

DETROIT REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT RECORDS

BOX 9 OF 16

FOLDER 2

MCLL REPORT ON SPLIT J

RAVITZ CHANGEOVER 1972

LAW OFFICES OF
GLOTTA, ADELMAN, DINGES, DAVIS, MIDDLETON AND RILEY, P. C.

FOURTH FLOOR, HARTZ BUILDING / 1529 BROADWAY / DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226

313/964-1190

HUGH M. DAVIS
ROBERT J. DINGES
RONALD D. GLOTTA
DIANE L. MIDDLETON
IVY THOMAS RILEY

January 21, 1976

MICHAEL ADELMAN
OF COUNSEL

George Genesta
%Pat Nitos
1640 North Edgecliff
Los Angeles, California 90026

Dear George:

Enclosed please find some materials concerning Chuck Ravitz. The materials that I am enclosing are a statement made by them at the time of the split of the facts that occurred. As you can appreciate, a lot of the facts are presented in a bias and unfair way. However, you can see the general, specific theoretical deviation on page 2H, number 4. They state that the priority at that time was the building of the mass movement and not the party. Now, the purpose of their making of that statement was in disagreement with us. They were taking a straight-up anti-communist position that democratic centralist organizations were inherently manipulative and wrong and therefore they were not going to use the democratic centralist organizations any longer. In addition, they were taking the position the reason that they were the minority and we were the majority was because we were democratic centralist and the people in the organization did not have the right to make any decisions. It was subsequent to the writing of this paper that Ravitz stated that if he ever got the chance he would put us in jail. I think that the best thing for you to do is to take a minute, however long you want to review this materials some of which is very teachous and then call me and I can answer specific questions.

Yours in struggle,

Ronald D. Glotta

RDG/ftm

Enclosures

PERSPECTIVE OF CHANGEOVER ON THE
EVENTS OF AUGUST 31 THROUGH
OCTOBER 2

(A Setback In The Building Of A
White Movement)

October 2, 1972

Margaret Borys, Lynda Chabot, b.p.
Flanigan, Randy Karfonta, Sara
Karfonta, Bill King, Kevin Murphy,
Sheila Murphy, Justin Ravitz, Jack
Russell, George Colman

© 1972 by Changeover Productions

SECTION 1: AN INTRODUCTORY/SUMMARY STATEMENT

On September 3, 1972, there was a split in the Motor City Labor League. This was occasioned by the walkout of 10 members of the organization from an MCLL General Membership meeting. At that time, it was explicitly agreed that the ultimate resolution of our differences would be most intelligently and politically determined during a two week "cooling off" period during which time papers would be exchanged, positions clarified, and the stage set for a dispositive meeting of all parties on Sunday, September 17, at which time a decision on the question of split, reunification, or something in between, might be jointly made.

It was plainly stated that during this two week interlude, the division in the organization was to be kept internalized so as to not disrupt ongoing work - especially CCC work - adding to existing divisions, or preclude reunification.

The two week interlude was, by mutual agreement, extended to three weeks. It was agreed that final position papers would be simultaneously exchanged on Saturday, September 23, and that the dispositive, joint meeting would take place on Sunday, September 24.

By September 23, the 10 of us who had left the organization became convinced that reunification was not politically feasible or correct. In our final position paper of September 23 (pertinent portions of which are attached here as "Appendix A"), we said, in part:

"...we are convinced that reunification is not possible. However, even if the apparent political differences...are substantive and of long duration, we believe that a coalition is possible, indeed politically correct, at this time. The coalition will be premised on the assumption that all of us share a fundamental commitment to the building of a revolutionary white movement. This movement will require the unification of numerous tendencies - more sharply divided than even we are at this time."

The foregoing paragraph summarizes our perspective as we prepared to enter discussions with MCLL on September 24. We, Changeover, called for, among other things, a coalition within CCC, "one of the most sensitive areas of mutual work." We proposed tri-sponsorship of CCC by MCLL, the Alliance, and Changeover and that the split not be publicly aired in the CCC arena. We suggested representation on the Planning Committee that would leave us outnumbered by MCLL cadre, and we suggested that the office staff remain the same as it formerly was. (See "Appendix A" for the full text of our CCC position).

We did not know that while we were adhering to the September 3 internal process agreed upon by all parties, MCLL was proceeding unilaterally to consolidate its power and control in CCC at not simply expense, but in our judgement, at the expense of CCC as well. Contrary to the "internalization" agreement and while we were offering a principled coalition for CCC, MCLL met privately with the CCC Planning Committee excluding Changeover people serving on the Planning Committee. MCLL replaced Changeover Planning Committee members with MCLL members, took the position that Jack Russell from Changeover was no longer Coordinator of CCC and that inasmuch as we had "resigned" from the program sponsored by MCLL and the Alliance they were free to unilaterally displace us at will. At the same time MCLL breached our internal agreement with them by showing internal documents exchanged post-September 3, to the Planning Committee and did so prior to the scheduled joint meeting of September 24.

From September 3 through September 24, MCLL demonstrated a willingness to spend days preparing statements on theoretical constructs of the criterion for conduct of the members of cadre organizations to each other and, at the same time, an unwillingness to engage in principled conduct with external political parties, including, but not limited to, CCC and Changeover. In their paper Struggle Within, they say, "Capitalist politics is personality politics. . . It is politics involving struggle between individuals or groups of individuals around an already baked pie." (p. 5). They also say, "Leadership is not possessive. . ." (p. 9). Their position on CCC is a blatant contradiction of these statements!

Their attempt to exclude Changeover from the Planning Committee of CCC and to do so unilaterally while we were adhering to internal agreements with them and seeking to advance a principled coalition, is a blatant contradiction to their quoted political pronouncements. They were trying to establish control of "an already baked pie," and they showed little or no interest in maintaining a process of political growth for hundreds of people - a process that has been shaped and defined and is partially dependent on the long historical relationship between CCC and members of both groups.

In Struggle Within they also say, "Leadership's ultimate responsibility is to the masses not to other leaders. . ." (p. 9) and "Leaders must lead in the struggle to eliminate bourgeois forms of personality and subjective strife from the organization or party." (p. 10). Yet, they ignore their responsibility to the masses by fostering bourgeois forms of personality and subjective strife by trying to force members of CCC to take sides in a struggle that does not relate to the business of CCC.

Because by their conduct, MCLL made it impossible for us to sit down and rationally negotiate a coalition and unified proposal for CCC and other previous, joint activities, it became necessary for outside political parties to make choices between MCLL and Changeover. We did not invite nor want this and our practice was scrupulously guided by the conscious desire to avoid this. We have been given no choice.

For this reason, we are writing and offering this paper. The Introductory/Summary Statement is designed to set forth a synopsis of some of the critical happenings and analyses that we in Changeover perceive. Subsequent sections elaborate further upon the political judgements, history and facts that we deem pertinent.

ON THE FALSE QUESTION OF "SPLIT" OR "RESIGNATION"

We¹ are indeed no longer members of the Motor City Labor League, but our departure can only be characterized as a split - a rupture of the organization which raises the problem of determining which faction will carry on the work of the various programs. A position which characterizes our departure as a "resignation" that left the organization fundamentally unchanged and its programs solely in the hands of the remaining members is both unrealistic and untenable.

¹ Changeover consists of Margaret Borys, Lynda Chabot, b. p. Flanigan, Randy Karfonta, Sara Karfonta, Bill King, Kevin Murphy, Sheila Murphy, Justin Ravitz, Jack Russell - the original 10 who split from MCLL, plus George Colman.

Changeover is a defined group that represents roughly 1/4 of the previous MCLL membership, 1/3 of the previously constituted Central Committee, and 1/2 of the General Staff (the functional leadership of MCLL). Changeover represents 1/2 of the organization prior to its most recent expansion and the majority of those who founded and began MCLL.

Our position on the sharing and coalition or division of programs and on the division of property is set forth in "Appendix A," a document prepared and distributed prior to the misconduct of MCLL that led them to cancel the joint meeting of Sunday, September 24, and that made any coalition impossible.

