Production Collective received its first two copies of Volume V in the last week of August, 1977. With a large number of comrades keenly interested in reading Volume V, these two copies were much in demand. One copy was placed in an editorial work room where editorial workers actively read and discussed its contents. The other copy, however, was seized by Edward Pickersgill who took it into his work room for his own personal "use". There it sat, untouched, for almost a week.

Mao Zedong, in "Strengthen Party Unity And Carry Forward Party Traditions", writes: "Subjectivism means proceeding not from objective reality and from what is actually possible, but from subjective wishes."

Edward Pickersgill's wish was that Volume V of the Selected Works of Mao Zedong could come into the Alive Production Collective and the world at large without assisting revolution to advance in leaps and bounds. The objective reality is that Volume V has been and continues to be a motive force in material progress. The only thing that was actually possible in the Collective, given the comrades' great expectation and longing for Volume V, was that the book would be eagerly and thoroughly read on receipt.

Edward Pickersgill's full blown subjectivism must wither before Mao Zedong's correct analysis, quoted from the same essay: "According to dialectical materialism, thought must reflect objective reality and must be tested and verified in objective practice before it can be taken as truth, otherwise it cannot. Though we have done well in the last few years, subjectivism is evident everywhere. There will be subjectivism in the future, just as there is today. Subjectivism will always be there, ten thousand years and even a hundred million years from now, and it will be so as long as humanity does not perish. Where there is subjectivism, there are mistakes."

Edward Pickersgill had his subjectivism only. He had no truth tested and verified in objective practice. Edward Pickersgill's practice was not guided by dialectical materialism. His theory and his practice were rife with mistakes.

One evening, approximately one week after the copies of Volume V were received, one of the comrades directly challenged Edward Pickersgill's "right" to remove one of the copies of Volume V from general collective use. This comrade walked into the blockhead's work room, took "his" copy of Volume V and started towards a collective reading room.

Edward Pickersgill saw this and called out, "Where are you going?"

"To the reading room", came the reply.

"Where are you going with that?" said the petty despot, pointing to the copy of Volume V.

"To the reading room," came the reply.

"No you're not!" countered Edward Pickersgill in his most vicious authoritarian tone.

The argument which followed lasted just two or three minutes.

It took place with the despot and the comrade standing face to face in a doorway angrily arguing two opposed views. He purposely confronted the comrade in this way so that other comrades could not participate in the struggle. This petty despot wanted a one-on-one confrontation, not an open, democratic exchange of views. Although a number of comrades overheard every word in the argument they did not realize that the reading of Volume V was the issue until after the whole thing was over.

The line of argument developed by Edward Pickersgill was based on the false charge that this comrade was in a bad mood. He said because of her "bad" mood this comrade should not be allowed to read Volume V. "You should go and read some pulp novel or watch TV", he insultingly snarled. What strange advice on dealing with "moods" from a supposed "revolutionary"!

The charge against the comrade of being in a "bad" mood was based on an exchange of sharp words Edward Pickersgill had had with the comrade earlier in the day.

In a 1975 directive Mao Zedong admonished: "Do away with the mistaken metaphysical notions that 'gold must be pure' and that 'man must be perfect'."

Edward Pickersgill, however, went against this idea, demanding purity and perfection.

The comrade responded to Edward Pickersgill with a clear, reasoned line of argument which indicated that she was obviously in a mood in which she was capable of operating with clear, correct progressive politics. She refused to surrender the book. The comrade argued that she had every right to read Volume V since it had been sent to the Collective and was collective property, not Edward Pickersgill's personal property.

Edward Pickersgill answered this solid political position with further baseless personal insults against this comrade. He told her, "You're not acting like a member of the Collective" and repeatedly yelled, "Give me the book!"

Edward Pickersgill also told the comrade that she shouldn't be rooting through the material in his work room when she was in such a "foul" mood. The comrade replied that she had not been rooting around in his work room but had simply gone in and picked up the book. The ideological blockhead's reply was a classic self-exposure. He retorted that she must have been rooting around because he had buried the copy under a pile of other material! What audacity! This reactionary sneak had actually tried to hide Mao Zedong's writings from revolutionary people!

When Edward Pickersgill's vile insults and slanders continued despite her reasoned opposition, the comrade simply handed over the book and walked away. This was not a liberal or cowardly action. Edward Pickersgill's intransigence was difficult to deal with but actually the comrade walked away due to the high general consciousness in the Collective of the importance of discipline, for, as Mao Zedong states: "Discipline is the guarantee for the implementation of the line."

The petty despot immediately sat down at a table with some other comrades with Volume V in his hands. Only then did the other comrades realize that the whole argument was centred on the reading of Volume V. The other comrades were horrified.

This story provides one striking example of Edward Pickersgill's direct suppression of study within the Collective.

"On The Chungking Negotiations" by Mao Zedong notes: "By uniting with the entire people in a common effort, we can certainly overcome all difficulties and win victory."

Edward Pickersgill wanted to pile more difficulties on the revolutionaries. He did not want the Canadian people to win victory in their revolution. As a result he did not even unite in a common effort with other members of the organization he belonged to.

This ideological blockhead never understood the importance of revolutionary theory. If he had ever taken the time to study Stalin's work "The Foundations Of Leninism", he would have come across this interesting passage on the question of theory which is a very straightforward, direct and powerful statement. Stalin says, "Theory is the experience of the working-class movement in all

countries taken in its general aspect. Of course, theory becomes purposeless if it is not connected with revolutionary practice; just as practice gropes in the dark if its path is not illumined by revolutionary theory. But theory can become a tremendous force in the working-class movement if it is built up in indissoluble connection with revolutionary practice; for theory, and theory alone, can give the movement confidence, the power of orientation, and an understanding of the inner relation of surrounding events; for it, and it alone, can help practice to realize not only how and in which direction classes are moving at the present time, but also how and in which direction they will move in the near future. None other than Lenin uttered and repeated scores of times the well-known thesis that:

"Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement!"

HAT FACTORY OPENLY PROMOTED

Edward Pickersgill displayed the style of masking his Rightist outlook with pseudo-"Leftism" in the way he denigrated and isolated comrades by slapping big hats on them. Edward Pickersgill was a master at raising minor points or personal faults of a person to the level of principle.

His hat slapping campaigns began with an unjust criticism of a comrade. The process of getting a comrade to accept such an unjust criticism was usually a vigorous struggle involving sharp words and heated emotions. Edward Pickersgill used every intimidatory trick in the book to break a rebellious spirit.

When his victim had been coerced into accepting the criticism and had done self-criticism, Edward Pickersgill gloated in his "triumph". Matters were not, however, left at this. Edward Pickersgill was politically "one up" and would not let the comrade forget this fact. So, a big hat would be slapped on the comrade.

The result was that for the next period of time a comrade's social practice was judged by Edward Pickersgill according to how well the comrade was wearing the big hat. If he perceived that a comrade was getting too uppity in challenging his "leadership", baseless personal attacks would intensify. Literally every action a comrade in this position engaged in had to be laced with cowed recognition of the big hat, or else the comrade would be purposefully trampled upon by the petty despot.

Edward Pickersgill showed no caring warmth for revolutionary comrades, neither towards them as ordinary Collective members from his role as leader, nor towards them as newer members from his role as veteran Collective member. Mao Zedong, contrary to this, advised: "All old cadres, therefore, should welcome the new ones with the utmost enthusiasm and show them the warmest solicitude."

Edward Pickersgill's practice also contradicts the correct view stated on August 12, 1977 by Hua Guofeng: "It doesn't matter if one makes mistakes. It is our Party's practice that whoever commits an error should make a self-criticism and be given a chance to make amends."

It was Edward Pickersgill's factional outlook that made it impossible for him to treat revolutionaries with warmth.

Mao Zedong sharply criticized Gang of Four factionalist, Jiang Qing at the July 17, 1974 meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, by saying: "Stop running those two factories, one the iron and steel factory and the other the hat factory. Stop slapping big hats on others at will."

Edward Pickersgill could have applied this caution directly to his own practice. He would have done well also to take to heart another caution to the Gang of Four from Mao Zedong on December 24, 1974: "Don't carry on factional activities. Those who do will take a tumble."

Hat slapping was a favourite tactic of the Gang of Four. Pseudo-"Left" dogmatists around the world have practiced this vile reactionary method of criticism. Edward Pickersgill was no exception.

Entrenched in his pseudo-“Left” politics and oblivious to the content of the anti-Gang of Four campaign in China, Edward Pickersgill intensified his hat slapping during the first eight months of 1978. A barefaced example of his hat slapping consciousness occurred during a meeting in the Mini-Cultural Revolution.

A comrade had grown quite subjective during this meeting, and other comrades’ attention turned to examining what was on her mind. Edward Pickersgill participated half-heartedly in this discussion, while at the same time doodling on a piece of paper. His doodling became a source of disruption. He then formally introduced this doodle into the meeting, explaining that it was a granny’s hat. He later produced three more drawings, representing a cowboy hat, a top hat and a construction hat. This last drawing was thought to be a horse jockey’s hat by the other comrades until Edward Pickersgill put the “proper” label on his poor art.

By this time the drawings of the hats dominated the meeting. The comrade having the problem was asked by Edward Pickersgill which of the hats she’d like to wear. She replied that she’d like to wear the construction hat, indicating she’d like to uphold a working class position.

Delighted in his hat slapping game, Edward Pickersgill said she’d probably really like to wear the granny’s hat because she was so straitlaced and “proper” in her outlook. He then explained that in his opinion, the correct answer to his question was that an anti-imperialist revolutionary should be able to wear any of the four hats. He said that a Collective member should be able to don the top hat, dress like a bourgeois and act like a bourgeois if this is what was required in the course of the anti-imperialist work!

Mao Zedong states that “to combat subjectivism we must propagate materialism and dialectics.”

Going completely opposite to this, Edward Pickersgill threw out charges of subjectivism at will and tried to create the impression that one could combat subjectivism by propagating subjectivism.

Why was Edward Pickersgill so infatuated with this hat slapping game? Because it accurately reflected his reactionary world view and his counter-revolutionary practice. This bourgeois careerist strived to suppress the revolutionary initiative of Collective members. At the same time he wanted these members to do anything he asked of them, without giving him any hassle.

In other words, he expected a comrade to wear any hat he slapped on, whether that hat was an unjust one-sided characterization designed to suppress a comrade’s initiative, or whether that hat represented a functional role Edward Pickersgill wanted a comrade to fill.

This is the double-edged significance of Edward Pickersgill’s big hat slapping: suppression of revolutionary initiative and the creation of an employee mentality amongst Collective members. It reveals his thoroughgoing ideological and organizational opportunism.

THE MASTERFUL THESIS ON PUTSCHISM

A major political campaign was waged inside the Alive Production Collective between January and August, 1978. This campaign was initiated and led by Edward Pickersgill and was based on a bastardization of Mao Zedong Thought. It was labelled the “anti-putschism campaign”.

“The most ridiculous person in the world is the ‘know-all’ who picks up a smattering of hearsay knowledge and proclaims himself ‘the world’s Number One authority’; this merely shows that he has not taken a proper measure of himself.”

This quote from “On Practice” by Mao Zedong sums up Edward Pickersgill exactly, as regards this campaign. The whole thing was started by an ideological quack who fancied himself “the world’s Number One authority” on “putschism”. Mao’s essay continues by stating: “Knowledge is a matter of science, and no dishonesty or conceit whatsoever is permissible. What is required is definitely the reverse — honesty and modesty.”

Edward Pickersgill knew no science nor had knowledge. He

permitted himself absolute dishonesty and deep-going conceit. Honesty and modesty were foreign to this blockhead, he only knew their reverse!

In January of 1978, Edward Pickersgill read and picked up a smattering from Mao Zedong’s essay “On Correcting Mistaken Ideas In The Party”. In this essay Mao Zedong discusses the problem of putschism in the Red Army in a section entitled “On The Remnants Of Putschism”. Chairman Mao wrote: “The Party organization in the Red Army has already waged struggles against putschism, but not yet to a sufficient extent. Therefore, remnants of this ideology still exist in the Red Army. Their manifestations are: (1) blind action regardless of subjective and objective conditions; (2) inadequate and irresolute application of the Party’s policies for the cities; (3) slack military discipline, especially in moments of defeat; (4) acts of house-burning by some units; and (5) the practices of shooting deserters and of inflicting corporal punishment, both of which smack of putschism. In its social origins, putschism is a combination of lumpen-proletarian and petty-bourgeois ideology.

“The methods of correction are as follows:

“1. Eradicate putschism ideologically.

“2. Correct putschist behaviour through rules, regulations and policies.”

Using this section as the basis of his “analysis” Edward Pickersgill put forward the masterful thesis that fully one-half of the members of the Alive Production Collective were “putschists”.

Was there in fact any real problem in the Collective at the time that this ideological quack launched his “anti-putschism campaign”? Yes.

What was the problem? The problem was one of individual rebellion against collective authority. This was a real problem which faced the Collective.

The fact that Edward Pickersgill misidentified this real problem as “putschism” did nothing to improve the situation. Rather it served to considerably worsen the situation.

In order to take up a strategy of enhancing the overall contribution of the Alive Production Collective, it was necessary to develop a tactical thrust against individual rebellion. Edward Pickersgill developed a wrongheaded tactical thrust so as to undermine the Collective’s overall improvement.

Stalin discusses the correct relationship of strategy and tactics in “Concerning The Question Of The Strategy And Tactics Of The Russian Communists”: “In other words, tactics must not be subordinated to the transient interests of the moment, they must not be guided by considerations of immediate political effect, still less must they desert firm ground and build castles in the air. Tactics must be devised in accordance with the aims and possibilities of strategy.”

Edward Pickersgill’s tactics always went against Collective strategy and against Stalin’s guidance.

Within the Collective certain comrades were extremely hesitant to accept Edward Pickersgill’s “anti-putschist campaign” since the word “putschism” did not scientifically describe the actual problem manifested in the Collective. Eventually the Collective agreed to use the term “putschism” to describe the problem in the Collective as long as “putschism” was defined as individual rebellion against collective leadership.

The comrades agreed to use this inaccurate word because the actual problem of individual rebellion against collective authority in the Collective was real and needed to be dealt with. The comrades decided that it was more important to actually deal with the problem than to argue for hours over the correct name to identify the problem. As long as the actual problem was correctly identified as individual rebellion against collective authority, the comrades decided to accept the inaccurate label of “putschism” for this phenomenon. In accepting the wrong terminology, Collective members opened the door for greater errors. This was a mistake of not upholding Mao’s dictum: “Say all you know and say it without reserve.”

However, we must realize that the error of the Collective, in this and other similar matters regarding Edward Pickersgill's incorrect practice, is of secondary importance. As Lenin shows, in "Left-Wing' Communism, An Infantile Disorder": "There are compromises and compromises. One must be able to analyse the situation and the concrete conditions of each compromise, or of each variety of compromise. One must learn to distinguish between a man who gave the bandits money and firearms in order to lessen the damage they can do and facilitate their capture and execution, and a man who gives bandits money and firearms in order to share in the loot."

The Collective made honest mistakes, which arose from good sentiments. Edward Pickersgill deliberately trampled revolutionary progress underfoot.

The basic understanding agreed to in the Collective on the question of putschism only once appeared in print in *Alive Magazine*. Edward Pickersgill openly promoted that the word putschism should be freely used in the magazine without any explanation being given. Other comrades put forward the position that the word should not be used at all but that if it were used it must be clearly explained how this word is being used by the *Alive Production Collective*. This position was argued vociferously with the ideological quack.

On the one occasion when the concept of putschism was presented in the magazine, the use of the word was very carefully explained. This reference to putschism appears on page 12 of issue #117 of *Alive* in Anne Holterman's essay "Proletarian Reality Versus Bourgeois Idealism". We should look carefully at this passage on putschism.

Putschism is first mentioned in reference to the line of contempt

for comrades. The essay states, "Unless this line of contempt for all comrades is rooted out it will lead time and again to putschism." This is an incorrect formulation. The line of contempt for comrades will lead to individual rebellion against collective authority and not to "putschism" as stated in the essay.

The next paragraph starts by presenting a clear and concise explanation of putschism. "Putschism is individual rebellion against the powers that be. On the large scale putschism is the mentality of pulling a coup d'etat rather than seizing state power by mobilizing the whole working class and all its allies. Putschism is an expression of idealism with regards to gaining control of the country's destiny."

The subsequent sentence notes that, "putschists, though, are not always running around trying to topple governments." This statement lends little to the overall analysis and serves simply to try to prepare conditions for the subsequent "development" of the concept of putschism.

The definition continues by pointing out that, "Putschism is the idealist notion that it is more effective and expedient to implement your line by intriguing and creating a conspiracy than to actually mobilize the masses to support your line."

The analysis then becomes shaky. The statement, "This attitude also expresses itself in the life of the revolutionary organizations", is a poor bridge between the actual definition of putschism and the presentation, by Anne Holterman, of Edward Pickersgill's label for individual rebellion against collective authority within the *Alive Production Collective*.

The essay continues by noting, "Thus, we have individual rebellion against the revolutionary leadership. Most often we witness this putschism as a 'conspiracy of one' to pull a coup against

GEORGE STEFFLER WE'VE SEEN THAT LOOK BEFORE



Bloodshot eyes bugging out
to the point of blurred vision,
jutting jaw aping anger,
head held up in pompous pose,
lips silently moving in prayer.
We've seen that look before.

Isn't yours the rabid complexion
colouring the scared rabbit-like faces
guarding the state, nervous and irritated
at the bold who demand an explanation
of the guardians' anti-people crimes.
Yes, we've seen that complexion before.

Isn't yours the dagger-like stare
of some bombastic jurist,
gesticulating from on high,
viewing his betters as less than equal,
as beneath his lofty self-image.
Yes, we've met that stare before.

Isn't yours the gaze gracing the visage
of conscious counter-revolutionaries,
revelling in conspiracy and intrigue,
misdirecting the daring movement
destined to smash capital's chains.
Yes, we've encountered that gaze before.

Isn't yours the squirming expression
on the quisling's cowardly face
in the unexpected moment of exposure,
employing semantics to try to pass off
shit's smell as a flower's fragrance.
Yes, we've known that expression before.

Isn't yours the snake-like demeanour
of the few oppressing the vast majority,
of that class and of its lackeys
whenever caught in their blood-sucking acts.
Yes, we have seen your like before.
To us, you and they are loathsome.

a specific centralized policy rather than to overthrow the leadership itself." These two sentences are again an attempt to explain that by "putschism" we mean "individual rebellion against collective authority".

The section goes on to add, "Thus, individualism is correctly identified as putschism when it manifests itself as rebellion against the discipline and the democratic centralist structure of the revolutionary organization." This is an incorrect formulation and should read, "Thus, individualism is correctly identified as individual rebellion against collective authority when it manifests itself as rebellion against the discipline and the democratic centralist structure of the revolutionary organization."

This explanation of the use of the word "putschism" concludes with another poor bridge between Mao Zedong's correct use of the term and Edward Pickersgill's bastardization of the term with individual rebellion against collective authority.

This attempt to explain the ideological quack's misuse of the word "putschism" is confused. Of course! If you call something by its wrong name it is bound to be confusing. A requirement for sensible communication between people is that there should be basic agreement on what we should call certain things in the real world. This is a point which Edward Pickersgill never grasped and on which the Collective did not fight him sharply enough on.

Edward Pickersgill could approve of trying to communicate with a number of contradictory terms because he had the mentality of "uniting" on the basis of a number of centres. Secret factional centres are well served by secret factional dialects and confused collective communications.

In "Foundations Of Leninism", Stalin exposes the corrosive effect of factions: "The existence of factions is compatible neither with the Party's unity nor with its iron discipline. It scarcely needs proof that the existence of factions leads to the existence of a number of centres, and the existence of a number of centres means the absence of one common centre in the Party, the breaking up of unity of will, the weakening and disintegration of discipline, the weakening and disintegration of the dictatorship."

Edward Pickersgill promoted confusion in terminology and ideology because he wanted to break up the unity of will and harmony of thinking in the Alive Production Collective.

The Collective should have been more jealous of its precious unity. There should have been more conscious self-criticism throughout the Collective towards each and every individual, including "the leader", and towards the organization itself. Joseph Stalin emphasizes these points in "Against Vulgarising The Slogan Of Self-Criticism": "Therefore, those comrades are absolutely wrong who think that self-criticism is a passing phenomenon, a fashion which is bound speedily to go out of existence as every fashion usually does. Actually, self-criticism is an indispensable and permanent weapon in the arsenal of Bolshevism, one that is intimately linked with the very nature of Bolshevism, with its revolutionary spirit."

THE "HAT FACTORY" IN FULL PRODUCTION

Having received collective agreement on the use of the term "putschism" Edward Pickersgill proceeded to distort the whole concept which had been agreed to. He began labelling errors other than individual rebellion against collective authority as "putschism". He used the term "putschism" to describe the errors of subjectivism, idealism, liberalism and many others.

Slowly but surely the "crimes" identified as "putschism" expanded. Putting forward a position different from Edward Pickersgill came to be labelled as putschism. Eventually just to question this petty despot was labelled as putschism.

Fully one-half of the members of the Alive Production Collective were labelled as "putschists" by Edward Pickersgill. Basically, "putschism" amounted to any act on the part of an individual or group of individuals in the "putschist" half of the Collective which did not accord with the petty despot's narrow perceptions of the

world. The smallest matters became major arguments as Edward Pickersgill hounded "putschist" after "putschist" for "rebellious against the leader".

The campaign developed further with the introduction of a new "crime". This was called "passive putschism". Basically "passive putschism" was defined as having a "putschist" thought. So to simply think a thought which opposed Edward Pickersgill's position on any question was labelled as "passive putschism". Since "passive putschism" was confined to the individual's own thought process any comrade could be accused of "passive putschism" by the petty despot at any time and be unable to defend themselves.

There came into existence a situation where Edward Pickersgill could accuse any comrade of "passive putschism" at any time and the comrade's only defence would be a denial that they had been thinking a "putschist" thought. This misleader was a master of fascist, psychological torture techniques.

In "Foundations Of Leninism", Stalin exposes the shallow method pursued by Edward Pickersgill, mocking the idea that real problems can be solved by conjuring up abstract theories and proposals. Stalin asks the rhetorical question: "Who does not know the disease of 'revolutionary' scheme concocting and 'revolutionary' plan drafting, which springs from the belief in the power of decrees to arrange everything and remake everything?"

Of course, all the "putschists" and "passive putschists" in the Collective were the people doing the revolutionary work on a consistent and sustained basis while Edward Pickersgill lay in bed. Stalin goes on to explain the basic worth of dedication to such ordinary, day-to-day tasks: "Lenin usually contrasted hollow 'revolutionary' phrasemongering with plain everyday work, thus emphasizing that 'revolutionary' scheme concocting is repugnant to the spirit and the letter of true Leninism. 'Fewer pompous phrases, more plain, everyday work,' says Lenin."

Stalin further attacks characters of the petty despot's type, attacking the other side of Edward Pickersgill's rotten practice. "Who has not heard of that disease of narrow empiricism and unprincipled practicalism which has not infrequently caused certain 'Bolsheviks' to degenerate and to abandon the cause of the revolution?... No one has ridiculed this disease of practicalism so incisively as Lenin. He branded it as 'narrow-minded empiricism' and 'brainless practicalism'. He usually contrasted it with vital revolutionary work and the necessity of having a revolutionary perspective in all our daily activities, thus emphasizing that this unprincipled practicalism is as repugnant to true Leninism as 'revolutionary' scheme concocting."

Armed with the labels "putschist" and "passive putschist", Edward Pickersgill put his "hat factory" into full-scale production. Any action which displeased this petty despot resulted in the label "putschist". The campaign of terror was soon in full swing. People were afraid to speak.

Mao Zedong addresses this very situation in his January 30, 1962 speech, when he says: "Neither should we put hats on people indiscriminately. Some comrades are addicted to using hats to put pressure on people. The moment they start speaking, hats start flying around everywhere and people are so frightened they aren't speak. Of course hats there will always be. Aren't there many hats in the report to the conference? Isn't 'decentralism' a hat? But we mustn't put hats on people at will, calling this one a decentralist and that one a decentralist, until everybody is a decentralist. It would be better for the people concerned to put on the hats themselves — and moreover the right hats — rather than have them put on by others. If people put on hats themselves and wear them for a while, they should be removed when everybody agrees that they no longer fit. This will create a good democratic atmosphere. We advocate not seizing on others' faults, not putting hats on people and not wielding the big stick, so that people will be free from fear and will dare to speak out."

Edward Pickersgill acted in direct opposition to these words by Chairman Mao. He labelled people indiscriminately as "putschists" and created an atmosphere of fear and panic. As might be expected,

the practical result of this "anti-putschist campaign" was increased rebellion against Edward Pickersgill's leadership at all levels in the Collective.

Faced with this situation Edward Pickersgill threatened to resign from the Collective unless he was given wide powers to deal with "putschists". He tried to justify his demands by noting that Mao Zedong had directed that putschism should be corrected through rules, regulations and policies.

At a meeting called to address the situation, the question of discipline was widely discussed. Expulsion and suspension from the Collective were discussed and a few cases from the past cited for reference. Edward Pickersgill then suggested that we look for some other disciplinary measure. He put forward the idea that people could be confined to a room if necessary. He proposed that he be temporarily given the power to enact "confinement" until such a time as a "confinement committee" could be established by the Lu Hsun Unit.

Several people had misgivings about the concept of "confinement" and about Edward Pickersgill becoming a committee of one to enact this discipline. Also, a number of Collective members, who were not at the meeting, did not even have a chance to vote on or discuss this policy. Despite this lack of unanimity, the policy was legislated into existence, although it was in full swing for only a short time before Edward Pickersgill's overthrow.

Edward Pickersgill promoted the idea as a type of "people's prison". What a distortion!

A "people's prison" should be used to confine enemies of the people, not comrades who make honest mistakes! In any case, at this time we are not even interested in confining enemies of the people in prison. These characters should be dealt with in a different manner.

It is interesting to note that although Edward Pickersgill began to use the power of "confinement", a real committee was never set up to implement this program as had been agreed by the Collective.

Despite these new disciplinary measures, rebellion against Edward Pickersgill continued. In the end, this petty despot was forced to remove one "putschist" member of his faction from the Collective. This comrade's rebellion was becoming increasingly open. Since this comrade was a factionalist also he was terrified that the comrade would "spill the beans" about his conspiracy. So he removed the comrade.

Edward Pickersgill actually physically removed the comrade in question from the Collective work place to a train station. Having done this he never dared to bring before the Collective any proposal that the comrade should be expelled or even suspended from the Collective.

SPREADING HIS EVIL WIND

There was never any collective decision on the status of the membership of the comrade who had been removed by Edward Pickersgill. Later, Edward Pickersgill even went so far as to raise the issue of this comrade's unsettled status as a point of attack against the Collective. This ruse can be read in documents written after August 18 by both Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault. Instead of proposing formal expulsion for the comrade he had removed, this petty despot simply warned all "putschists" that they would receive the same treatment unless the "putschism" stopped.

In the "Preliminary Draft Resolution Of The Tenth Congress Of The R.C.P. On Party Unity", Lenin wrote: "All class-conscious workers must clearly realise that factionalism of any kind is harmful and impermissible, for no matter how members of individual groups may desire to safeguard Party unity, factionalism in practice inevitably leads to the weakening of team-work and to intensified and repeated attempts by the enemies of the governing Party, who have wormed their way into it, to widen the cleavage and to use it for counter-revolutionary purposes."

Edward Pickersgill proved that he understood the damage that

can be caused in a revolutionary organization by factionalism. This can be seen in his use of a faction to deliberately undermine Collective unity and specifically in his attempt to widen the cleavage created when he threw a comrade out of the organization. He tried to deepen disunity for his counter-revolutionary purposes.

The ordinary Collective members proved their understanding in practice of the effect factionalism had in weakening team-work. They protected their unity and collective work practices.

The "putschism" did not stop.

Edward Pickersgill launched a specific attack on another "putschist". There was no content to this attack. It was simply a case of criticizing everything this comrade did. For nine weeks this struggle raged. Throughout this comrade's "nine week putsch" the petty despot constantly warned the other "putschists" in the Collective that this comrade's fate awaited them too, unless the "putschism" stopped.

Edward Pickersgill's "anti-putschist campaign" began early in 1978 and continued until his overthrow in August 1978. It resulted in massive paranoia, fear, hesitation to speak up, and an enormous increase in open rebellion against the petty despot's leadership.