We are a group of committed political people, many of whom participated in the creation and development of CCC and almost every other program claimed by MCLL. Our departure was the result of our adherence to, rather than abdication of, that political commitment.

ON THE INTERNAL ESCALATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE TENTATIVE SPLIT
(SEPTEMBER 3) AND ULTIMATE SPLIT (SEPTEMBER 24).

The history of these events shall not be fully chronicled and aired in this Section of our paper. There was a chain of actions and reactions that precipitated the "split" and all parties once members of MCLL are to lesser or greater degrees blameworthy for their role in the organizational crisis. But, some parties are more blameworthy than others and this is attributable to a combination of factors, summarized only, here:

Frank Joyce, with the support of others in "leadership" and with the conscious or unconscious support of all of the now existing MCLL members, repeatedly misread internal organizational dynamics and did so because he was in quest of personal, not political, power within the organization. He, with others, distorted internal problems into grave crises which at each stage justified his next unprincipled move.

The organization had rather clear and simple procedural avenues for resolving internal struggles. In sequence, these would properly flow from the Central Committee of 6 to the General Staff of 18 to the General Membership of 42. When a crisis was precipitated in the CC by Valerie lying to Sheila in a most uncomradely and unprincipled way, Sheila and Jack called for Valerie's expulsion from the CC. When this was summarily, and without political discussion, rejected by Frank, Valerie Snnok, Buck Davis, and Lynda Ann Ewen, Sheila and Jack Russell "resigned" from the CC, thereby automatically forcing the either/or question into the jurisdictional body of the General Staff the next morning.

MCLL, for the first time in their final position paper, delivered close to midnight on September 23, admitted that Valerie's lie was "uncomradely" and that Sheila and Jack's either/or postulation was a proper political formulation. At the same time they stated, and so did Changeover, that it was inherently disruptive for Sheila and Jack to have resigned in the manner they did at the CC.

Though Sheila and Jack did act precipitously, they continued to respect vital organizational integrity by not trying to organize within the organization for the coming day's discussion of these problems at a GS meeting Sunday, September 3, and at a GM meeting that night.

Frank, on the other hand, along with Valerie, Buck and Lynda Ann did just the opposite. Selectively, they singled out three-quarters of the organization for protracted meetings with individuals to deal with this "grave crisis," supposedly out of respect for the organization. If they really respected the people and the organization they would have engaged in the political struggle in the GS and the GM on Sunday, September 3, and not called three-quarters of the organization together to pre-organize that meeting.

The GS met and could not resolve the issues, forcing them into the General Membership. The 10 of us ~~split that night~~ because after three and on half hours of meeting, and after repeated exhortations to the three-quarters of the membership which met in the fraudulent Saturday night meeting to speak to that meeting, from which we were excluded, and at least one General Member was sworn to secrecy and all others have to this date maintained secrecy. MCLL now claims the Saturday night meeting, never placed on the agenda, was outside the parameters of the agenda item under discussion - namely, "Valerie's expulsion from the CC." Our position, then, and now, is: If the question of Valerie's expulsion was ~~decided~~ by three-quarters of the "membership" at the improperly called Saturday night meeting, weren't we wasting our time sitting in good faith to discuss the question?

We left because we did not trust comrades with whom we had struggled for many, many months or years. We left because they were decidedly opposed to open discussion, and because we had every reason, then and now, to believe that while we adhered to internal rules, in a democratic-centralist cadre organization, they repeatedly violated them. An analogy to the Saturday night, September 2 meeting, never to this day explained to us (!) was the Friday night, September 22 meeting of MCLL and Alliance representatives to the Planning Committee of CCC - another breach of an important internal agreement.

MCLL goes to great lengths in their last paper to demonstrate how between September 3 and September 24 they sought reunification by cooperating with us while we refused to cooperate with them. Cooperation, if well intended, would have been to have offered an explanation for the meeting of Saturday night, September 2, rather than to act as if RAAG's (Research and Analysis Group) role in the Ravitz Campaign was going to continue "business as usual." We had, albeit tentatively, split from MCLL. Business was not usual. We had no desire or intention to foist work on RAAG for us without there being any RAAG-MCLL voice in the campaign's major decisions. That was not a lack of cooperation, but rather an expression of our waiting, during the interlude, for them to address the points of division and split.

A number of other assertions in their final paper are just plain erroneous and further demonstrate to us that they were even during the period September 3 to September 24, bent on writing a final position paper not to gain reunification with us, but rather to draft an external document by which they could self-righteously seek to organize others.

²George Colman, who has since left the Motor City Labor League and joined Changeover, was forced to swear secrecy when he said that he'd like to discuss the matter with Jack Russell.

In their last paper, MCLL makes a vicious attempt to assassinate the character of Jack Russell, a comrade of ours in Changeover, whom we shall resolutely defend. Many extraordinary charges are levelled at Jack, yet, characteristically, not one charge was ever made by a single member of MCLL while we were in the organization, either privately to Jack or publicly within the organization. Indeed, the only charge ever fronted by anyone, which was of no significance alongside their vicious attack, was made (and accepted) by a member of Changeover at a General Membership meeting.

This attack, like the one's which preceded it upon Sheila, simply reinforced our view that a number of subjective people whose political history, practice and genuine forthrightness does not approximate that of Jack and Sheila's, have engaged in a two-bit, cowardly and subjective 'mob' attack upon members of Changeover, all fashioned to support their own discomfort with the practices in which they have engaged.

Rather than openly criticize the Saturday night, September 2 meeting, as a fundamental breach and betrayal of organizational principle, they gather together and claim it was the greatest meeting ever at which they all grew enormously. Then, they proceed to no doubt tear apart Sheila, Jack, and perhaps others, all of whom are absent, and neither of whom they had the courage or candor to comradely criticize even assuming that 10 per cent of their fabrications were to be true!

You can sense our bitterness and there is little point in trying to conceal it. It is abundantly present! We worked hard with many people for a common cause. We respected and regarded these folks as our closest comrades for whom we would go to any ends. Many have made invaluable contributions to our struggle in the past, but we are obliged to deal with the present and not sentimentalize over past alliances.

In the present it is bad enough that we have been betrayed; that members of CCC and other mass forms have had their real interests betrayed. But beyond this, the entire movement has suffered enormous losses by their subjective, counter-revolutionary conduct, all of which continued on its disastrous course Sunday, September 24, while we hopefully looked for a coalition that could hold the pieces together and help us continue the fundamental work to which we in Changeover have committed ourselves.

ON SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 24: WHILE WE WAITED TO WORK TOWARD A COALITION,
THEY STOLE LDC PROPERTY

Before Sunday, September 24, several papers had been exchanged and it had been mutually agreed that the joint meeting would take place on Sunday, September 24 rather than on September 17. It was further agreed that "final position papers" would be exchanged Saturday afternoon, September 23. Though Changeover had taken the position that reunification was impossible, we had in our final paper called for a "coalition for CCC," and otherwise wrote out the bases for a division of prior joint activities and properties in a way that would maximize future movement cooperation and minimize the disruptive effect of the internal split upon independent and external movement forces.

Buck Davis, in communications with Bill King, had called for a meeting of three representatives of each grouping on Sunday morning, September 24, so that an agreed upon agenda could be derived for the evening joint meeting. On Saturday afternoon, September 23, after our position had been written and prepared, Justin told Buck that we would prefer that the agenda meeting take place just before the joint meeting that was to take place at 7:30 p.m. Sunday night. Justin suggested a 6:45 agenda meeting. Buck said all right. At the same time, Buck informed Justin that MCLL's final position paper was not yet ready. Arrangements were made for the simultaneous transfer of such papers, and they were exchanged between 11:30 p.m. and midnight on Saturday, September 23.

In the MCLL paper, they called for an 11:00 a.m. or 3:00 p.m. "agenda" meeting to precede the Sunday night joint meeting. To work out the confusion as to the time of the agenda meeting, Justin called Buck Sunday morning to see if Buck still agreed to a later agenda meeting just prior to the joint meeting. Buck said he did not know; that he would raise this at a Sunday, 1:00 p.m. General Staff meeting, early in the agenda, and call Justin as quickly as possible from the GS meeting to let him know. Justin gave Buck three phone numbers to call so that there would be no trouble in speedily transmitting this information to Changeover.