Perhaps the most interesting comment this ideological quack ever made on the question of "putschism" was six words written in pencil on the bottom of a document written by another comrade. The last sentence of the document read, "Any centralism is too much centralism to a putschist." Edward Pickersgill added to this statement by writing, "unless the putschist is the centralism." One wonders if Edward Pickersgill wrote this subconsciously as a self-exposure!

Edward Pickersgill's whole ideological performance and quackery in practice serves as an excellent self-exposure!

The quack's "anti-putschism campaign" was an attempt to stir up an evil wind to blow revolutionary politics away from the Alive Production Collective. He stirred up whatever he could but his efforts resulted only in his own unmasking. The Collective — and, through this issue of Alive, our readers and supporters — can now see all Edward Pickersgill's ugly features. We see him as a hidden enemy who has given rise to his own demise. This is excellent.

"Things Are Beginning To Change" is the title of one of Mao Zedong's works. In it, Mao states: "The current criticism and rectification movement has been launched by the Communist Party. As we expected and hoped, poisonous weeds have been growing side by side with fragrant flowers and ghosts and monsters appearing together with the unicorn and phoenix. Anyway, good things outnumber bad. Some say we are trying to catch big fish, and we say we are digging up poisonous weeds, which are only different ways of saying the same thing. In order to achieve their end, the Rightists, who are anti-Communist, are making a desperate attempt to stir up a typhoon above force 7 in China, strong enough to devastate crops and houses. The more outrageous their conduct, the more quickly will they show themselves up as doing the opposite of co-operating with the Communist Party and accepting its leadership, as they pretended in the past, and the people will thus recognize them as nothing but a handful of ghosts and monsters opposed to the Communist Party and the people. They will end up by burying themselves. Is there anything bad about that?"

"There are two alternatives for the Rightists. One is to keep their tails tucked between their legs and mend their ways. The other is to go on making trouble and court ruin. Gentlemen Rightists, the choice is yours, the initiative (for a short time) is in your hands."

This statement by Mao Zedong applies very well to Edward Pickersgill's case. Before August, 1978, Edward Pickersgill had two alternatives also. He chose to make trouble and court ruin. As a result his faction and his dream world ended in ruins.

Since August, 1978, Edward Pickersgill has again had two alternatives. Again, the initiative was in his hands for a short time. Again he chose to make trouble and court ruin. Again his choice can only lead him to the dustbin of history.

IMMEDIATE GAIN NOT LONG-TERM SUCCESS

The political errors of individualism and subjectivism occurring in the Collective were dealt with by Edward Pickersgill in his usual dogmatic, one-sided manner.

Edward Pickersgill persistently talked about the harm that subjective analysis of the political situation caused our political work while refusing to address the issue of the harm caused to our political work by subjective criticism. On a regular basis members of the Collective would attempt to criticize the ideological blockhead for his subjective criticism of comrades in the organization. Comrades objected to the fact that he would yell during criticism, thump on the table, call comrades vile names and issue dire threats at loud volume. He would often go off the deep end over the smallest points, flying into a rage over some small personal shortcomings of one of the comrades.

In his essay "On Correcting Mistaken Ideas In The Party", Mao Zedong addresses this question of subjective criticism. It is interesting to note that Edward Pickersgill picked up on the concept of "putschism" when he read this essay and proceeded to distort it for his own bankrupt ends, but seemed to miss the section which so accurately describes his own pattern of subjective criticism.

Mao Zedong points out that: "Some comrades ignore the major issues and confine their attention to minor points when they make their criticism. They do not understand that the main task of criticism is to point out political and organizational mistakes."

Acting in direct opposition to these words of Mao Zedong, Edward Pickersgill's criticisms of comrades were mostly low-level personal attacks of the most slanderous kind.

When Edward Pickersgill's subjectivism in criticism was addressed by the other comrades, this opportunist always immediately rushed to the attack. Believing that attack was the best means of defence, this blockhead would slander his comrades, saying that they disapproved of the style of criticism because they were afraid of class struggle.

In defending his own leadership, this petty tyrant put forward the line that what counts is the end result of any action i.e. "the end justifies the means". In this way he tried to defend his cruelty, shouting, spontaneity, arrogance, ideological laziness and all other facets of his practice which other comrades disagreed with.

Initially Collective members were fooled by Edward Pickersgill's argument because it did appear as if his methods were achieving success. Evidence to the contrary mounted over time, however, as short-term success after short-term success turned into long-term failures.

Edward Pickersgill's inability to examine these failures reveals the absolute dishonesty with which he put forward the line that "the end justifies the means".

In his essay "On Correcting Mistaken Ideas In The Party", Mao Zedong points out that subjective criticism will lead to comrades becoming timid and overcautious. Comrades did indeed become afraid to speak in the presence of Edward Pickersgill for fear of saying something he did not agree with and so being subjected to a stream of abuse and slander.

Mao Zedong describes this exact situation in his 1962 "Talk At An Enlarged Working Conference Convened By The Central Committee Of The Communist Party Of China". Mao Zedong states: "Some of our comrades can't bear to hear any opinion contrary to their own and can't tolerate any criticism. That is very wrong. During this conference, the group meeting of one province started off in a very lively manner, but as soon as the secretary of the provincial Party committee went to sit in, a hush fell and nobody said a word. Comrade provincial Party secretary, why do you go and sit there? Why don't you stay in your own room and think things over and let the others talk freely? Since such an atmosphere has been brought about and people don't dare speak in your presence, then you should absent yourself. Whoever makes mistakes must criticize himself, and we must let others speak up, let

others criticize."

What was Edward Pickersgill's response to this situation? Did he indeed absent himself from the meetings and work to rectify his errors? No. Instead he launched new, and more vicious attacks on the comrades.

The response of this ideological quack was to develop the masterful thesis of "mass individualism". This ideological ignoramus used the term "mass individualism" to describe the situation when a number of comrades fell silent as soon as Edward Pickersgill entered a discussion. He refused to even consider that this phenomenon might be a result of him terrorizing the comrades but instead launched further attacks on the comrades accusing them of "mass individualism". What a ridiculous concept!

It is clear that Edward Pickersgill had no interest in objectively studying the real situation at hand, locating the sources of the problem, and changing the situation. No, this opportunist had just one goal in mind. He wanted to try to continue to fool the members of the Alive Production Collective into thinking that he was indeed the leading member of the organization. This petty dictator was concerned with his position and his "career".

"THE STINKING NINTH CATEGORY"

Edward Pickersgill had an ultra-"Left" dogmatic position on the question of intellectuals. Basically he put forward the "masterful" thesis that the more one was educated in the bourgeois system, the less one knew! The Collective members and supporters who held university degrees were labelled "vegetables" by Edward Pickersgill regardless of the revolutionary dynamism of their current social practice.

This wrong attitude goes against Mao Zedong Thought. Edward Pickersgill was extremely subjective in his view of university people. He was one-sided, taking into account only one aspect of their life's experience.

In "The Role Of The Chinese Communist Party In The National War", one can learn a correct attitude to take in making such judgements: "We must know how to judge cadres. We must not confine our judgement to a short period or a single incident in a cadre's life, but should consider his life and work as a whole. This is the principal method of judging cadres."

In order to attack bourgeois university trained intellectuals, Edward Pickersgill issued the "glorious" slogan: "Uphold the Banner of Grade Nine Science". In Edward Pickersgill's usage, this slogan was meant to attack the knowledge of those trained in university science departments. He would say: "I can defeat any university trained person, even those with Ph.D.'s, simply by applying the knowledge I learned in grade nine science."

The actual political content of this slogan was that grade nine bourgeois education is better than university bourgeois education. This is nonsense. These are the words of a grade nine chauvinist! All bourgeois education is unsatisfactory. We should not uphold any kind of bourgeois education. We should recognize, however, that a person trained in the bourgeois education system can serve the people if they overthrow the bourgeois world view and adopt the anti-imperialist revolutionary world view. Those with specialized bourgeois university training can make great contributions to the revolution if they orient their thinking correctly.

This slogan also denied Edward Pickersgill's own experience. He had been educated by the bourgeoisie through grade school, high school and teachers' training college. He had then taught in a high school for some years. In addition, he had engaged in a number of scientific discussions with university trained scientists over the years. Edward Pickersgill knew a lot more about science than is taught to a 14-year-old at the grade nine level in bourgeois schools. Yet when he spoke he treated his own understanding of science and grade nine science as one and the same. In practice what he was actually saying was, "Uphold *my* understanding of science."

The basic line this dogmatist used against comrades with university education paralleled the line he used against those

comrades who were better read than him in the Marxist-Leninist classics. He argued that although they knew more than him, he knew how to apply his knowledge better. This blockhead argued that these intellectuals were unable to apply anything they knew.

Intellectuals have an important role to play in propaganda and educational work. It is this work, generally in the cultural sphere, to which the Alive Production Collective dedicates itself. Taking a wrong line on intellectuals, Edward Pickersgill was alienating himself from a significant section of the membership of our organization. His line on intellectuals also showed that he was incapable of distinguishing between the levels of consciousness that actually demarcate people in the revolutionary ranks. To brand a person an intellectual has no special significance. What has significance is whether they contribute from an advanced level, an intermediary level or a relatively backward level.

Mao Zedong teaches these concepts in "Some Questions Concerning Methods Of Leadership": "However active the leading group may be, its activity will amount to fruitless effort by a handful of people unless combined with the activity of the masses. On the other hand, if the masses alone are active without a strong leading group to organize their activity properly, such activity cannot be sustained for long, or carried forward in the right direction, or raised to a high level. The masses in any given place are generally composed of three parts, the relatively active, the intermediate and the relatively backward."

Needless to say, Edward Pickersgill's line did not allow him to win respect as a strong leader amongst those revolutionaries with an intellectual background. He was a misleader strongly alienated from the masses.

Edward Pickersgill's wrong view of intellectuals led him to pursue many fruitless efforts. He got into a number of ridiculous arguments with various university trained scientists in the Collective. He would argue for the sake of winning a point and literally had no interest at all in science. He would never conduct an investigation into scientific affairs unless it was for the purpose of setting up another comrade to look like an idiot.

On one such occasion the quack asked, "Can one eat plastic?" One of the comrades with a university education answered, "Yes".

Edward Pickersgill had set the bait and he decided to try to win a point. He put forward an opposing position based on a trivial question of semantics. He argued that the word "eat" signifies both the process of ingestion and digestion, i.e. taking in the substance and breaking it down inside the body. The other comrade agreed that it is possible to eat plastic but not to digest it or gain nutritional benefit from it.

Not satisfied, the quack began to argue that we can only eat things which give us nutritional benefit. This is an extremely idealistic position for anyone to take under capitalism, where we are presented with substances to eat which not only provide no nutritional benefit but instead cause a whole range of diseases, including cancer.

Edward Pickersgill's petty argument was non-material in basis. It is in essence a position which denies the possibility of doing anything detrimental to oneself. It is the same as saying that it is impossible to jump off a cliff on the basis that such an act may kill the person involved. Yes, it may kill the person involved but this does not make it impossible. In practical life at the time, some of them by jumping off cliffs!

Many of their arguments of this same petty nature were launched by Edward Pickersgill. Because he could anticipate this incorrect idea better than the knowledgeable comrades could anticipate their correct ideas, he could often win arguments on the basis of erroneous ideas. The knowledgeable comrades would often back down, even if they thought they were right, for the simple reason that Edward Pickersgill would get hysterical and vicious out of all proportion to the importance of the question. Edward Pickersgill's arrogance and vile temper prevailed against a calm, reasoned and correct position.

Edward Pickersgill's ultra-"Left" dogmatic position on intellectuals was very similar to the Gang of Four's anti-intellectual policy.

In China, the Gang of Four treated intellectuals as if they were a reactionary class in their own right. This is nonsense. Intellectuals themselves do not constitute a separate, independent class. They can serve either the bourgeoisie or the working class. The crucial point is: which class do they adhere to?

Under the rule of the Gang of Four there was a list of "nine sorts of evil people". The first five had been defined long ago by Mao Zedong as, 1) landlords, 2) rich peasant-farmers, 3) counter-revolutionaries, 4) hooligans, vandals and criminals, and, 5) rightist politicians.

During the Cultural Revolution three new groups were added. These were, 6) national traitors, 7) spies, 8) capitalist sympathizers or theorists.

The Gang of Four then added the intellectuals and scientists as what they called "the stumbling ninth category". It is clear that this ninth category has nothing in common with the first eight categories of "evil people".

In 1975, Mao Zedong said: "The 'ninth category' mustn't quit." Edward Pickersgill took the opposite view, trying to breed sectarianism within our organization by ostracizing university trained comrades. This again was the ugly weed of subjectivism showing its blossom. As Mao Zedong stated: "Sectarianism is an expression of subjectivism in organizational relations".

Edward Pickersgill took up the Gang of Four's ultra-"Left" dogmatic line and viewed all intellectuals as bourgeois by definition and refused to acknowledge that the crucial point with all intellectuals is whose class interests they serve. This "Left" sectarian refused to acknowledge that anybody in the Collective who has been trained in a bourgeois university nevertheless has the interests of the proletariat at heart. People who do not have this class orientation simply do not belong in the Alive Production Collective. This truth is now well illustrated by Edward Pickersgill's case, now that his opposition to the proletariat has put him out of the Collective.

Edward Pickersgill, with his puffed-up arrogance, had the audacity to put down the ordinary Collective members, when he had no legitimate right to be in the ranks of the revolutionaries in the first place. He boasted about his pointless contribution. The Collective could never get along without him, in his opinion, but he could do everything just the same without the Collective. Not so, we now say categorically. Not at all so.

Mao Zedong exposes Edward Pickersgill's type and explains the correct view of relations between leaders and the masses. In "Speeches At The National Conference Of The Communist Party Of China", Mao states: "Don't play the haggard. Our cause depends on the many for its success and the few play only a limited role. While the few, that is, the leaders and cadres, play a role that should be recognized, it is not a role of signal importance. The role of signal importance is played by the masses. The correct relationship between the cadres and the masses is such that, necessary as the cadres are, it is the masses who do the actual work, with the cadres giving leadership, a role which should not be exaggerated. Would things be in a mess without you? Things can get along without you, as history and many facts of life can testify. Have things been in a mess, say, without Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih? Well, things are going quite well, aren't they? Without T'ao-t'ieh, without Chang Kuo-tan, without Chen Tu-hsiu, things have gone quite well, too. They were all bad characters. Confucius has been dead for ages and today we have a Communist Party in China, which is surely wiser than Confucius; this goes to show that we can do better without Confucius. As for good people, they are not indispensable either. Would the earth stop turning without them? The earth will go on turning all the same. Things will proceed as usual or perhaps even better."

Let there be no doubt. Things are proceeding as usual and are much better without Edward Pickersgill in the Alive Production Collective.

"COME WHAT MAY, WE SHALL WIN"

N.G. Chernyshevsky (1828-1889) was a great revolutionary democrat who staunchly fought against the oppression of Russian serfdom. He and his work were held in high regard by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. Lenin so appreciated Chernyshevsky's revolutionary novel "What Is To Be Done?" that he titled one of his most important political pamphlets after it. He titled this pamphlet, "What Is To Be Done? — Burning Questions Of Our Movement". Chernyshevsky's revolutionary writings reflect a materialist philosophy which is the height of pre-Marxian philosophy.

Lenin, in "From The History Of The Labour Press In Russia", written on May 5, 1914, stated: "Chernyshevsky was a far more consistent and militant democrat. His writings breathe the spirit of class struggle. He vigorously pursued the line of exposing the treachery of liberalism, the line which to this day is so repugnant to the Cadets and the Liquidators. He was a remarkably profound critic of capitalism, in spite of his utopian Socialism."

Before being overthrown, the Gang of Four in China viciously attacked those revolutionary writers who, in the tradition of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, upheld Chernyshevsky for his revolutionary accomplishments. In 1971 a pamphlet written by the Gang of Four writing group, "The Shanghai Writing Group For Revolutionary Mass Criticism", openly attacked prominent Chinese writer Zhou Yang for, among other things, praising Chernyshevsky's novel "What Is To Be Done?".

Titled "To Trumpet Bourgeois Literature And Art Is To Restore Capitalism", the pamphlet states: "His (Zhou Yang's) concept is that bourgeois writers have not only created countless 'typical characters true to life', but also created images of the 'new people' of 'imminent socialism'. Time and again he heaped praises on the Russian bourgeois writer of the novel *What Is To Be Done?*, Chernyshevsky, for painting not only a superb 'picture of socialist society', but also creating a group of typical 'new people'.... Just dress up capitalism and call it 'socialism' and you have at once the typical 'new people' of 'imminent socialism', so close to Zhou Yang's heart. This is what he called unsurpassable 'ideological and artistic peaks'!"

This is a classic example of the Gang of Four's pseudo-"Left" line in action. In their frantic unprincipled personal attack on Zhou Yang, the Gang of Four "gloriously" rewrote history in terms of Chernyshevsky, throwing by the board the well considered opinions of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and millions of working people throughout the world.

The Gang of Four's class brother in the Alive Production Collective, Edward Pickersgill, used this pseudo-"Left", truly reactionary pamphlet to legitimize one of his own unprincipled personal attacks on a comrade in the Alive Production Collective.

In January, 1976, the Alive Production Collective was faced with the important task of deepening its criticism campaign against the Bainzites following the public split between the two organizations in October, 1975. At the same time the Bainzites were in the process of seizing control of the Wellington County Canada-China Friendship Society (see history of the society in Alive Magazine issues #110 and #111) and forcing all those sympathetic to Alive out of that organization. This was a very crucial period for the Alive Production Collective.

One comrade responded to this situation by putting up a large wall poster containing Chernyshevsky's famous call "Come What May, We Shall Win". This slogan was posted to encourage the comrades to keep up their spirits. The unflagging, unstoppable spirit of determination epitomized in this call was an important factor in the successes won by the Alive Production Collective in this period.

Lenin, in "On The Significance Of Militant Materialism", written on March 12, 1922, noted: "Fortunately, the main trends of advanced social thought in Russia have a solid materialist tradition. To say nothing of G.V. Plekhanov, it is enough to mention Chernyshevsky, from whom the modern Narodniks (the Populist

Socialists, Socialist-Revolutionaries, etc.) have retreated frequently in a quest for fashionable reactionary philosophical doctrines, captivated by the tinsel of the so-called 'last word' in European science and unable to discern beneath this tinsel one or another variety of servility to the bourgeoisie, bourgeois prejudice and bourgeois reaction."

This identification of Chernyshevsky as an advanced Russian materialist, did not mean anything to Edward Pickersgill. It was not major works by Lenin that appealed to this ideological quack's petty mind, rather it was two-bit pamphlets from the Gang of Four.

A number of months later, Edward Pickersgill launched a vicious personal attack against the comrade who had posted the slogan. The comrade was labelled a "revisionist", and the slogan "Come What May, We Shall Win" was torn apart by this demagogue. Edward Pickersgill raved that the slogan was "defeatist" and that it promoted that victory could be won without struggle.

Of course, this opportunist used the Gang of Four's attack on Chernyshevsky in the pamphlet "To Trumpet Bourgeois Literature And Art Is To Restore Capitalism" as ideological legitimacy for his attack on the slogan. Dogmatically, he tore the Gang of Four's rotten analysis out of context and applied it to the situation inside the Alive Production Collective. This kind of dogmatism is exactly the trademark of the Gang of Four.

Even after the Gang of Four's overthrow in October, 1976, Edward Pickersgill stuck to his same rotten pseudo-"Left" line. Time and again he mockingly referred to the slogan "Come What May, We Shall Win" as revisionist nonsense.

He used to say that "this unhealthy attitude" had been spread throughout the Collective and that the comrade who put this slogan up was responsible for giving people a bad way of thinking which affected others' thinking and methods of work. This comrade was responsible, according to Edward Pickersgill, for the fact that other Collective members took "uncaring attitudes" and put too much on others' shoulders — apparently any acceptance of this slogan would lead to an attitude of "the work will get done, there's no need to organize it".

Edward Pickersgill's purpose in making these superficial references was to keep "one up" on the comrade concerned. He was driven by his desire to personally attack and denigrate other comrades and so ensure his own position as a petty dictator.

Edward Pickersgill, always one to flog a dead horse in the vain hope of bringing it back to life, even made reference in his August 1978 documents to this so-called "attitude" of "Come What May, We Shall Win".

Since October 1976, the Chinese have worked tirelessly to rectify the Gang of Four's ideological and practical mistakes. Zhou Yang has been a leader in this in his capacity as vice-chairman of the All-China Federation of Literary and Art Circles. The Federation met in May 1978 after having its work interrupted for twelve years.

To commemorate the 150th birthday of Chernyshevsky, on July 22, 1978, a large number of Chinese papers featured an article reviewing the Russian writer's life and dealing at length with this novel "What Is To Be Done?" The article reverses the incorrect pseudo-"Left" judgements of the Gang of Four, stating most emphatically, "What Is To Be Done?" is a novel burning with optimism. It reflects Chernyshevsky's deep-rooted conviction in the triumph of revolution. He concluded the work by painting a glowing picture of the coming new society."

This article was picked by the editorial unit for an issue of Alive. It was sent to the technical unit where it was typeset, proofread and corrected. After that stage Edward Pickersgill, full of arrogance, threw the article into the garbage!

Lenin, in "On The National Pride Of The Great-Russians", written on December 12, 1914, expressed deep felt emotion towards the militant Russian democrat: "We remember that, half a century ago, the Great-Russian democrat Chernyshevsky, who sacrificed all his life to the cause of the revolution, said: 'A miserable nation, a nation of slaves, from top to bottom, only slaves.' The

open and covert Great-Russian slaves (slaves in relation to the tsarist monarchy) do not like to recall these words. We, however, think that those words were words of real love for the motherland; it was love full of sadness due to the absence of revolutionary sentiment among the masses of the Great-Russian population. There was none of it at that time."

Edward Pickersgill did not have a contemporary revolutionary consciousness. He did not even have the democratic consciousness that was revolutionary back in the mid-1800's. Edward Pickersgill could easily speak foul words about Chernyshevsky and he could try to trample revolutionary heritage through the mud. However, he had none of the militancy and revolutionary thinking that Chernyshevsky had. He had none of the great love of people that the great Russian democrat had.

Edward Pickersgill only has the servility to the ruling class that Chernyshevsky fought.

COMRADES VIEWED AS DISPOSABLE COMMODITIES

The documents issued by Edward Pickersgill since the struggle against his bankrupt political line broke out in August 1978, contain a number of glaring examples of his pseudo-"Left" posturing.

In his "Response To August 28/78 Statement By Members Of The Alive Production Collective" Edward Pickersgill states: "It will always be incorrect to place the interests of the majority of present members of the Alive Production Collective and their continuing in the APC ahead of the class struggle — which may well drive some (even the majority) away from anti-imperialist politics and programs. Placing class struggle as the first task we will have the lives and futures of the majority of people in society in our sights — not just those in the existing organizations. That is, your first task must be to seek the truth (and let the chips fall where they may, so to speak, in terms of those who are members of the APC). Besides, you will never, never be able to guarantee that the majority of members in the existing organizations continue in their political work and ideological commitment'. To attempt to do so as a first, primary or principal task is wrong but is also a foolish goal for it can never be achieved. There are no such guarantees."

This is a classic ultra-"Left" line. This ideological blockhead raves that politics are everything while people are nothing. He views comrades as disposable commodities.

It should be pointed out that Mao Zedong stated: "Class struggle is the key link." Mao Zedong did not say "class struggle is the first task" as Edward Pickersgill states.

It is also interesting to note the ideological quack's view that class struggle may well drive some comrades (even a majority) away from anti-imperialist politics and programs. Why uphold something which will disillusion people? The Alive Production Collective upholds class struggle because it is objectively correct and serves as a unifying force in our political work. People will always rally to a correct political line.

Mao Zedong correctly states: "The people, and the people alone, are the motive force in the making of world history."

Edward Pickersgill, wishing that revolution will not take hold in world history, wants to drive people away from anti-imperialist politics! Every word from this ideological blockhead goes opposite to Mao Zedong Thought.

Why does Edward Pickersgill uphold "class struggle"? In practice he does not uphold class struggle, rather he upholds class dominance — the dominance of the wrong class! In words he upholds "class struggle" because he thinks it will disillusion and disunify people and this is his goal.

This quack sees "class struggle" as a matter of others falling into line with his narrow perceptions. Progressive people are unable to fall into a reactionary line-up in this way. As a result, they may well become disillusioned and passive.

Alternatively, though, progressive people are most likely to fight such narrow perceptions in a true expression of class struggle. This is what happened in the Alive Production Collective, despite the

fact that Edward Pickersgill did not foresee this happening.

The Collective's criticism of Edward Pickersgill accords with Mao Zedong's directive: "The mistakes of the past must be exposed without sparing anyone's sensibilities."

The Collective's experience in the time period since Edward Pickersgill's overthrow confirms Mao Zedong's axiom: "Revolutionary successors of the proletariat are invariably brought up in great storms."

We have consolidated our ranks and re-organized our Collective. The two-line struggle between our organization and Edward Pickersgill, and the revolutionary struggle of the Canadian people against U.S. imperialism, have inspired us to strive for greater unity and greater practical commitment. We have achieved this to a significant degree already and we are striving to achieve more and more.

In any political struggle in which disillusionment and loss of revolutionary spirit are serious dangers, attempting to guarantee the political commitment of the majority of revolutionaries in our ranks is indeed a correct primary task. The only way that such a task can be successful is by taking class struggle as the key link, that is by guaranteeing people's political commitment on the basis of a correct, revolutionary political line.

Contrary to Edward Pickersgill's dire warnings this goal can be achieved and, indeed, has been achieved by the Alive Production Collective in the current struggle.

Edward Pickersgill's promotion of false "class struggle" is an anti-people outlook. It denies the basic tenets of revolutionary ideology. Without people from the labouring classes, there would literally be no material existence in this world, other than the natural earth itself!

As Zhou Enlai said August 24, 1973: "Marx pointed out that 'the greatest productive power is the revolutionary class itself.'"

Chairman Mao did not say, as Edward Pickersgill implies, that of all things in the world, class struggle is the most precious. Chairman Mao taught: "Of all things in the world, people are the most precious."

Edward Pickersgill's pseudo-"Left" dogmatism is graphically exposed. Dogmatically upholding "class struggle" he falsely juxtaposes the struggle for a correct line against rallying people in a united effort. Edward Pickersgill's ideal organization may have so-called "class struggle" and a so-called "correct line" but without members it is nothing. If an organization cannot maintain and build up its membership, it does not have a correct political line. Edward Pickersgill denies this truth also.

On November 14, 1971, Zhou Enlai outlined the correct balance between a truly correct line and mobilizing people: "Line is the life-blood of our Party. Fifty years of experience prove that as long as we persist in struggle for the correct line we will win. If our line is correct, even if we have only a few Party members our Party will grow, as when our Communist Party was organized in 1921. We had only a few people then, no army, nothing. But as long as our political line is correct we can recruit Party members, we can build an army and we can win victory. But if our political line is not correct the Communist Party will collapse. Under the line set by Wang Ming all the Party organizations in the enemy areas collapsed. And no matter how big an army you have, if your line is wrong, that army will be lost.... In addition to the Wang Ming line there was the Chang Kuo-tao line that split what remained of the Red Army. At that time Chang Kuo-tao commanded over 100,000 men, the biggest single force under our leadership. But he split this army and led part of it off to the west of the Yellow River. He failed and the army was lost. If your political line is wrong, even if you are the head of an army, you yourself will collapse.... The biggest splitter in our history was Chang Kuo-tao, who once led 100,000 men but in the end found himself alone. When he departed from the Border Region not even his bodyguard would follow him. The whole army accepted Chairman Mao's leadership and Chang Kuo-tao left by himself. Later we sent his wife and children to join him. If you are interested in his story you can go to Canada and ask him.

He used to live in Hongkong receiving American money for his autobiography. But he was only in the Communist Party for 17 years. There are 50 years of Party history. Once the United States bought his memoirs his usefulness to them was over. His role as a reference file has long since lost its value."

Perhaps Edward Pickersgill would be interested in looking Chang Kuo-tao up in Toronto. Such an encounter would give him a portent of his own future. Like Chang Kuo-tao, Edward Pickersgill is a splitter. Like Chang Kuo-tao, Edward Pickersgill is alone.