The third number given was Sheila's, where we were to be conducting a Changeover meeting in preparation for that night's joint meeting. Shortly after 3:30 p.m. the phone rang at Sheila's. We anticipated that it was Buck calling to inform us of the agenda meeting time and place. It wasn't Buck. It was Ken Cockrel telling us that Reggie McGee, a member of LDC, had called saying a number of whites, some of whom he knew to be members of MCLL, were at the LDC office ripping off LDC property. Angrily, Ken inquired as to what was going on. We told him we did not know, but that we would check it out and call him back.

We left our meeting and hurried to 510 1/2 Monroe determined to stop the widening of an internal conflict to the point where it would affect and infect racial relations in this City.

As we arrived at 510 1/2, MCLL members had just departed, having loaded the LDC Gestefax and mimeograph machine and many other items (some CCC's; some Changeover's) into the Joyce van. Ken called back and we informed him that they had taken property, including the Gestefax and mimeo, which LDC had paid \$1,500 for, and which was worth much more than that. Calls went out to inform MCLL that it was their duty to immediately return LDC property.

Justin reached Valerie Snook and told her this at 5:00 p.m. and told her MCLL had "one hour" to return the stolen property. She said Justin must be incorrect; no LDC property was taken. Justin told her it was. Ken, at some point, reached Frank Joyce and likewise, in no uncertain terms, told him that the property was to be immediately returned.

At 7:00 p.m. Justin spoke to Frank by telephone. Frank made it plain that he knew they had LDC property and indicated that they had taken the wrong property "by mistake." When asked if they would rectify this mistake by immediately returning the property, Frank said no. MCLL, the organization that is so into criticism/self-criticism, made a mistake involving other, important revolutionaries, and yet rather than rectify their error they deliberately and consciously determined to exploit it. Frank said that they would hold this property as ransom for the delivery to MCLL of the CCC checkbook, membership list and mimeo.

It should be pointed out here that the mimeo machine, #260, was at 510 1/2 and in our final paper, given to Buck Saturday night, it was identified as CCC's while the #350 was identified as LDC's; likewise, in that same paper we identified the ownership of the two Gestefaxes - saying the large one "belongs to LDC" and the Junior was "purchased by Ad Hoc." We understand that MCLL later tried to blame their error on Changeover, saying we planted the machines in such a way as to mislead them. The machines were where they always had been. In our paper, we identified all property held, and their error was just the final example of their paranoia, ineptness, and willingness to subvert real political struggle in this city to serve their own childish and subjective views.

At this point, two questions are extremely important and should be answered by those put in a position - by MCLL, not us - that forces people to resolve the present CCC crisis. Before MCLL's conduct of September 24, these questions could have been internally resolved via our proposed coalition.

1. Was it proper or improper for MCLL to deliberately decide to hold very valuable LDC property as ransom for the submission of CCC property which we had never been asked for, which we had proper possession of, and which we did not claim to be solely ours? Was it proper to take and hold LDC property?

2. If it was improper, what should LDC have done?

LDC had already communicated that the property was theirs and that they expected it back. LDC had been told that they would not get it back until certain conditions bearing upon internal matters - in which LDC was not a party - were resolved. LDC had really only three options:

1. To call into operation the state apparatus that exists for dealing with criminals who unlawfully take or possess stolen property.

2. To ignore the State and go about retrieving its own property by whatever means necessary, up to and including force.

3. To capitulate, to allow MCLL to take LDC property and hold it in order to extort what was desired not from LDC organizationally, but from some people who happened to be LDC members.

The third option was never considered. As self-respecting people, LDC would not allow MCLL to exploit, rob and extort in this manner. Regardless of where readers are on the political spectrum, people should understand that survival on the left requires that persons challenged carry forward the burden and responsibility of prevailing in "left warfare" initiated by renegades. MCLL knows this and so do we. On Sunday, Sept. 24, MCLL were objectively the renegades.

LDC determined to reacquire its property and not to give legitimacy to the ransom demand. An LDC representative called Ron Glotta and told him that warrants would be sought and that he, Glotta, and others would be arrested by officers from the Guardians who had already been contacted. It was made clear that MCLL's option was to return the property. MCLL refused to do so.

On Sunday nights prosecutors are not normally available for the signing of complaints and warrants. Nearly always, prosecutors are not called into play until after a citizen complains to a police officer who, based upon (the claim at least of) "probable cause," is licensed to make a warrantless arrest. After the arrest, the case goes to the prosecutor.

If LDC wished to get the property back via legal coercion, rather than by the exercise of force (the only other alternative) we had an option of filing a complaint with pig cops or of calling upon non-pig cops who could understand what was at stake and exercise wiser political judgment in this tense situation. LDC got on with police who have worked with LDC and are affiliated with LDC. Having an interest in the property stolen and the persons involved, and knowing that LDC wished the property back, officers armed with probable cause based upon the complaint tendered to them by the Pres. of LDC went with three black cadre members of LDC who for legal reasons (and others) were best postured to accomplish the LDC objective.

A group of seven people, comprised of four officers, went to Glotta's Highland Park address and knocked on the door. There was no answer. While the contingent was at the door, a Highland Park police car pulled up and officers exited with weapons drawn. They were cooled out by proper authorities present on behalf of LDC. The LDC group then went to the Moss House where it was understood MCLL members were present.

As the contingent pulled up, the lights in the house went out. Obviously, such a predictable visit - caused by MCLL, not Changeover and not LDC - was anticipated. The group went to the door and spoke thru the door with John Taylor. Taylor was told that folks were there for the property or to arrest those who stole it. Taylor said if there was no warrant (State legitimacy) no one would be permitted entry. Once again, the Highland Park police pulled up. This time there were three carloads of police, who jumped out brandishing shotguns. The situation was extremely tense. Fortunately, once again it was cooled out before a shootout commenced.

With all this in mind, the LDC group had the option of going for the property unilaterally or of formalizing the "legal approach." People should pause again, and consider the following:

1. Who caused the trouble? Who was wrong?
2. Wasn't the LDC response predictable and even anticipated by MCLL?
3. Who used the State to this point and how?

Our position is that LDC used the State in the most limited manner possible - trusted officers, not pigs - and did so in order to achieve the necessary result in the least disruptive, least militaristic manner possible. MCLL used the State indiscriminately, calling the Highland Park pigs and knowingly setting up an on the street encounter between political blacks and Highland Park rollers armed to the gills. All the while, MCLL "revolutionaries" laid inside the Moss House having postured the situation by their own apolitical conduct and then having purposefully exacerbated it by setting up and provoking what could have been a shoot out that would have decimated the left in this City and would have been attributable to treasonous, cowardly MCLL forces!

Explanation should be given here as to why black cadre from LDC went out rather than those of us in Changeover who were immediately involved in the precipitant dispute:

1. The LDC contingent went to Highland Park at approximately 9:30 p.m. Before this, at 7:30 p.m., a Changeover and LDC representative went to 715 E. Grand Blvd. to see if MCLL would be present for the joint meeting at the time and place designated. They were not. Had they been, Changeover and LDC were prepared to go there to discuss the situation, and, without the trusted police present, to issue one more demand to the entire membership for the return of LDC property. Our position was if they were willing to still talk at the designated meeting place, we would do so.

2. Postured then to retrieve the property or, if possible effectuate arrests, the question was who should go. Black cadre were selected by LDC because:

a. MCLL had, by their irrational and unprincipled conduct, created a situation where they could not be trusted in any way. They were willing to deliberately rupture multi-racial relations in Detroit and to provoke LDC to the limited options of a "legal or forceful alternative." LDC people were not going to the MCLL turf unarmed. No one in Changeover at that time had CCW permits and LDC did not want to be set up for busts.

b. The trusted police wanted black accompaniment.

c. And, most importantly, we understood that Changeover's presence in an LDC hat would, given our past relationship with former comrades, only cloud the issue and not lend itself to the reacquisition of LDC property - property irrelevant to an internal MCLL dispute.

Sunday night, after again opting against a military response, LDC filed a complaint with the DPD First Precinct, calling for the arrest of Attorney Glotta, Professor Lynda Ann Ewen, Attorney Buck Davis, and others. Yes, their transgression was consciously being carried to another stage. John Taylor asked for a warrant. LDC went for one. They precipitated this, not LDC nor Changeover. No matter how unfortunate and saddened we were by moving against former comrades, we were forced to do so in order to retrieve LDC property.

Furthermore, we were forced by their apolitical conduct to abandon the "ethic" of not using the State against Left forces.

MCLL conduct was completely counter-revolutionary and unprincipled in numerous respects:

1. While we waited for a phone call to attend a meeting to fashion a principled coalition that would minimize the damage done to the Left in this City and would help prevent externalization of our differences, they commandeered equipment from the LDC/CCC office.

2. When informed of their error, rather than return the equipment "mistakenly" taken, they decided to nonetheless keep it to extort other things from us which could have easily been the subject of negotiation - within the Planning Committee of CCC, or if necessary, within the General Staff of CCC. (Was MCLL acting in the best interests as sponsor of CCC by stealing and holding onto LDC equipment in demand for the return of CCC equipment which ~~lack~~ properly held and which we never hid, nor would have withheld from CCC?)

3. MCLL purposely and deliberately and predictably set up a situation that brought an encounter between the Highland Park police, whom they called, and revolutionaries whose importance and practice, cannot objectively be disputed by anyone; and, indeed, involving people who every day face the serious risk of extermination from STRESS-type cops or other reactionaries.

4. In so doing, MCLL deliberately and consciously called into question one of the most serious, important and distinguishing elements painstakingly built over the years here in Detroit - the most advanced and harmonious multi-racial relations built anywhere in this racially divided country. You should all remember that it is still easier for blacks to aggrandize their immediate strength by posturing as nationalists, and that at great political expense, but for legitimate (and, despite MCLL, still legitimate) political reasons, Ken and other LDC members have long maintained white alliances and spoken here, nationally, and internationally of the political growth and integrity of whites, most particularly MCLL, in this City. All these developments have been substantially tarnished by the subjective, sick and apolitical conduct of MCLL.

We offered our coalition. We took principled and internal positions with parties who by conduct have now made it utterly impossible for us to co-sponsor or work with them on any co-equal political efforts whatsoever. We hold Frank Joyce principally responsible. We do not stop with him, however. We hold every member of MCLL responsible until it is proven that they fought and rebelled against the betraying leadership that caused and perpetuated the misconduct on Sunday, September 24.

LDC formalized the complaint on Sunday night and Changeover contacted Sandy Buist, Kathy Schultz and Peg Posa of the Planning Committee of CCC. Monday morning the latter three informed MCLL that they were obliged to immediately return the confiscated property to LDC. Lynda Ann Ewen called and said they would do so, but they wanted the CCC mimeo which they apparently overlooked in the Sunday seizure. This was apparently to "save face." At that point, we felt their illegitimacy was fully exposed, and we turned over the mimeograph, and retrieved the stolen LDC property.

Tuesday, the LDC complainant and attorneys from the Glotta office, met with the Wayne County Prosecutor on the question of warrants. LDC jammed for warrants in their attorney's presence, and privately told the prosecutor that the State's role could wither away.

Subsequent to the "resolution" of the LDC equipment question, we find MCLL moving around the city - taking positions which charitably can be described as racist. Statements like, "We weren't going to turn Frank over to those killers." Or, referring to LDC personnel as, "Ken and his boys," in conversations with folks not even in CCC.

And the ultimate, accusing Ken Cockrel of "reverse sychophancy" - this statement made by none other than Frank Joyce. It is our position that these statements are the height of racism. Members of MCLL knew what the response would be to the holding of LDC equipment..

Multi-racial relations are in fundamental jeopardy, and persons in this General Staff should understand that, however unfortunately, you must take a position on the behavior of MCLL. The events of Sunday, September 24, are the cement that make a coalition IMPOSSIBLE.

Are members of the CCC General Staff prepared to maintain political relations with a group who is prepared to jeopardize multi-racial political relations throughout this City because of an internal dispute and then run around this City engaging in verbal attacks of the lowest racial character?

But we of Changeover take the position that this behavior of MCLL is not the only question. It is not the only question because the capacity to act in the above stated manner is just part of an overall political perspective which has emerged in their documents. Their behavior is consistent with persons who believe that they are "making history" in an illegitimate meeting held on September 2, 1972.

It is consistent with a group of persons who themselves state that if differences exist, they exist around matters of "internal party work", but who also formulate a strategy that precludes even discussion of a coalition, and in fact, jeopardize mass work - i.e. CCC.

It is consistent with the internalized perspective particularly seen in Struggle Within. (For an elaboration of Changeover's perspective of MCLL's politics - see Section 2 of this paper.)

SECTION 2: CHANGEVER'S POSITION ON "STRUGGLE WITHIN"

CRITICISM/SELF-CRITICISM

In order to thoroughly critique the Motor City Labor League position on criticism/self-criticism we must look at it within a larger context. What is the purpose of criticism/self-criticism? The point of criticism/self-criticism is to effect the behavior of an individual so as to advance the struggle. For the process of criticism/self-criticism to have any meaning it requires a high level of trust - a shared view of objectives and unswerving commitment to the Struggle - in short, folks must be revolutionary comrades.

It is further essential that there be a real understanding of the nature and therefore the effects of bourgeois democracy on each of us as individuals. Criticism/self-criticism improperly engaged in can be only one more destructive occurrence in the life of human beings in this society. A destructive occurrence, however couched in political terms, is not productive of political results.

By way of example, how does a revolutionary comrade criticize someone for "inability or failure to correctly communicate with and educate the people" (p. 14, Struggle Within)? What revolutionary comrades should do is train folks in the art of communicating with others and therefore rule out the inability. To criticize someone for an inability is to only further the sense of worthlessness felt by the individual being criticized. The opposite of what the point of the process is supposed to be. If there is any area of sensitivity which we all share, it is in the area of our abilities.

To criticize someone for "a.) mis-estimation of others' abilities and capacities and the failure to trust in the revolutionary abilities and capacities of the people or the development of such. b.) failure to be correctly conscious of objective conditions among the people and the material base available that facilitates political organization and work. c.) failure to listen and learn from people. e.) failure to have sufficient theoretical, strategic, and factual understanding of objectives/ too great a hesitation to act awaiting more data or understanding." (p. 14, Struggle Within), is guaranteed to have the result of a constant process of criticism/self-criticism going on because there is not a human being on the planet who is not subject to be criticized for some portion of the above at almost any time. It breeds an internalized, individualized view of the world that only reinforces the sense of our individual worthlessness and organizational weakness. It is antithetical to the building of a people's movement.

NATURE AND EFFECTS OF BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY

For a moment, let's look at the nature and effects of bourgeois democracy, because it is a portion of the larger context.

In order for capitalism to maintain itself, there must be divisions within our class, racially, sexually, and between the different strata within the class. All of us, regardless of our position, our color, our sex, are inculcated with a sense of worthlessness - a sense of individual isolation. We are not socialized to see that every aspect of human life is political. Every decision that each of us makes is a decision which is political in character. Many of us do not always see the political nature of the decisions because we have been taught to compartmentalize our lives and to see some arenas as personal and some as political. For example, decisions about where we live or go to school, whether to marry, etc. are viewed basically as personal decisions. We are taught that political decisions are made in selecting leaders (electorally), when joining political organizations, etc. We are taught that we are not capable of making big decisions - that our instincts, our intuitions, our personal judgements, are SUBJECTIVE AND THEREFORE BAD.