If Edward Pickersgill is too lazy or too scared to look up this class brother of his in Toronto, we can quote Zhou Enlai further to spell out the future of splitters: "Lines that split the Party have always failed. In the end we have always united."

Edward Pickersgill's splittist line has failed. The Alive Production Collective is firmly united.

Edward Pickersgill type splitters are further exposed by Zhou Enlai when he states: "Our line is out in the open, clear and open. Schemers can never win."

"UNITED FRONT" OF ULTRA-"LEFTISTS"

Edward Pickersgill's low ideological level was reflected in his vacillation and panic after the overthrow of the Gang of Four in China in October, 1976. The ideological blockhead was thrown into a big panic by this event.

Instantly, Edward Pickersgill suppressed all discussion in the Collective on this question on the basis that it would be too confusing for the ordinary members of the organization. This petty despot then assigned one member of the Collective to investigate the issue of the Gang of Four. The comrade doing the investigation was instructed to report directly back to Edward Pickersgill without discussing anything with the other members of the Collective. This stifling of free exchange of information and democracy lasted for more than 3 months.

The comrade assigned to investigate the situation of the Gang of Four in China, arrived at the conclusion, well before the end of 1976, that their overthrow was correct. Still, the discipline prohibiting discussion on this matter continued and Alive Magazine published no information on the struggle against the Gang of Four until well into 1977.

Collective members eventually, broke this discipline on a spontaneous basis as it dragged on for a ridiculously long period of time. Lively discussion on the topic of the Gang of Four and the situation in China was soon underway.

Alive Magazine has a significant readership and considerable influence. The Alive Production Collective is a political organization that rallies support from its friends and contacts only to the extent that it is capable of formulating and popularizing a correct line.

Supporters of our organization put faith in our ability to analyze current affairs and to put events in the context of our general ideology. These people seek and expect to find clarity on a wide range of matters from the Collective.

When such a major, and at first confusing, event happens as the overthrow of the Gang of Four, people demand clear answers to their questions from the political organization they support. If the organization falls down in analyzing events correctly and popularizing its analysis, it will lose people's support. This has been proven countless times in the real world. It is entirely correct that political friends put forward or retract their support in the course of laying great importance on key issues in world affairs. Mao Zedong said in "Two Talks On Mutual Aid And Co-operation In Agriculture": "As an old saying goes, 'Once the headrope of a fishing net is pulled up, all its meshes open.' It is only by taking hold of the key link that everything else will fall into its proper place."

Because people demand clarity, they are willing to wait for a certain amount of time, while an organization gathers facts from all sides and processes the facts analytically. The people want *clear* answers, not just something conjured up in some individual's head,

and so they'll wait if that's what is necessary to get clarity.

It is when an organization takes an inordinate amount of time to formulate a position or refuses to take a stand or takes an incorrect stand that people drop their support.

When the Gang of Four were overthrown, people looked to our Collective to take a stand and popularize our understanding of events. Under Edward Pickersgill's leadership, we took an inordinate amount of time to popularize the position of the majority in our organization: a position of support for the overthrow of the Gang of Four under Hua Guofeng's leadership.

Further, by Edward Pickersgill's order, we took a dishonest position: printing other people's words to present what was, in reality, our own position. Our supporters may have been interested in how much we could present of other groups' positions on the Gang of Four, however, the crucial matter of interest to these friends of Alive was to hear our organization's statement on the situation in the People's Republic of China and its meaning to the world revolutionary movement. The Collective took too long to make such a statement of its own.

In his misleadership, Edward Pickersgill loosened the tight unity between the Collective and its supporters, and amongst the Collective members themselves. This unity is strongly re-established now. However, when it was sabotaged, even to a small extent, it gave rise to looser discipline, for one cannot accept discipline where there is no unity. Thus, it meant that the organization's political line was implemented less effectively in practice. The result of such misleadership is not only alienation of some already committed to support but also less effort to rally new support.

A popular position against the Gang of Four was well established inside the Collective before "Xinhua" news items exposing the Gang first appeared in Alive Magazine in March of 1977. The first such item appeared in Alive #67 (March 5, 1977) on page one. The article is entitled, "Chinese Cultural Society Greets Chairman Hua".

After this initial article there were a number of articles in the magazine, both reprinted from "Xinhua" and written by "CNS", which expressed opposition to the Gang of Four by various groups and individuals around the world.

It was not until September 17, 1977, in issue #92 of Alive Magazine, that the Alive Production Collective finally made a definite statement in print opposing the Gang of Four. This appears on page one of the magazine under the title, "Turning Grief Into Strength". This article, written by another leading member of the Alive Production Collective, summarizes the developments in China since the death of Mao Zedong. The article states: "We support the line which has pursued victory after victory in China since Mao Zedong's death. We fully support that the Chinese people have the right to choose their own chairman and recognize that they have chosen Hua Guofeng, a leader of revolutionary integrity. We hail the overthrow of the Gang of Four as a victory for the Chinese people and in that the Gang of Four's schemes extended beyond China, it is also a victory for the world's people."

This statement appeared fully six months after the majority of the members of the Collective had taken a position against the Gang of Four. This firm position was developed by members of the Collective with no support from Edward Pickersgill. In fact, Edward Pickersgill was still hesitant and continued to vacillate in his position.

In "The Debate On The Co-operative Transformation Of Agriculture And The Current Class Struggle", Mao Zedong advises: "When there is an upsurge of enthusiasm among the masses, when everyone asks to join the co-operative, it is imperative to envisage all kinds of difficulties and every unfavourable condition conceivable, openly make them known to the masses and let the masses consider the matter fully. If they are not afraid, they can join up; if they are afraid, they don't have to. Of course, we must not frighten people away. I suppose I won't scare you away today, for we have been in session for so many days. It is

necessary to cool people's heads at the right moment so that they won't become hot-headed."

It is a similar situation when there is an upsurge of enthusiasm among the supporters of an organization. Just because there is a demand for a position on a certain political question doesn't mean we should become hot-headed. We have to take time to give a correct position but we have to balance this with taking political positions at a good speed.

The consciousness of not being hot-headed has been in play in the Collective for a long time. It is this consciousness that Edward Pickersgill played on when he slowed down the formal Collective decision on the Gang of Four.

It is interesting to examine Edward Pickersgill's slow down on the question of the Gang of Four side by side with his general impetuosity. These two things appear contradictory but they are, in essence, the same. Both are deviations from the correct path. To deviate was Edward Pickersgill's strongest interest, it did not matter to him if his deviations took him in various, contradictory directions.

In the same essay cited above, Mao Zedong explains these two types of deviation: "As the old Chinese sayings go, 'When a melon is ripe, it falls off its stem,' and 'When water flows, a channel is formed.' We should act in accordance with specific conditions and achieve our aims naturally instead of forcing their attainment. Take childbirth for instance. It requires nine months. If, in the seventh month, the doctor should exert pressure and force the child out, that would not be good, that would be a 'Left' deviation. If, on the other hand, the unborn child is already nine months old and very much wants to come out and yet you don't allow it, that would be a Right deviation. In short, everything moves in time. When the right time comes for something to be done; it has to be done. If you don't allow it, that is Right deviation. If the right time has not come for something and yet you try to force it through, that is a 'Left' deviation."

It is interesting to note that during the months and years prior to October, 1976 *Alive Magazine* printed just two articles which we can trace directly to Gang of Four sources. Of these, just one was reprinted directly without comment. This article, entitled "Negating The Revolution In Literature And Art Aims At Restoring Capitalism", was reprinted in *Alive* #52 (September 25, 1976) from "Beijing Review" #22 (May 28, 1976).

The "Beijing Review" article was first popularized, with suggestions that it be reprinted, by Michelle Landriault who "found" the 4-month-old article while she was "catching up" on her reading during one of her many long bouts of "sickness". It was Edward Pickersgill who pushed hardest to reprint this article. A number of the other comrades were not overly excited about the article and advised against reprinting it. The blockhead's pressure finally meant that the article was printed in the magazine.

Looking back over the quack's ideological mistakes it is clear that they have been based in Rightist politics and have taken a "Left" disguise. The Gang of Four's pseudo-"Left", true Right politics clearly appealed to Edward Pickersgill. He was the firmest upholder of the Gang of Four's rotten political line prior to their downfall, and the most reluctant to stand in opposition to them after their downfall.

PETTY IDEALISM ON INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

On November 1, 1976 Enver Hoxha delivered a report on the activity of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania (PLA) to the 7th Congress of the PLA. In *Alive* #60 (November 20, 1976), a summary of this report received from the "Albanian Telegraphic Agency" was printed. This report contains Albania's first open attack on Chairman Mao Zedong's theory of the differentiation of the three worlds.

When this report to the 7th Congress of the PLA was released the Bainzites immediately hailed it as a Marxist-Leninist classic. While other Collective members scoffed at this claim, Edward

Pickersgill bleated that he wasn't sure that it was not a Marxist-Leninist classic. The fact is that the report follows the exact form as those presented to the 5th and 6th Congresses of the PLA to the extent that the same subtitles are used in many cases. The report is mechanically organized and woodenly presented and can hardly be described as a Marxist-Leninist classic. This report is a duplicate of all previous such reports.

Edward Pickersgill was not easily convinced of this position.

In *Alive* #66 (February 26, 1977), this ideological quack, writing under the pseudonym John Burnley, made a vigorous defence of Enver Hoxha. In an article titled "We Live In Three Different Worlds", Edward Pickersgill attempted to defend the three worlds theory by promoting Enver Hoxha (who attacks the three worlds theory). Further, he attempted to defend Enver Hoxha against the Bainzites (who support Enver Hoxha) by putting Mao Zedong's words in his mouth!

Read how the quack pontificates: "In Canada the Bainzite Cleftists have been using Enver Hoxha's Report to the Seventh Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania last November to 'buttress' their attack on Mao Zedong's brilliant thesis and encouragement to the Third World countries and peoples.

"The Bainzite Cleftists have jiggled and juggled paragraphs from the staunch Marxist-Leninist Report by Enver Hoxha and have turned truth on its head claiming that the Report 'proves' the strategic concept of 'Three Worlds' to be counter-revolutionary.... Enver Hoxha, of course, did not in any way contradict the brilliant economic thesis of 'Three Worlds'.... This incisive and revolutionary leadership by Enver Hoxha was indeed most timely and most needed in the time immediately following the death of Mao Zedong.... The stirring and correct words of Enver Hoxha cannot be twisted into the service of one or the other superpower...."

Clearly, Edward Pickersgill thinks Enver Hoxha is quite a guy! However, all has not yet been said about the "staunch Marxist-Leninist", "incisive and revolutionary leadership" found in "the stirring and correct words of Enver Hoxha". We might re-iterate that these words were not spoken by the First Secretary of the Party of Labour of Albania, they were put into his mouth by Edward Pickersgill.

The ideological quack was not satisfied with undoing Enver Hoxha's political mistakes, he went on to replace the mistake — that is, attacking Mao Zedong's theory — with the correct political contribution that Enver Hoxha himself did not make in defence of the three worlds theory.

Edward Pickersgill wrote: "The brilliant Marxist-Leninist thesis put forward by Mao Zedong on the struggle of the Third World countries and peoples has been most courageously and gloriously defended by Enver Hoxha."

Well! Enver Hoxha is quite a guy, eh Ed?

No, he is not. Enver Hoxha is misleading in the world revolutionary movement. He has carved himself a place at the head of a rotten trend that has split from correct politics and that is wrongly waging attacks on correct revolutionary politics in the current world polemic.

Read Enver Hoxha's actual words and compare them to those put in his mouth by Edward Pickersgill.

In his "Report To The 7th Congress", Enver Hoxha said: "The traitor and putschist group of Beqir Ballaku, Petrit Dume and Hito Cako was a faction at the head of the army, a group of plotters seeking to overthrow the Central Committee by force, by means of an armed putsch, and to wipe out the Party of Labour of Albania and the dictatorship of the proletariat, while relying also on armed intervention from abroad."

Hoxha also said this group had "capitulated to the pressure of the external and internal enemies, to the ideological encirclement and aggression of international imperialism and revisionism."

The Central Committee of Hoxha's party on July 29, 1978 revealed that these accusations of threat of "armed intervention from abroad" and "aggression of international imperialism and revisionism" were the false charges that the Albanian party was

laying against Zhou Enlai and the Chinese Communist Party: "The Political Bureau of the Central Committee of our Party unanimously condemned and rejected Zhou Enlai's anti-Albanian and counter-revolutionary proposal... Later facts proved that Beqir Balluku had in reality been in full agreement with the proposal of the Chinese leadership and worked in secret to carry out this hostile strategic plan... If these condemnable acts undertaken by the Chinese leadership in collusion with the Albanian traitors were realized, the People's Socialist Republic of Albania, its independence and sovereignty would have been liquidated."

So, Hoxha's 7th Congress Report contained hidden slanders against Zhou Enlai and "the Chinese leadership". We might add that the time period referred to was 1968, when Mao Zedong was still alive and giving direct leadership. Further, we could add that Beqir Balluku was purged by execution — friendship with Zhou Enlai and agreement with his proposals is apparently a crime punishable by death under Enver Hoxha's leadership. That's your kind of "staunch", "incisive" "leadership", eh Ed?

Read the words in Enver Hoxha's 7th Congress Report on the theory of the three worlds: "The 'second world', the 'third world', the 'non-aligned world' or the 'developing countries'. All these terms, which refer to the various political forces acting in the world today, cover up and do not bring out the class character of these political forces, the fundamental contradictions of our epoch, the key problem which is predominant today on a national and international scale, the ruthless struggle between the bourgeois-imperialist world, on the one hand, and socialism, the world proletariat, and its natural allies, on the other."

Sharp defence of the theory of the three worlds? Read on!

"The terms 'third world', 'non-aligned states' or 'developing countries', create the illusion among the broad masses fighting for national and social liberation that a roof has allegedly been found under which to shelter from the threat of the superpowers."

It is easy to understand that Edward Piskensgjill, an active illusion-monger, could believe that when one labels something "an illusion", one is waging a defence of the thing.

As the polemic between China and Albania developed and Albania came out more and more openly against the three worlds theory, Edward Piskensgjill began to panic. He began to hypothesize that perhaps Enver Hoxha was isolated inside the P.L.A. as Mao Zedong had been isolated in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China just before the beginning of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. All this was presented without a shred of evidence or scientific analysis. The ideological bludgehead went so far as to propose that we should attack the Hainzites' support for Albania as false support.