The single most destructive concept is that human beings are evil - that we (as it's taught in religious terms) are victims of "original sin", and subject to err at any time. We are left with a consuming sense of our worthlessness as human beings and that is a political statement! It is a political statement because it is from that sense of worthlessness that we view every aspect of our lives. It translates into many things: sexism, racism, capitalist competition, pointless conflict and, most importantly, we learn to make decisions from the non-dialectical perspective of what is bad and what is good.

We are not taught to think and therefore, to act dialectically. We see the world with a static vision of the opposite of love is hate. We see that conflict is bad because it is uncomfortable - unharmonious. We see that growth is good and that decay is bad. We are taught that, because we are evil, we should look out for ourselves because "If I don't look out for myself, who's going to?" Individualism is essential to the maintenance of the capitalist system. What our struggle is about is the synthesis of individuals into a movement, not the destruction of individual human beings who participate in it.

WE will only take power when enough of us have self-respect to the point that we are capable of synthesizing ourselves into a movement. It is a dialectical process - this relationship between the individual and the movement. It is a process that has many phases - we draw on the past in order to create the future. In order for us to reach the point of taking power we have to have arrived at an understanding of power - of what it means to take it, and a view of the process necessary to take power. We should examine these three elements. Power is the capacity to organize means of social control that work. Capitalism imposes its methods of social control on all of us.

INDIVIDUALISM

Individualism has many forms - we can see it in capitalist politicians, in the definition of the nuclear family, in the modes of production which are employed, in advertising, in education, and on and on and on. Examining individualism's effects on different kinds of personalities is a very delicate process, and it surely must be a pre-condition to the development of a process of criticism/self-criticism. On one hand, people are fundamentally distrustful of others, and on the other, desperate for some form of collective relations which allow for trust. On one hand, persons are instinctively protective of selves and therefore prone to demeaning others as compensation for sense of one's own inadequacy, and on the other, desperately trying to establish open relations with other human beings. One of the effects of bourgeois socialization is the scars - those events which constitute betrayal by others of self, which then inform relations with others for the duration of one's life. The sexual and racial scars which all of us bring, deeply affect our perceptions and expectations of other human beings. It is usually the case that none of this organically creates the open environment necessary for criticism/self-criticism.

INTIMIDATION

Another effect of bourgeois socialization is what is called intimidation. What is it? Intimidation is a relation between human beings in which some parties feel so deeply inadequate, that they assume that they cannot be right on the point under discussion or the situation being disputed - that the level of self-respect by some of the parties is so low that they will not speak out for what it is they believe. That the level of respect for the other is not high enough to where one will require that the other deal with one's perspective regardless of cost. Intimidation is possible when there is mystification of an individual and, most importantly, when there is fear.

FEAR: AN ELEMENT OF INTIMIDATION

Fear is the most critical element of intimidation. Fear of reprisal from the party being disagreed with or challenged. What is the basis of this fear? Is it physical survival, or harsh words, or the anger of this individual? Intimidation by an agent of the state is one thing, intimidation by a comrade is another. As we said, intimidation is a relation. It therefore minimally involves two human beings. We have looked at the person being "intimidated" - what is necessary from the person "intimidating?"

If an individual is setting out to intimidate, then they are acting in a way to consciously squash debate, discussion, or disagreement. They are purposely attacking persons at points understood to be vulnerable in the other, and that they ultimately use force to maintain their position. The individual "intimidating" must be prepared to use fear as a method for affecting outcomes of the given situation. Intimidation occurs far less frequently than most of us understand - as a self-conscious process employed by an individual to make others cower.

There is self-induced intimidation however, a phenomenon that is reflective of the bourgeois socialization to which we have all been subjected. It is the mentality that allows for an individual to explain their own fear and sense of worthlessness as the fault of someone else. "I was timid - I was intimidated." It should be noted, that for there to be intimidation short of physical intimidation for real, that individuals MUST allow themselves to cower, if you will.

POWER AND LEADERSHIP

We have all been acclimated to accept illusions of power. For example, that there is a real difference between a Republican and a Democrat. That the big corporations cannot control our "independent government" - and on and on. We have been socialized to accept the fact that it takes money to run for office and that it comes from a few specific sources that therefore have the real say in who runs and who doesn't. We, knowing this, still go to the polls and vote because there hasn't ever been a viable alternative - electorally, legally, or militarily for that matter.

One of the results of this sketchily outlined process is that we shy away from power and see the corruption of leadership as inherent to the process of taking power. WE DO NOT TRUST LEADERS. There is indeed cause for skepticism, but it is critical that we examine the kind of leadership being exercised in any given situation - who they are, where they come from, and how they got into a position of leadership. This is too infrequently done, because once again, it is easier and safer to assume the worst, and act from it, instead of taking risks. All of this discussion of the effects of bourgeois socialization is, we believe, important to the process of criticism/self-criticism which should be engaged in by a revolutionary organization.

To return to our critique of the position of the Motor City Labor League on this subject. If one reads their paper Struggle Within carefully, one will see between the lofty phraseology such as, "The class will overcome its divisions because it must in order to defeat the bourgeoisie" (p. 1, Struggle Within) - a statement with which no one left of Benito Mussolini can disagree with - but said within the context of a paper designed precisely to divert that struggle by: 1.) never anywhere suggesting how that is going to occur or be assisted by this internalized process of criticism/self-criticism, and 2.) moving consciously to exacerbate divisions within the class by their actions (see Section 1 of this paper). We can see the seeds of self-hatred, defeatism, and fear.

The entire tone of the section on criticism/self-criticism reads like a teacher's manual for a 2nd grade religion class in a Catholic school - preparing for FIRST CONFESSION. The objectification of human beings for example, in the statement of the three reasons why revolutionary comrades engage in criticism/self-criticism, we quote, "Acknowledgement of responsibility toward the object of criticism." (p. 12, Struggle Within). The entire set of structural formulations is "AT SELF," and "AT COMRADES" (see Struggle Within).- precisely the kind of dehumanization that brings people into the Struggle. (It is true that particularly the White Left in this country has never been able to sufficiently analyze its Puritan roots to understand, let alone overcome, falling right into the same traps).

People come into Struggle to get away from that kind of dehumanization, not to get larger and more intense doses of it - unless that having arrived at the point of being in Struggle, folks realize the costs involved and are afraid and so seek out methods to rationalize, essentially withdrawing themselves from real struggle for power and turn instead to a process of attempting to create the new society and therefore the new relationships right here, right now. We reject this as more New Left game-playing and avoidance of the serious responsibility for building a movement in this city.

The revolution is a process - a process of growth and decay - and the new society and new people - because that's what we're talking about - people socialized in a different system, with different values and operating assumptions. It isn't going to happen in 1972 or 1973. A careful reading of the MCLL formulation concerning criticism/self-criticism leaves one with the distinct impression that a phenomenal amount of time is spent on this process - that any and every action, indeed motive of a member is subject to be criticized or should be self-criticized at any moment.

The entire process is built on the assumption that people are subject to error and incorrectness in anything they do. We understand that there is a high margin of error possible in the building of a movement but it is LUNACY TO SUGGEST THAT A COLLECTION OF HUMAN BEINGS SPENDING AN INCREDIBLE AMOUNT OF TIME TELLING EACH OTHER THAT THEY HAVE ERRED IN THOUGHT AND ACTION IS GOING TO RESULT IN A REVOLUTIONARY ORGANIZATION CAPABLE OF INSTILLING IN OUR PEOPLE A SENSE OF WORTH AND DIGNITY AND PROVE STRONG ENOUGH TO CARRY PEOPLE THROUGH THE HARD AND COSTLY STRUGGLE TO POWER. It will not occur. There was once a Weatherman that blew himself into self-hating oblivion. There is now an MCLL confessing its way to liberation. It won't work.

Throughout the paper we hear that criticisms must be made "Within political terms" (pp. 12-13, Struggle Within). The "political terms" outlined in the paper, and we quote,

"At Self" - "Must be made within political terms; must be carefully separated from psychological needs to remove guilt, engage in self-flagellation, impress others, with own humbleness, etc.; this is not to say that such motives will be present, but IF present, must be dealt with in political terms, e.g. what are class, sex, racial, and family origins of 'guilt', etc." (p. 12, Struggle Within).

AND FURTHER, in section

"AT COMRADES" - "Must be made within political terms; must be carefully removed from psychological needs to asset authority, to 'prove' oneself, etc. IF such motives are present, they must be dealt with in political terms, e.g. how does this society's emphasis on

competitive individualism create the need to put others "down."
(p. 13, Struggle Within)

These are the only areas in which MCLL explicitly states "political terms" - it is fascinating that the essence of all their "political terms" are psychological or intellectual abstractions which in no way are reflective of the real political realities of our struggle today and how external work is actually affected.

We who are engaged in Struggle are only in the process of fully analyzing and understanding the phenomenon of guilt within its class, sexual, racial, and familial contexts. Nowhere does MCLL lay out what these "origins" do mean or how to analyze them. There is a reason for this absence - the reason is that these are precisely the questions which we are trying to answer generally in the movement. There is no quick or easy way to arrive at an understanding of what class, race, and sex mean in organizing terms to our struggle and the building of a white revolutionary movement in Detroit or the country. But we can say categorically that the process of criticism/self-criticism as outlined in Struggle Within will not lead to a stronger, healthier movement, but to an introspective collection of human beings who view the world through an inter-personal kalidescope.

CHANGEOVER'S POSITION

Since we have seen fit to thoroughly reject the perspective of the Motor City Labor League, it is incumbent upon us to outline our position on these matters. It will follow.

Since we see that the primary role of pre-party cadre formations is to engage in external work (work outside the confines of the organization and more precisely - mass work - that type of program which brings us into relation with larger and larger numbers of people in the community), we believe that internal methods of organization should reflect that external commitment. We see the development of the party as synonymous with the development of a mass movement. To elaborate on this point, there will never be a real party capable of leading our people to and through revolution if it does not encompass large and differing numbers of folks. The only way folks will come to the cadre formations is through the mass programs.

WE BELIEVE THAT AT THIS POINT IN THE STRUGGLE IN THE UNITED STATES, THE RESPONSIBILITY INCUMBENT UPON WHITE REVOLUTIONARIES IS THE BUILDING OF THE MASS MOVEMENTS AND THROUGH THEM BRINGING FOLKS INTO THE CADRE ORGANIZATIONS WHICH WILL ULTIMATELY SYNTHESIZE INTO THE PARTY, AND THE REQUISITE MASS STRENGTH TO MAKE A SERIOUS BID FOR POWER AND INDEED, CONTROL OF THIS COUNTRY.

Therefore, the nature of these pre-party cadre formations is a most serious question. The kinds of internal mechanisms become CRITICAL because the internal mechanisms will influence how the cadre members will or will not organize themselves to organize the mass movement. We therefore believe that methods of internal work should, among other things, reflect our understanding of our people and the socialization processes to which we have all been subjected, indeed in many cases, precisely the reasons why folks began to seek new, and ultimately, radical perspectives.

Therefore, we would call our process SELF AND COLLECTIVE EVALUATION. The term "criticism" is tainted with the negativism and defeatism and self-contempt from which we all desperately seek escape. We would use the term "evaluation" because it suggests some kind of external criteria which is precisely that which we are committed to - external work. At this juncture we should probably explain what we mean by leadership and external work.

LEADERSHIP

In the MCLL paper Struggle Within there is a definition of leadership - a definition that is not particularly helpful and, in some parts, a perspective with which we fundamentally disagree. By way of example, "Leadership is not perfect; nor is it an example or some end quality or goal." (p. 9, Struggle Within). We agree that leadership is not perfect - it is even a superfluous statement. We however, do believe that leadership is an example, if you will, a symbol for the people.

We should be precise in what we mean - revolutionary leadership, under the discipline of a democratic-centralist organization, is capable of being an 'example' or a symbol to folks without becoming power-tripping, stalinist dictators. Leadership is a process as well as an individual or group of individuals, but it is a human process.

We look for example at the great leader of the People's Republic of China - Mao Tse Tung. Mao as a symbol - a symbol of the hopes, the struggle, the pain and suffering of the people of China, has done much to assist the process of organizing a people's state in China. Given the level of defeatism that comes with capitalism, people need symbols - need leaders to (yes, and there's nothing wrong with it) inspire folks to come back again and again and go against the enemy in order to defeat him (said advisedly).

We believe that it is critical for the development of our movement that there be leaders. MCLL says, and we quote, "Leadership is a process by which cadre through their interaction with the highest level of struggle come to a clearer understanding of internal and external contradictions and a sharper ability to move toward revolutionary objectives." (p. 9, Struggle Within). We believe this to be a very narrow concept of leadership - internally defined and reflective of the same mentality that we observed in the section on criticism/self-criticism.

Leadership is a learning process for members of a cadre organization but its purpose is not limited to the process for the cadre, but is in fact, externally motivated - namely, the reasons why cadre organizations spend time developing leadership is to affect the capacity to organize the mass movement. Within that construct, it is essential that criteria for leadership be developed.

"Leaders must exercise great care not to mistake differences in cultural style for political differences." (p. 9, Struggle Within). WE take great exception to this statement and its premises. Culture is political. The ways in which human beings react to the cultural socialization of this society and how they attempt to adapt to, and generate compensation for, the effects of bourgeois socialization in fact are political. This could be indeed, the crux of the apparent differences between MCLL and Changeover.

We should state clearly that cultural differences, reflective of the strata within our class, from which folks come, need not be antagonistic contradictions. The building of a mass movement requires precisely that we have the capacity to synthesize contradictions in order to attain our objectives. Cultural differences become antagonistic differences when the cultural biases and fears (reflective of strata position) are used to direct the course of an organization that is a leadership unit to the struggle in a given locale.

We do take the position that physical survival is still a stronger motivating force than psychic survival and that cultural differences are directly tied to the survival experience of individuals coming into struggle. To digress for a moment, and speak to a clear class bias reflected in MCLL's paper (see p. 7 - the section that speaks to gangs).

We take the position that however members of MCLL understand or misunderstand a gang, a gang is a step toward productive unity. A unity members of MCLL might be better off having experienced sometime in their lifetime. It is unnecessary to state that intra-class fighting is counterproductive and in the interest of the ruling class. It is unfortunate that gangs end up fighting each other for "turf" neither possesses. But honor - that is a different matter, however one might reject the definition of honor expressed by gangs. The comradeship necessary to define honor and collective respect serious enough to engage in physical violence, it is certainly something the Motor City Labor League could learn from gangs, i. e. the lies of Valerie Snook constitute a betrayal of organizational honor. We are not however, advocating a gang method of organization. Many of us know the structure and politics of gangs and would not have left them had we not seen the limitations. However, it is clear that MCLL's attack on gangs is based on lack of direct experience.

WHAT CONSTITUTES LEADERSHIP?

We would like to speak for a minute explicitly to what constitutes our view of leadership. While in MCLL, members of Changeover took the stronger positions regarding the electoral arena - we took positions that Justin should run for judge and that the Cockrel Draft effort should be supported in order to advance struggle in this city. What do we mean by this?

We mean that it is clear that the capacity of the class to wage armed struggle is, in this period, virtually non-existent. That, in fact, given socialization, people in this society view political struggle as essentially an electoral process. There are protest votes - there is the defeat of millage in order to express outrage at busing, etc. That if we, as serious revolutionaries, are committed to building a mass movement that we must be able to meet folks halfway and respect the place from which folks are coming. If folks will move in the electoral arena, then that's where we should be, providing revolutionary leadership. We know that folks out here are motivated by the need to survive and that the largest number of folks will come to struggle when they know that it is not simply an exercise in futility - when folks know that we have a shot at winning.

The best way to show folks that we can win is to, in fact, WIN. We therefore set out to run Justin for judge and to win. We have won the primary and are moving forward to win number 1 in November. The projection of Justin as a mass leader (under collective discipline) is a very important step to the building of a people's movement in this city, in the white community. The access which has been created by this electoral effort is incredibly important. We believe that the projection of mass leadership is a necessary pre-condition to the building of mass movements and the therefore gained capacity to bring folks to the pre-party formations which ultimately become the party. This kind of leadership is the most important leadership in this period.