FROM BETTY TO MAJOR IDEALISM

During the summer of 1977 Edward Piskensgjill continued to refuse to face facts. With his eyes shut tight and his hands over his ears this buffoon refused to acknowledge that Albania was attacking the three worlds theory. On July 7, 1977 an editorial in "Zeri i Popullit", organ of the Central Committee of the P.L.A. openly attacked the three worlds theory. This editorial was entitled, "The Theory and Practice of the Revolution".

Shortly before the "Zeri i Popullit" article, during the months of April and May, the Hainzites were in Albania. At the same time, on May 4, Alive Magazine was unilaterally cut off by Albania from receiving the "Albanian Telegraphic Agency" bulletins. Still Edward Piskensgjill was unconvinced.

When a news item on Radio Tirana defined Canada as an imperialist power Edward Piskensgjill refused to believe it. The comrades who reported this to him said that they had taped the report but this bludgehead refused to listen to the tape and instead demanded that he be provided with a transcript of the tape, so that he could "study" it. This was done. The bludgehead made no further comment.

This Radio Tirana news item was popularizing the analysis found in the "Zeri i Popullit" article. That July 7 article tried to downplay the role of the second world countries in opposition to the two imperialist superpowers by stating the differences between the second and first world countries "are contradictions over markets, spheres of influence, zones for the export of capital and the exploitation of the riches of others, of such imperialism as the West German, Japanese, British, French, Canadian one, etc., with one or the other superpower, as well as with one another."

We have italicized the words that give the Albanian Party's incorrect analysis of Canada. The article states, further on: "The anti-revolutionary and pseudo-anti-imperialist character of the theory of the 'three worlds' (sic) is quite obvious."

"This is an anti-revolutionary 'theory' because it preaches social peace, collaboration with the bourgeoisie, hence giving up the revolution, to the proletariat of Europe, Japan, Canada, etc."

Even when it became extremely clear that the Party of Labour of Albania was taking an incorrect political line Edward Piskensgjill was still wavering. He persisted in suggesting that we should do an article saying that Enver Hoxha is isolated inside the P.L.A. Such an article would amount to nothing more than groundless fantasy. Yet this ideological ignoramus continued to push to write such an article right up until August 1978 when he split from the Collective. Edward Piskensgjill never gave up this childish fantasy. He continued to believe in fairy godmothers and wishes that come true.

During the period of time that Edward Piskensgjill was holding his last formal talks with the Alive Production Collective after August 18, 1978, he was given a copy of the 56 page July 29, 1978 "Letter Of The CC Of The Party Of Labour And The Government Of Albania".

This document, combined with his overthrow in the Alive Production Collective, must have made Edward Piskensgjill realize that wishes don't govern the world after all. He had wished for an Albanian Party defence of Mao Zedong and the three worlds theory. In the July 29, 1978 "Letter" there are the slanders on Zhou Enlai, by name, as mentioned earlier. There are also slanders against Mao Zedong by name and against the Party and State government in the People's Republic of China. The Chinese revolutionary leaders are branded as revisionists, the three worlds theory is further opposed and the Albanian Party declares that it is waging a polemic against the Communist Party of China, then it defines its specific attitude: "Polemics, as the word itself indicates, means a state of ideological and political struggle, it is a state in which non-antagonistic contradictions are transformed into antagonistic contradictions!"

The "Letter" not only effects a transformation in the nature of central contradictions, it transforms history too! Writing about the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the document claims: "The Cultural Revolution, more often than not, preserved the spirit and actions of an unprincipled struggle, which was not led by genuine party of the working class which should strive for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus, these debates among factionalist groups ended in the establishment in China of a state power dominated by bourgeois and revisionist elements"

Elsewhere, the July 29, 1978 "Letter" says the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution "was the logical outcome of the factional and unprincipled struggle which took place within the ranks of the Communist Party of China during the time of the struggle for the carrying out of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and after 1949!!"

Even struggles between the two lines of major political significance refused to mean "factional and unprincipled struggle" at the stroke of the Albanian Party's pen? No, it can't be done. However, that did it stop Edward Piskensgjill from trying the same trick on the Alive Production Collective, branding all our Collective struggles as factional disputes.

The anti-China attacks from Albania were not issued in Enver

Hoxha's name, though. Perhaps there is still hope, eh Ed? Do you still think Enver Hoxha is isolated inside the Central Committee?

Well, they reserved Enver Hoxha's name only so that they could issue the most specific, vile attacks using his prestige.

On September 20, 1978, Enver Hoxha said: "The Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian state will fight and expose Chinese social-imperialism which has taken sides with U.S. imperialism and world reaction in its struggle against the peoples, especially against socialism in Albania."

On November 8, 1978, Enver Hoxha said: "We merely expressed a series of opinions to Mao Zedong and the Chinese leadership. But the fact is that they took our comradely remarks for antagonistic opposition, and Mao Zedong himself said that he would not reply to them because he did not want to engage in polemics with us. Despite this, seeing that China was sliding deeper and deeper into the revisionist quagmire, the Party of Labour of Albania continued to offer the proper comradely opinions to the Chinese leadership, and sought discussions and consultations with them. These discussions and consultations were consistently refused by their side. It is more than clear to us that the Chinese leaders acted in this way because their positions were weak, and they were quite unable to face up to the powerful Marxist-Leninist logic of the Party of Labour of Albania. They were not in favour of talks and consultations with us because they wanted us to accept their views and dictate, without any discussion.

"As you know, the Chinese leadership, through Zhou Enlai and company, several times tried to blackmail us...."

"In fact, the Seventh Congress attacked neither China nor Mao Zedong. It merely exposed the anti-Marxist 'theory of three worlds', theoretically and politically, regardless of who was its author, whether Mao Zedong or Deng Xiaoping...."

"The Party of Labour of Albania is acting correctly in exposing the anti-Marxist theories and activities of the Chinese leadership, which are based on what is called 'Mao Zedong Thought', which cannot be, and never has been, Marxist-Leninist."

Also on November 8, 1978, Enver Hoxha gave this brilliant regurgitation of the Soviet social-imperialists' cover-up of the Soviet backed Vietnamese invasion of Democratic Kampuchea: "The Albanian people condemn the intrigues and plots concocted by Chinese social-imperialism against the Vietnamese people. We think that the conflict between Vietnam and Cambodia, between two fraternal peoples, should be resolved on the road of negotiations and without external interference, in the interests of the independence and sovereignty of the two countries."

Edward Pickersgill said one could not twist Hoxha's words to make them support either of the two imperialist superpowers. There is no need to give them even the slightest twist, Hoxha's words openly support Soviet social-imperialist aggression!

Enver Hoxha's rotten role is now quite clear, as are the reasons that Edward Pickersgill loved him so dearly. The only additional point to clear up is that Hoxha was not really holding himself in reserve at all. Earlier, in April, 1978, Enver Hoxha wrote a secret internal Party document which stated: "In accordance with the concrete conditions of a country and the situations in general, the armed uprising may be a sudden outburst or a more protracted revolutionary process, but not an endless one without perspective as is advocated by Mao Zedong's theory of 'protracted people's war'. If you compare the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the revolutionary armed insurrection, with Mao's theory on 'people's war', the anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist, anti-scientific nature of this theory becomes clearly apparent."

Edward Pickersgill was a petty idealist who acted as if world politics were determined by his own personal whims. To him correct political line was a minor and insignificant point which paled in comparison to his own personal wishes and desires. If Edward Pickersgill wanted Enver Hoxha to be correct, then Enver Hoxha was correct as far as this petty idealist was concerned. Hard cold facts and scientific analysis had no part in Edward Pickersgill's world view.

THE SEVENTH GREAT TEACHER OF MARXISM-LENINISM!

One would think that a person with a low ideological level, even if he refused to openly acknowledge this fact, would at least have enough humility not to promote himself as some great Marxist-Leninist teacher. Not Edward Pickersgill. He had no such humility. No claim was too wild for this ideological quack.

Mao Zedong, the greatest Marxist-Leninist of the present era, had an extremely humble outlook, never forgetting that his function was to serve the people and that all strength and wisdom comes from the people. In "The Situation And Our Policy After The Victory In The War Of Resistance Against Japan", Mao Zedong gave an excellent presentation from this position of practical humility: "If we do not win, we will blame neither heaven nor earth but only ourselves. However, let no one think that the people can be easily robbed or defrauded of the rights they have won; that is impossible. Last year an American correspondent asked me, 'Who has given you the power to act?' I replied, 'The people.' Who else indeed, if not the people? ... Our duty is to hold ourselves responsible to the people. Every word, every act and every policy must conform to the people's interests, and if mistakes occur, they must be corrected — that is what being responsible to the people means. Comrades! The people want liberation and therefore entrust power to those who can represent them and work faithfully for them, that is, to us Communists. As representatives of the people, we must represent them well."

Edward Pickersgill never understood, or put himself at the service of, the people's drive for liberation. He never had the practical humility that grows from the drive to serve the people.

In this light it is interesting to look at the "Against Cleftism" columns which appeared in *Alive Magazine*. These columns were written by Edward Pickersgill under the pseudonym, John Burnley. The first of these columns appeared in issue #71 of *Alive Magazine*. At first, this item was fairly modest in appearance and tone. In *Alive #94*, however, there is a marked change. "Against Cleftism" began to appear under pictures of the five great teachers of Marxism-Leninism.

In the column in *Alive #94*, John Burnley not too humbly announced, "In the future, this column will deal with all of the negative, anti-people, counter-revolutionary forces. This will be accomplished by presenting pertinent guidance from the great leaders and teachers: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong. Also, where necessary and possible, we will present the guidance of other revolutionary leaders and teachers, current and past."

Where did Edward Pickersgill suddenly get the gall to promise such high level political analysis? How was he going to present "pertinent guidance" from the five great teachers of Marxism-Leninism when he had consistently refused to read works by any of them? The answer is shockingly simple. Edward Pickersgill had hijacked a collection of quotes by Stalin on culture which were destined to be published as a complete manuscript in *Alive Magazine*. He tried to use these quotes one by one to proclaim himself a great Marxist-Leninist ideologue.

Edward Pickersgill's legitimacy as an ideologue was to be based on this manuscript alone. After Edward Pickersgill stopped using these Stalin quotes he produced only six "Against Cleftism" columns. He stopped using the quotes after *Alive #97*. Thus, for twenty-seven issues of *Alive*, Edward Pickersgill only produced six installments of his column.

The blockhead's "weekly" column lived up to its schedule about as well as the *Bainzites'* "daily" newspaper!

The six "Against Cleftism" columns that were produced were all based on ideas developed by other comrades in the Collective and presented more or less complete to Edward Pickersgill for writing.

It is important to stress here that only Edward Pickersgill thought that this collection of Stalin quotes gave him legitimacy as a Marxist-Leninist ideologue.

Also, nobody in the Collective was consulted about whether they thought that the five great teachers of Marxism-Leninism should

appear above the "Against Cleftism" column. Most of the comrades were quite shocked when they saw the new form of the column but made no comment because the magazine was already in print. The comrades were simply presented with a fait accompli.

Edward Pickersgill's arrogance on the ideological front did not end there however. After the ideological quack split in August, 1978, among his books and papers an interesting item was discovered. This was a personal index of Alive Magazine prepared for his individual use by a member of his faction. This index was not a complete record of everything in Alive but listed works by just a few writers. The only items listed in the index were works by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Zedong, Enver Hoxha and John Burnley! What arrogance!

The Bainzites upheld Enver Hoxha as the sixth great teacher of Marxism-Leninism but Edward Pickersgill goes the Bainzites one better. He dares to uphold himself as the seventh great teacher of Marxism-Leninism.

Juxtaposed to this incredibly overblown, absolutely conceited self-opinion from Edward Pickersgill, Mao Zedong's voice comes across like a refreshing breeze livening up stale thought, teaching the most profound guides to action in the most readily grasped fashion. A passage from "On Coalition Government" directly exposes many errors, most of which Edward Pickersgill has committed, and indicates the direction that honest people must take in avoiding or rectifying similar mistakes.

Mao Zedong teaches: "Another hallmark distinguishing our Party from all other political parties is that we have very close ties with the broadest masses of the people. Our point of departure is to serve the people whole-heartedly and never for a moment divorce ourselves from the masses, to proceed in all cases from the interests of the people and not from the interests of individuals or groups, and to understand the identity of our responsibility to the people and our responsibility to the leading organs of the Party. Communists must be ready at all times to stand up for the truth, because truth is in the interests of the people; Communists must be ready at all times to correct their mistakes, because mistakes are against the interests of the people. Twenty-four years of experience tell us that the right task, policy and style of work invariably conform with the demands of the masses at a given time and place and invariably strengthen our ties with the masses, and the wrong task, policy and style of work invariably disagree with the demands of the masses at a given time and place and invariably alienate us from the masses. The reason why such evils as dogmatism, empiricism, commandism, tailism, sectarianism, bureaucracy and an arrogant attitude in work are definitely harmful and intolerable, and why anyone suffering from these maladies must overcome them, is that they alienate us from the masses. Our congress should call upon the whole Party to be vigilant and to see that no comrade at any post is divorced from the masses. It should teach every comrade to love the people and listen attentively to the voice of the masses; to identify himself with the masses wherever he goes and, instead of standing above them, to immerse himself among them; and, according to their present level, to awaken them or raise their political consciousness and help them gradually to organize themselves voluntarily and to set going all essential struggles permitted by the internal and external circumstances of the given time and place. Commandism is wrong in any type of work, because in overstepping the level of political consciousness of the masses and violating the principle of voluntary mass action it reflects the disease of impetuosity. Our comrades must not assume that everything they themselves understand is understood by the masses. Whether the masses understand it and are ready to take action can be discovered only by going into their midst and making investigations. If we do so, we can avoid commandism. Tailism in any type of work is also wrong, because in falling below the level of political consciousness of the masses and violating the principle of leading the masses forward it reflects the disease of dilatoriness. Our comrades must not assume that the masses have no understanding of what they themselves do not yet understand. It

often happens that the masses outstrip us and are eager to advance a step when our comrades are still tailing behind certain backward elements, for instead of acting as leaders of the masses such comrades reflect the views of these backward elements and, moreover, mistake them for those of the broad masses. In a word, every comrade must be brought to understand that the supreme test of the words and deeds of a Communist is whether they conform with the highest interests and enjoy the support of the overwhelming majority of the people. Every comrade must be helped to understand that as long as we rely on the people, believe firmly in the inexhaustible creative power of the masses and hence trust and identify ourselves with them, no enemy can crush us while we can crush every enemy and overcome every difficulty."