Leadership within the cadre organization to which Justin and others are members must be an organization committed ~~first~~ to mass leadership and the development of mass leadership skills. We live in a pre-revolutionary society and Justin Ravitz for example, is not going to purge himself of bourgeois ego, nor, in our view, should he take the time and energy to try to strip himself of it. What he and others must do is understand the effects of bourgeois socialization and attempt to synthesize his ego with others in the interest of struggle.

We will return now to the process of Self and Collective Evaluation. As stated earlier, our process is externally defined - the effects our individual practice has on mass work.

ASSUMPTIONS

1.) That a person is never evaluated for an inability which the organization has not educated its members around or because of socialization a person does not immediately learn what is being taught. Members should be given assignments which are commensurate to ability, innate and acquired.

2.) That human beings are essentially dignified and self-respecting and are capable of acting in the collective interest of the whole.

3.) That the purpose of cadre formations is to accelerate the building of mass movements and the taking of power.

4.) That the priority is the building of the mass movements in this period and not the party, therefore our organizational emphasis is external.

5.) That the purpose of evaluation is not to purge self or others of all vestiges of bourgeois socialization - that's impossible and so time consuming and internalized a process as to be antithetical to external work.

6.) In pre-party cadre formations, the level of trust and sense of organizational loyalty is critical. There are no guns being held to people's heads making them members of the organizations (as there never should be) and it is therefore critical that people operate from trust generated by shared practice. The leaps in trust of which MCLL speaks is a nostalgic/idealistic perspective. Trust comes with shared practice, not from statements of its existence.

Our process would be marked by its factual nature. There have been statements made by key forces in this dispute (Frank Joyce) that "facts get in the way of the truth." We reject this as absurd. If a process of Self and Mutual Evaluation is to have any meaning it is to be governed by its factual nature. Therefore, our process would look at the following areas:

AREAS OF EVALUATION

Evaluation of Organizing Practice:

This is handled in both informal and formal organizational settings. The full context of the organizing situation is evaluated. The positive is looked at first. Overall, was the organizing effort a success? If a success, examine the reasons why the strategy was successful - organizationally and individually.

Where mistakes were made: (1) Isolate the situation, (2) Further discussion isolates the nature and effects of the mistake, (3) Explanation and exploration of what should have occurred, (4) Full non-hostile and factually correct discussion of the precise situation, (5) Collectively arrive at agreement on nature of mistake - its cause and effect, and (6) Definitive action, if any.

Tensions In Internal Political Relations:

The importance of internal tensions to pre-party cadre formations is only when those internal tensions affect external work. Those tensions should be stated forthrightly and their nature fully understood. None of us are devoid of personality and shouldn't be. If there are personality conflicts they should be stated straight up and factored into the life of the organization. One of the "vanguard" responsibilities of pre-party cadre formations is to learn how to synthesize contradictions (non-antagonistic though they may objectively be) in order to learn how to effectuate a synthesis down the road into a party.

SELF EVALUATION

This process goes on all the time - in informal and formal settings. We all learn to evaluate our practice. For different folks it means different things - we must understand our comrades in order to understand the significance of what is or is not occurring in the process of self evaluation. Some folks find it very easy to admit mistakes (indeed, some feel "absolved" in so doing), for others it is most difficult, but always we must employ our external criteria.

We are not going to make the new people prior to the new society and complicated attempts to do so is only going to result in organizational paralysis. Self-Evaluation does however look at pertinent factors: (1) background, (2) past experience and practice, (3) role external and internal to the organization, (4) prior experience in organizing situation, (5) status of tensions in the internal political life of the organization, (6) capacity to listen and accept evaluation of others.

CHARGES

Given the uncharted nature of this course for us in struggle, there needs to be a clearly defined area that goes beyond Evaluation. If persons in a cadre organization believe that a member has so fundamentally transgressed organizational discipline to the detriment of external work, that there must be a major overhaul, then formal charges should be initiated. Charges: (1) Clearly stated, (2) Proof offered, (3) Clearly stated course of action and resolution ~~offered by initiator~~ and then if situation is still unresolved in the leadership bodies it is taken to the membership for organizational resolution, (4) Position of person charged - acceptance or rejection of charges and proof. Members of organizations need to understand the serious nature of bringing charges because it can be a very critical point in the life of the organization.

We do not view this as a fully developed process, rather one which should be tried and refined through practice. It would clearly be understood by all that the perspective of MCLL as outlined in Struggle Within does not reflect the struggle of MCLL members prior to September 2, 1972. We in Changeover were not party to the discussion which resulted in the paper Struggle Within. Indeed, this whole area did not represent an area of our advanced development. We had only minimally looked at the area of criticism/self-criticism or Self and Collective Evaluation in a most incomplete way and had not yet arrived at a firm position. This may be one of the fundamental mistakes made by all of us in what was MCLL.

The last portion of this response to MCLL stated politics in Struggle Within will look at a few issues: Power, and a few more thoughts on the effects of the politics of MCLL (see Struggle Within) on organizational practice, for them and for the movement in Detroit.

The entire document Struggle Within is very difficult to follow, because there are numerous statements with which anyone, genuinely to the left of Mussolini can not disagree. But in the total context, in careful examination of the mechanistic divisions, in scrutiny of the underlying assumptions made about human beings, the "sense" of disagreement begins to take shape as a categorical opposition.

One of the basic reasons for that categorical opposition is that, in between the simultaneously rigid definition and vague abstraction, lies the potential for totalitarianism, manipulation, and fundamental abuse of human beings in struggle. How else can a "leadership" best maintain its control but to have a category of theoretical error? Just how many people, however miseducated in this society, have had the opportunity of not only miseducation, but then RE-education from a Marxist perspective? There are very few, but if everyone is subject to be criticized for theoretical error at any time, then it certainly does allow for a leadership to maintain itself, since it possesses the luxury of mis-education and re-education. Further, given the infinite parameters for criticism/self-criticism outlined in Struggle Within, all a leader has to do is "accept" criticism (verbally) with little regard for its real origins and we have "one bog happy family." We may not have much struggle, but the collection of human beings calling itself MCLL will be able to tell itself that is it revolutionary - it's able to "criticize" its leadership, it's no longer "intimidated" and on and on.

If the membership of MCLL will not understand that it has been in large part manipulated, there is at this time nothing that we can do about it. The meeting which was held on Saturday, September 2, 1972 at Nancy Woodside's was, and is, a travesty of organizational structure. It was the Joyce "organizing" of the MCLL membership.

Now there are a number of explanations for the behavior of our former comrades, and why their subsequent behavior and attitude of Sunday, September 4, was what it was - most simply put, folks had been caught in a manipulative net by the Joyce power play, and did not have the courage to stand up to what had occurred. Now, folks will not admit that lack of courage, because it would say something definitive to themselves about their "politics."

The attitude of MCLL members toward Changeover people was (at the membership meeting of September 3) the attitude of your every day garden variety lynch mob. There was no interest in arriving at the facts or the truth of the situation, but a subjective desire to "punish" leadership that they had been organized to see as the enemy. We understand how difficult it is for persons whose entire life has been defined by the manipulative methods of capitalism to admit that, once again, they have been manipulated, but time and history will show the members of MCLL (most of them in MCLL for less than six months) just how manipulated they have been for the personal power of one Frank Joyce.

WHAT IS POWER?

We would like to take a look, for a moment, at power. Since it is infact, at the roots of this sorry state of affairs. What is power? Power is the capacity to control that which is necessary to survive.

It is the capacity to exert control over the means of production, the modes of production, and further, the capacity to direct the methods and means of societal controls (those institutions which any society must have in order to have a productive and worthwhile existence.) That is power - control. MCLL says, "It is inevitable that we must and would evolve through phases of bourgeois "personality" power struggles on the zig-zag path to revolution. There is no where else from whence we could have come." (p. 7, Struggle Within)

MCLL is going to be very upset to find out that "to the Revolution" just ain't enough. There are going to be "personality" disputes to, through, and after the revolution. Personality plays a part in organization and a part in power and there is absolutely nothing wrong with it. What IS wrong with this situation is the nature of the power play - it is not for the good of the organization, but for the personal aggrandizement of Frank Joyce. His need to control - to be Number 1 - not in political power terms, but in individual power terms.