PERSONALITY CONFLICT NOT POLITICAL STRUGGLE

Edward Pickersgill loved to ramble on for hours about his experiences with the Bainzites prior to the split in October, 1975. Despite all his stories Edward Pickersgill did not grasp the most simple political facts about these KGB agents.

Edward Pickersgill avoided self-criticism and analysis of his weaknesses which had led the Collective to make errors in uniting in certain activities with the Bainzites. In taking such an attitude he left our organization in a weaker position than it needed to be, whenever it confronted the Bainzites in practice or in the realm of ideas.

Joseph Stalin addressed this wrong attitude in "Against Vulgarising The Slogan Of Self-Criticism": "If we want to strengthen the revolution and meet our enemies fully prepared, we must rid ourselves as quickly as possible of our errors and weaknesses...."

"If we do not want to be caught unawares by all sorts of 'surprises' and 'accidents,' to the joy of the enemies of the working class, we must disclose as quickly as possible those weaknesses and errors of ours which have not yet been disclosed, but which undoubtedly exist.

"If we are tardy in this, we shall be facilitating the work of our enemies and aggravating our weaknesses and errors. But all this will be impossible if self-criticism is not developed and stimulated, if the vast masses of the working class and peasantry are not drawn into the work of bringing to light and eliminating our weaknesses and errors."

Edward Pickersgill put the Alive Production Collective in a position where it could have been caught unawares by all sorts of "surprises" and "accidents" from the Bainzites. He never disclosed to the Collective those errors and weaknesses on his part which facilitated the work of our enemies.

The fact is that Edward Pickersgill did not split from the Bainzites for political reasons. Edward Pickersgill split from the Bainzites because of a personality conflict between himself and Hardial Bains. These two were an explosive combination! It boggles the mind to think of two of Canada's biggest, most arrogant bourgeois individualists constantly cooped up in a small enclosed space, making frequent trips between Montreal and Toronto during the hot and steamy weather in the summer of 1975.

The other members of the Alive Production Collective did split with the Bainzites on a principled political basis. After the split therefore, these honest comrades suggested that a political campaign should be launched to expose the Bainzites.

Edward Pickersgill was terrified of launching a campaign against the Bainzites. Further, he was astonished that this was even suggested. This ideological ignoramus could not imagine on what basis such a political campaign could be launched. Thus, the comrades who could see that the Bainzites had to be attacked, set about convincing Edward Pickersgill that this could be done. He would say: "What about the classics? They can quote from the classics better than we can."

The comrades would reply: "They don't really know the classics very well at all. We have people who know the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong better than they do. Besides there's nothing in the classics that can be quoted which will actually

defend them but there's a lot that can be used to expose them."

Edward Pickersgill would say: "But Bains ... Bains knows ideology. He can use the books better than us for sure."

"No. We can take him on. He knows nothing really. He's just a showman. Everyone knows other people dig out the quotes for him. It's the people who do his research we should worry about, if we're going to worry at all, but even they don't know Marxism-Leninism."

This reply from the comrades would be doubted by Edward Pickersgill. He would be told that just because someone tags the words "Marxist-Leninist" on the end of their organization's name doesn't mean they are Marxist-Leninist. He would be told that the Bainzites were not "the Party" in Canada.

Edward Pickersgill would raise specific cases to try to prove Hardial Bains' prowess in ideological matters. The comrades would respond by looking out essays by Mao Zedong that specifically contradicted the exact things Bains had said.

It was only after days of discussion that Edward Pickersgill was finally convinced that we even had a political case against the Bainzites. The blockhead was extremely intransigent on this point.

After he was convinced that we should launch a political attack against the Bainzites, Edward Pickersgill's political posture changed. Suddenly he became a 200% anti-Bainzite. He was the most enthusiastic anti-Bainzite imaginable. Yet he never openly expounded on what effects the Bainzites had had on his own political consciousness.

Edward Pickersgill did call for analysis of the effects of the Bainzites in the Alive Production Collective as a whole however. In *Alive #66* (February 26, 1977) in an article entitled, "Thoughts On Further Combatting The Organizational Line Of Cleftism", he addressed this question. In this article, the ideological quack, states: "Within the anti-imperialist forces, those of us who have had more, direct experience with Bainzite Cleftism have a better possibility of accurately and promptly analysing the strengths and weaknesses of that specific enemy. This is because there has been more opportunity for development of correct ideas in this area: matter to consciousness and back to matter and back to consciousness, etc. Those of us who have had less direct experience have more possibility of falling into unfounded fears (incorrect ideas) simply because there is a greater possibility of basing judgements on 'unknown' and untested factors."

So, Edward Pickersgill prepares the ground work. Those with most direct experience are in a better position to correctly analyze the Bainzites. The blockhead himself, of course, had more direct experience with the Bainzites than anybody else in the Collective. Presumably, therefore, he was best able to analyze the Bainzite organization. Nice try, but facts categorically deny this statement. Edward Pickersgill had the worst analysis of the Bainzites within the Collective.

In this same article, the quack wrote: "Unchecked, Cleftism gives rise to internal and external paranoia (manifesting itself in various forms such as passivity, splittism, terrorism, name-calling, etc.). This response to unknown and unfounded fears effectively works against achieving revolutionary change."

So here we have it. Cleftism is not wrong, rather our response to Cleftism is wrong!

Taken together these two sections in the article paint Edward Pickersgill's position quite clearly. He himself has a clear view of the political errors of the Bainzite Cleftists whereas other comrades do not. It is these other comrades who are the main problem because of their incorrect response to Bainzite Cleftism. What nonsense! It is these other comrades who provided the political analysis to wipe out these KGB agents, not Edward Pickersgill.

BAINS, PICKERSGILL AND MALINOVSKY

In "Against Vulgarising The Slogan Of Self-Criticism", Stalin teaches: "The slogan of self-criticism must not be regarded as something temporary and transient. Self-criticism is a specific method, a Bolshevik method, of training the forces of the Party and

of the working class generally in the spirit of revolutionary development. Marx himself spoke of self-criticism as a method of strengthening the proletarian revolution."

Edward Pickersgill never did honest self-criticism for his involvement with the Bainzites because he never honestly saw anything wrong with it. He did not find any contradiction between his pseudo-"Left" posturing and the Bainzites' political outlook because there was none. He did not find any contradiction between his social degeneracy and the Bainzites' lifestyle because there was none.

When Edward Pickersgill was with the Bainzites he was as happy as a pig in shit. Edward Pickersgill split with the Bainzites because he would rather be a big frog in a small pond than a small frog in a big pond. The split was not based on political differences.

It is easy to understand, then, why Edward Pickersgill could not articulate and defend an anti-Bainzite position based on correct political analysis. There were no major political differences between Edward Pickersgill and the Bainzites.

Hardial Bains has visited Albania again since his jaunt in May 1977. This representative of the KGB was Enver Hoxha's guest again in October 1978. On this trip Bains was invited to sit with members of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, on a rostrum at a national conference. Of course, the event was much photographed to enhance the pages of PCDN. The event did not do much to raise the international image of Bains or the prestige of his party gang. It simply amounted to a rather unfortunate drop in the prestige of the Albanian Party's Central Committee.

Perhaps Edward Pickersgill could patch up his personality conflict with Bains and get invited as a companion/chauffeur on the next Albanian holiday. He might have to carry the KGB agent's briefcase but he might get a chance to meet his idol, Enver Hoxha. It may be that Hoxha would like to meet Hardial Bains' "materialist driver".

Perhaps it would not be best for Edward Pickersgill's image, however. Bains is already exposed in the international revolutionary movement. As evidence, read this excerpt from a letter sent to the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania early in the autumn of 1977. The letter is from the Central Committee of the Workers' Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) of Norway and says in part: "We have observed that the organization of Hardial Bains, the so-called 'Communist Party of Canada (M-L)' has propagated these meetings. We will therefore once more draw your attention to the fact that we are utterly convinced that Bains operates as an agent for an imperialist superpower."

Although there was and is no major political contradiction between Edward Pickersgill and the Bainzites, there was, and is, a major political contradiction between the Alive Production Collective and the Bainzites. Objectively, therefore, there was a major political contradiction between Edward Pickersgill and the Alive Production Collective. This is simple logic. It was this major contradiction which came to a head in August, 1978 — a contradiction between the Collective's correct line and Edward Pickersgill's pseudo-"Left", true Right political line.

The Bainzites themselves gave Edward Pickersgill support in establishing a name for himself as a 200% anti-Bainzite. When the Alive Production Collective made statements denouncing and exposing this KGB-sponsored gang of agents, they would respond to Edward Pickersgill as an individual. Their attacks never acknowledged our organization but played up Edward Pickersgill as an individual, personal enemy.

The Bainzites did this despite the fact that Edward Pickersgill did not set the Collective policies they were responding to. They did it even though they knew this quack did not have the ideological level necessary to carry out the anti-Bainzite attacks. They did it even though they knew that Edward Pickersgill was too cowardly to wage such attacks; they knew that only once was he involved in the many direct confrontations with them. They did it because they knew it was the Alive Production Collective that was their actual

enemy and that it was the members of our organization other than Edward Pickersgill who gave substance to the anti-Bainzite campaign. They did it because they wanted to pull a sleight of hand to misdirect the focus of interest in our exposure of their rottenness.

Lenin, in "Left-Wing' Communism, An Infantile Disorder" tells of the damage of Edward Pickersgill types who falsely bear the title of "leader". "Whoever weakens ever so little the iron discipline of the party of the proletariat (especially during the time of its dictatorship), actually aids the bourgeoisie against the proletariat...."

"The worst was that in 1912 the agent-provocateur Malinovsky got on the Bolshevik Central Committee. He betrayed scores and scores of the best and most loyal comrades, caused them to be sent to penal servitude and hastened the death of many of them. That he did not cause still greater harm was due to the fact that we had a proper relationship between legal and illegal work."

Although we have not suffered so substantially as the Bolsheviks, Edward Pickersgill was a Malinovsky in the Alive Production Collective. It is therefore interesting to read as Lenin goes on to explain the dialectical view we must take when assessing the effect of such a treacherous character.

Lenin states: "As a member of the Central Committee of the Party and a deputy to the Duma, Malinovsky was forced, in order to gain our confidence, to aid us in establishing legal daily papers, which even under tsardom were able to wage a struggle against the opportunism of the Mensheviks and to propagate the fundamentals of Bolshevism in a suitably disguised form. While Malinovsky with one hand sent scores and scores of the best Bolsheviks to penal servitude and to death, he was obliged with the other to assist in the education of scores and scores of thousands of new Bolsheviks through the medium of the legal press."

This is a good assessment and the judgement passed on Malinovsky was good too. In May, 1920, Lenin reported: "Malinovsky was a prisoner-of-war in Germany. When he returned to Russia under the rule of the Bolsheviks, he was instantly put on trial and shot by our workers."

Edward Pickersgill should take a stern warning from this chapter in revolutionary history. The Russian proletariat had a strong memory of Malinovsky's crimes that lasted over five years. Their memory was powerful enough to call him to task years and years after that if it had been necessary to wait longer. The Canadian people have strong memories too. Edward Pickersgill would do well to curb his crimes.

REFUSAL TO FACE SERIOUS POLITICAL ERRORS

Edward Pickersgill's documents on the question of factionalism serve to further expose his ideological ignorance and political opportunism.

In a document titled "Factionalism: Roots And Effects", dated September 1, 1978, Edward Pickersgill stated: "In an organization formed out of a faction, and in which there is little or no consciousness of factionalism as a bad thing, and in which factionalism is unopposed in any serious, relevant way, there will be many, many examples of factions and factionalism. This is the case in the A.P.C. Factionalism, perceived or not, is a major force in the A.P.C. and in the methods by which A.P.C. members work and organize, socially and politically. This all stems primarily from me and my history and I must take primary responsibility for it."

What kind of theory is this? It is a classic trotskyite theory by which a faction attempts to legitimize its errors by bleating that "everybody is doing it". Edward Pickersgill put forward an almost identical incorrect position to that which the trotskyites put forward inside the Bolshevik Party in the Soviet Union in the 1920's. Joseph Stalin discusses the trotskyite position in his August 5, 1927 "Speech To The Joint Plenum Of The Central Committee And The Central Control Commission Of The C.P.S.U. (B.)": "The third fundamental question on which the leaders of the opposition went astray was the question of our Party, of its monolithic character, of

its iron unity.

"Leninism teaches that the proletarian Party must be united and monolithic, that it must not have any factions or factional centres, that it must have a single Party centre and a single will. Leninism teaches that the interests of the proletarian party require enlightened discussion of questions of Party policy, an enlightened attitude of the mass of the Party membership towards the Party's leadership, criticism of the Party's defects, criticism of its mistakes. At the same time, however, Leninism requires that the decisions of the Party should be unquestioningly carried out by all members of the Party, once these decisions have been adopted and approved by the leading Party bodies.

"Trotskyism looks at the matter differently. According to Trotskyism, the Party is something in the nature of a federation of factional groups, with separate factional centres. According to Trotskyism, the Party's proletarian discipline is unbearable. Trotskyism cannot tolerate the proletarian regime in the Party. Trotskyism does not understand that it is impossible to carry out the dictatorship of the proletariat unless there is iron discipline in the Party."

Although the Alive Production Collective is not a communist party, the Leninist guidelines for the unity of revolutionary parties apply very well to the Alive Production Collective, as a revolutionary, anti-imperialist collective.

Edward Pickersgill distorts the whole organizational history of the Alive Production Collective with his slanderous comments. He whines that the Collective was formed out of a faction and that factionalism is a major force in the Collective. This is a lie. What slander to say that factionalism has been unopposed inside the Alive Production Collective in any serious, relevant way! As soon as Edward Pickersgill's faction was exposed in August, 1978, the Collective dealt with it in an extremely serious and relevant way.

Edward Pickersgill then proceeds to make a mockery of the Alive Production Collective's fine tradition of criticism/self-criticism/transformation by doing self-criticism for a major organizational error which never existed. How easy it is to do self-criticism for errors you have not made! To date, Edward Pickersgill has done no actual self-criticism for the political errors which he has made.

Edward Pickersgill's twisting and turning, wriggling and writhing on the question of factionalism starkly reveals his total unwillingness to come to grips with the actual political errors he has made.

At another point in this same document, Edward Pickersgill states: "Let it also be known that factionalism is a manifestation of opportunism and is on the organizational front the same as liberalism on the ideological front. They are twin children of opportunism and must be combatted and opposed. There can be no room for either in the ranks of the revolution!"

This is a seriously wrong statement which bears close examination. Liberalism is a manifestation of opportunism and is found in the ideological, political and organizational aspects of a revolutionary collective. Liberalism is not merely an ideological error as Edward Pickersgill's "masterful" thesis would have us believe. Liberalism is a corrosive which undermines the unity of all aspects of a revolutionary organization's work. For as Chairman Mao teaches in his essay "Combat Liberalism": "Liberalism is extremely harmful in a revolutionary collective. It is a corrosive which eats away unity, undermines cohesion, causes apathy and creates dissension. It robs the revolutionary ranks of compact organization and strict discipline, prevents policies from being carried through and alienates the Party organizations from the masses which the Party leads. It is an extremely bad tendency.

"Liberalism stems from petty-bourgeois selfishness, it places personal interests first and the interests of the revolution second, and this gives rise to ideological, political and organizational liberalism."

As Mao Zedong points out, unless combatted, liberalism can slowly but surely undermine revolutionary work. Although liberalism has its effects on many fronts in practice, the main field

of combat against liberalism is on the ideological front. It is combatted by explaining to those revolutionary workers exhibiting liberal tendencies, the errors of their ways.

Factionalism is an entirely different matter. It is *not* the twin of liberalism. Liberalism destroys a revolutionary collective in the same way as rust can corrode the body of a car over many years of unchecked action. Factionalism, on the other hand, destroys a revolutionary collective in the same way as the body of a car is destroyed by a high speed collision with a brick wall!

Factionalists make a conscious decision to set themselves apart from the revolutionary collective. So the first step in combatting a faction, once its presence becomes known, is to destroy the faction in practical terms. Once the immediate practical danger of the faction is overcome, ideological criticism of the faction must be made so as to root out its influence at all levels of the revolutionary collective.

To enter into factional activity is a political crime. Mao Zedong taught: "Practice Marxism, and not revisionism; unite, and don't split; be open and aboveboard, and don't intrigue and conspire."

A faction works against the interests of a revolutionary collective in a conscious sectarian fashion. A faction practices revisionism, splits with the majority in the collective and intrigues and conspires against the collective.

Like liberalism, factionalism is a manifestation of opportunism. Yet factionalism and liberalism are political trends which are qualitatively different in character. Liberalism is combatted in a revolutionary collective according to the norms of a non-antagonistic contradiction. Factionalism is combatted according to the norms of a contradiction which has both antagonistic and non-antagonistic aspects.

All factions operate in direct opposition to the basic unity of a revolutionary collective. Depending on the degree to which a faction opposes the interests of a revolutionary collective, either the antagonistic or non-antagonistic aspect of this contradiction will be in dominance. As struggle takes place, it is possible for the basic nature of contradictions related to factionalism to change. As Mao Zedong wrote in his essay "On Contradiction": "In accordance with the concrete development of things, some contradictions which were originally non-antagonistic develop into antagonistic ones, while others which were originally antagonistic develop into non-antagonistic ones."

Edward Pickersgill's "masterful" thesis on liberalism and factionalism is a shoddy attempt to slough off the seriousness of his own political errors. Revolutionaries throughout the world are keenly aware of the huge practical difference involved in dealing with "factional" mistakes as opposed to "liberal" mistakes. In investigating the political ramifications of the actions of Edward Pickersgill's faction in the Alive Production Collective, the members of the Collective have come to know the rottenness of factionalism in concrete terms.

The theory dropped from the sky by Edward Pickersgill claiming that "liberalism and factionalism are the twin children of opportunism" is anti-material, anti-dialectical and opportunistic in itself. It is "Left" in appearance, but Right in essence and is an accurate reflection of Edward Pickersgill's rotten political line.

COMING TO KNOW THE SOURCE OF FACTIONALISM

Edward Pickersgill's September 1, 1978 document, which accuses the Alive Production Collective of being nothing but a federation of factions, has a logic of its own. The logic of this document is entirely abstract from fact and alien to truth. The logic of the document holds up only within the confines of the document itself, as soon as it comes in touch with the real world it is shattered into pieces.

Even within the confines of Edward Pickersgill's document, his logic does not accord with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. This ideological quack's thesis is that it was fine for him to create a faction inside our organization because there were already many factions and a history of factionalism existing. It is

not at all true that there were other factions existing or that there have been any other factions inside the Collective at any time in its history. However, even if there had been such a history, the decisive actions taken at the moment Edward Pickersgill's role as a factionalist chieftain was revealed and the in-depth anti-factional investigation and study taken up since his overthrow, prove that the other members of the Collective now consciously and unequivocally oppose factionalism in practice and in theory.

The firm anti-factional consciousness is significant because it shows that even if there had been a history of widespread factionalism in our organization, the majority of members would now be in agreement on the necessity to destroy all factions and remnants of the factional outlook with great haste.

Lenin, in "The New Faction Of Conciliators", wrote: "What real guarantee is there that factions will be abolished? *Only* the complete healing of the split, which dates from the time of the revolution (and *only* the purging of the two main factions of liquidationism and otzovism will lead to this), the creation of a proletarian organization strong enough to force the minority to submit to the majority. As long as no such organization exists, *only* an agreement of all the factions *could* accelerate the process of their disappearance."

Thus it can be seen that for all Edward Pickersgill's pompous excuses, his logic, as well as the logic of facts, shows him to be the factionalist criminal. Even if factions were widespread in the Collective, he is the one blocking an anti-factional agreement of *all*. Every other member of the Collective, whether having been involved in the faction or not, would now eagerly be party to a firm, formal anti-factional agreement. It is Edward Pickersgill who saw running from struggle as the only option besides continuing his faction.

Since Edward Pickersgill blocks any agreement of all factionalists, we have but one option — to strengthen our organization such that it can force the factional minority to submit to the anti-factional majority. Such a strengthening and consolidation has taken place and Edward Pickersgill who refused to submit to the majority was overthrown.

This accords with Mao Zedong's words in "A Dialectical Approach To Inner-Party Unity": "The unity of opposites is the fundamental concept of dialectics. In accordance with this concept, what should we do with a comrade who has made mistakes? We should first wage a struggle to rid him of his wrong ideas. Second, we should also help him. Point one, struggle, and point two, help. We should proceed from good intentions to help him correct his mistakes so that he will have a way out.

"However, dealing with persons of another type is different. Towards persons like Trotsky and like Chen Tu-hsiu, Chang Kuo-tao and Kao Kang in China, it was impossible to adopt a helpful attitude, for they were incorrigible. And there were individuals like Hitler, Chiang Kai-shek and the tsar, who were likewise incorrigible and had to be overthrown because we and they were absolutely exclusive of each other. In this sense, there is only one aspect to their nature, not two. In the final analysis, this is also true of the imperialist and capitalist systems, which are bound to be replaced in the end by the socialist system. The same applies to ideology, idealism will be replaced by materialism and theism by atheism."

The Alive Production Collective has had to overthrow Edward Pickersgill because he was an incorrigible factionalist and because our anti-imperialist revolutionary motivation and his opportunist motivation were absolutely exclusive of each other.

Edward Pickersgill has a history of factionalism. The Alive Production Collective has no such history. Edward Pickersgill held to his factionalism and split rather than giving up his factionalism in order to unite. Our organization is united, it is firmly anti-factional, it has overthrown Edward Pickersgill and it has rid itself of other incorrigible individuals. Edward Pickersgill is an opportunist. We are principled anti-imperialist revolutionaries.

Edward Pickersgill was the main source of factionalism in our

organization. In "Foundations Of Leninism", Joseph Stalin, a great anti-factional activist wrote: "The source of factionalism in the Party is its opportunist elements."

COMING TO KNOW THE NATURE OF FACTIONALISM

Edward Pickersgill tried to destroy the Alive Production Collective's understanding of the nature of factionalism. He did this in an attempt to save his own false prestige when his factional and counter-revolutionary practice was fully exposed in August 1978.

Edward Pickersgill's effort was to no avail. He did not save his individual position, just the contrary — he facilitated his own overthrow. He did not distort our understanding, just the contrary — he helped us come to know the nature of factionalism more deeply and more practically than ever before.

Lenin was the first to introduce many norms of organization to the world revolutionary movement. Early in Lenin's time factions were openly accepted and were not frowned upon in revolutionary organizations. The revolutionary groups were little different from bourgeois political parties in this regard. It was Lenin who first proclaimed the necessity for a formal unity of will amongst revolutionaries. It was Lenin who first defined factionalism's negative effect on revolutionary practice. It was Lenin who led the first resolutions to ban factions from the revolutionary groups.

In "Violation Of Unity Under Cover Of Cries For Unity", Lenin gives a formal definition: "'Factionalism' i.e. nominal unity (in words all belong to the same Party), but real dismemberment (in reality all the groups are independent of each other, and enter into negotiations and agreements with each other, just like sovereign powers)."

This is Edward Pickersgill's self-centred stock-in-trade: nominal unity but real dismemberment. Against this, all those who know Edward Pickersgill and his ilk, must take up a constant guard. Factionalists are friends to nobody, except themselves as individuals, not even to other factionalists. Factions are good for nobody, not even those people who are in them.

Let Edward Pickersgill be known to all as an incorrigible factionalist and an opportunist.

Lenin also wrote, in the same work cited above: "Although Trotsky professes to be non-factional, he is known to all who are in the slightest degree acquainted with the labour movement in Russia as the representative of 'Trotsky's faction' — there is factionalism here, for both the essential characteristics of it are present: 1) the nominal recognition of unity, and 2) group segregation in reality."

It is important that Edward Pickersgill be given as little leeway as Trotsky. Before splitting from our organization Edward Pickersgill proclaimed his intentions to create a group to serve his rotten ends under the disguise of a Marxist-Leninist organization. Since splitting he has desperately tried to forestall our public exposure of him while he tried to knock together a circle of degenerate cronies in practice.

Although Edward Pickersgill proclaims everyone in our Collective to be factionalist, he must be known to all as a true factionalist who recognizes Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought only nominally and who is for splits among revolutionaries in reality.

Having seen Lenin's concise definition of factionalism, one can readily see how completely bankrupt is Edward Pickersgill's September 1, 1978 document on the question. In fact, this ideological quack's writings are close enough to Trotsky's to be duplicates.

Read Lenin's exposure of Trotsky and see Edward Pickersgill unmasked. "What, then, is 'non-factionalism'?"

"Trotsky's 'workers' magazine' is Trotsky's magazine for the workers, for it bears no trace either of workers' initiative or of contact with the workers' organizations. Wishing to be popular, Trotsky in his magazine for the workers explains to the readers the meaning of the words 'territory', 'factor', etc.

"That is all very well. But why not explain to the workers the meaning of the term 'non-factionalism' as well? Is this word really more intelligible than the terms territory and factor?"

"No, this is not the point. The point is that by this label of 'non-factionalism' the worst representatives of the worst remnants of factionalism *mislead* the young generation of workers. It is worth while pausing to explain this point."

On every point Edward Pickersgill parallels Trotsky in this wriggling and writhing performance around the issue of factionalism. Edward Pickersgill had no sense of or contact with the workers' initiative. He had no contact with the workers in any real sense. Edward Pickersgill wished to write in a "popular" style and so became condescending and patronizing to the broad masses. Edward Pickersgill, too, refused to explain any phenomenon when such explanations could have only exposed his own ignorance and rotten practice. Edward Pickersgill, too, used a liberal sprinkling of labels to cover the fact that he represented the worst brand of factionalism.

We, too, must pause to grasp this point. Otherwise we will be guilty of allowing Edward Pickersgill and other types like him to mislead the young generation.

Read Lenin further to see more of Edward Pickersgill's reflection in Trotsky's mirror: "But Trotsky completely lacks a definite ideology and policy, for having the patent for 'non-factionalism' only means (we shall deal with this in greater detail in a moment) having a patent granting complete freedom to flit to and fro from one faction to another.

"To sum up:

"1) Trotsky does not explain and he himself does not understand the historical significance of the *ideological* differences among tendencies and factions in Marxism, although these differences fill the twenty years' history of Social-Democracy and concern the basic questions of present-day life (as we shall prove later on);

"2) Trotsky has not understood the basic peculiarities of *factionalism* — nominal recognition of unity and virtual dismemberment;

"3) Under the flag of 'non-factionalism' Trotsky is upholding one of the factions abroad which is particularly devoid of ideas and has no basis in the labour movement in Russia.

"Not all is gold that glitters. Trotsky's phrases are full of glitter and noise, but they lack content."

Edward Pickersgill's name is written all over this quote from Lenin. The blockhead's phrases are full of superficial appeal and pompous promise too, but they lack content. Not all is Marxism-Leninism that pins the name on its chest, to be sure. However, all that is Trotsky's factionalism is to be found in Edward Pickersgill.

Lenin faced the factions in his organizations. He saw their rottenness and led their overthrow. In the "Preliminary Draft Resolution Of The Tenth Congress Of The R.C.P. On Party Unity", Lenin correctly and firmly proclaimed: "In order to ensure strict discipline within the Party and in all Soviet work and to secure the maximum unanimity in eliminating all factionalism, the Congress authorises the Central Committee, in cases of breach of discipline or of a revival or toleration of factionalism, to apply all Party penalties, including expulsion, and in regard to members of the Central Committee, reduction to the status of alternate members and, as an extreme measure, expulsion from the Party."

From our experience, we can strongly affirm that Lenin's guidance in opposing factionalism, combined with the subsequent wealth of teachings from Stalin and Mao Zedong's experiences, are of irreplaceable value in fighting and defeating factionalism in the present day. Following Lenin's guideline, we reduced Edward Pickersgill's status in the Collective by way of a penalty for his serious breach of our organizational norms. His intransigence even after such penalties made it necessary for us to expel him. We took preliminary measures towards expulsion against Edward Pickersgill. We were stopped from formally fulfilling these measures only because Edward Pickersgill was so quick to implement the traditional factionalist escape mechanism by resigning.