MCLL would have us separate out personality, power and politics (for all their talk of dialectics, a most undialectical approach). What we must understand is that our people need to come to grips with power and leadership and put down the bourgeois assumption of our evilness and the cynicism toward leadership.

THE SINGLE GREATEST TRAGEDY IN THIS SITUATION IS THAT THE ACTIONS OF FRANK JOYCE AND THE MANIPULATED MEMBERSHIP OF MCLL DO NOTHING TO REVOLUTIONIZE THE CONCEPT OF TAKING POWER --- DO NOTHING TO ADVANCE THE POSSIBILITY OF POLITICAL STRUGGLE AND NOT PERSONAL POWER STRUGGLES. THE TRAGEDY IS THAT THIS SITUATION DOES, IN FACT, SHOW THE WORSE POTENTIAL OF HUMAN BEINGS --- AND NOT THE BEST. IT GIVES US PAUSE FOR A LONG, LONG MOMENT ON HOW TO PROCEED.

BUT WE IN CHANGEOVER CAN SAY WE BELIEVE IN THE CAPACITY OF OUR PEOPLE TO PUT DOWN OUR REAL ENEMY --- THE RULING CLASS --- THAT WE ARE A GREAT AND GOOD PEOPLE WHO ARE JUST AWAKENING TO OUR REVOLUTIONARY POTENTIAL. THAT WE ARE NOT AFRAID OF POWER, OR OUR LEADERS. . .

AND THAT WE WILL WIN. . .WE WILL SURELY, SURELY WIN. . .

Section 3: CHANGEOVER'S ASSESSMENT OF THE ROLE OF FRANK JOYCE DURING THIS PROLONGED CRISIS.

A fair question might be: Why comment separately on Frank Joyce's role? Surely MCLL has a collective leadership--why single anyone out? We do so reluctantly. All of us have experienced, at one level or another, the acrimony and individualized hostility which is all too characteristic of activist politics. Each of us came to "the movement" with the hope of transcending the pettiness and bickering of life in bourgeois society.

But daily life in the movement has taught us all our individual and collective imperfections. We know that ego and jealousy and intense personal dislike effect organizations and their political work. While we of Changeover acknowledge that MCLL has a defined collective leadership we also assert that the role played by one of their leaders, Frank Joyce, has significantly influenced in deeply destructive ways the development of events over the past month.

It is the position of Changeover that one of the primary causes of the current crisis has been the unprincipled conduct of Frank Joyce, conduct which had as its eventual goal his own personal elevation to decisive power within MCLL. Frank's objective has been to delegitimize, by virtually any means necessary, other leadership in MCLL which seemed threatening to him. In the pursuit of his personal objectives Frank Joyce has been willing to risk the split of MCLL and the fundamental disruption of CCC and has engaged in absolutely senseless actions which have profoundly endangered and can still destroy progressive racial relations in Detroit.

We'll use the term "power play" to characterize Frank Joyce's conduct. What is a "power play"? First, it should be clearly distinguished from legitimate struggle which involves open contention between clearly articulated political positions. Such struggle is personalized only in the sense that the political perspective of an individual is in some sense conditioned by their personality and all the social forces which have shared it. And while such legitimate struggle can of course disrupt organizations the "worst" result will be a healthy split between two or more perspectives which are understood by those involved to be incompatible at a level which requires division.

A "power play" is something different. It is made by someone dissatisfied with their personal power and status in an organization. It is usually conducted as covertly as possible. Its predictable method is to attempt to delegitimize other leadership by any means necessary. Despite whatever political or ideological garments may be draped around the pieces in the play the subjectivity (and perhaps the guilt) of those involved does tend to flash through at times. Power plays can only harm organizations because they do not spring from potentially healthy political differences and because they poison the sources of the trust which is essential for prolonged political work.

By the summer of 1971, though still a secret formation, MCLL was well on its way to becoming an established cadre organization. Frank (and Valerie Snook) were not members and at that time belonged to no cadre grouping. Over the strenuous objections by some in MCLL Sheiola fought for and achieved Frank and Valerie's entry into MCLL. Significantly, according to Valerie, Frank viewed joining MCLL as a personal political defeat. Before the summer was over and before their terms of "provisional" membership had expired both Frank Joyce and Valerie Snook, again at Sheiola's insistence, were added to the MCLL General Staff (leadership body).

For as long as Frank Joyce has been in MCLL his attitude toward Sheila Murphy has been a combination of respect and resentment. The basis for the respect should be obvious to all. The basis of the resentment has been Frank Joyce's yearlong dissatisfaction with working in an organization he did not create and in which he was in his own eyes (at best) "second fiddle" to a woman. This resentment has been evidenced in scores of petty ways and upon two occasions at least burst forth in direct attacks on Sheila's integrity.

Sheila is not the easiest person to know and work with. Real leaders never are--certainly not in this period. But Frank Joyce's historic problems with Sheila are essentially just that: Frank Joyce's problems.

A secondary theme of some moment now is Frank Joyce's attitude toward Jack Russell. When Jack and Michele came to Detroit in the summer of 1971 the only fully active whites they knew in the city were Frank Joyce and Valerie Snook. There had been some discussion of the four sharing a flat with the result that Valerie established quarters with the Ressells while Frank chose to live elsewhere.

Within six weeks, as a result of their won contact and work with Jack, several members of the General Staff thought he belonged in MCLL. Frank initially opposed this, surfacing several reservations which seemed to have developed in pace with the development of independent relationships between Jack and other leaders of MCLL. Despite Frank's position Jack joined MCLL in mid-September of 1971. By January it was clear to many on the MCLL General Staff that Jack belonged on the organization's leadership body. Again the only expressed "reservations" came from Frank Joyce and Valerie Snook but this did not carry and Jack joined the General Staff.

If Frank's attitude toward Sheila could be described as a restive combination of respect and resentment, his feelings toward Jack might be summarized as intense dislike and resentment.

Such frictions as these seemed "normal" if unfortunate part of life in MCLL; we assumed they would be transcended as we developed politically. But, as we look back, it seems to us now that at some point during the summer of 1972, Frank Joyce must have concluded that his personal position in the web of the organization was simply no longer acceptable. We know that Frank was having a difficult time last summer and some of us made personal overtures of help.

But whatever was going on in Frank Joyce's mind during the summer, it's clear now that by the time the Central Committee elections were approaching he had decided to take some action. Late in July, Justin and Frank had a casual conversation in which Justin expressed some reservations about Jack Russell serving on the soon to be elected Central Committee. He speculated that Lynda Ann Ewen might be a good substitute for Jack's likely role as developing "strategist/theoretician." Shortly thereafter, Brian Flanigan had, in Frank's presence, expressed some annoyance with Jack. Frank's quick response was, "We should talk about that." Frank had a meeting with Brian in which he laid out some ways people might move to keep Jack off the Central Committee (for example, "confront" Jack at the upcoming convention, or seek private meetings with people to encourage them not to vote for Jack.). Frank asked Brian to convey these suggestions to Sheila which he did. Sheila's reply to Frank's overtures was that such covert organizing would be a violation of the process the organization had agreed upon. She asked Brian to tell Frank the elections would be very "interesting." Brian conveyed the message. Frank's response was, "Well, that's what people in power do - they lay."

Proceeding on his own, Frank had had a number of conversations with individuals and discovered that Jack in fact, had fairly substantial support within the organization. He eventually recontacted Brian to indicate that he had "changed his mind, that Jack had too much support to be dumped, and that he (Frank) had discovered he had no political basis to oppose Jack's candidacy."

At the Convention, six members were elected as MCLL's first Central Committee. Sheila and Frank were, in that order, the top two vote getters. It has subsequently come out that Frank Joyce did not vote for Sheila. Since Frank obviously must have thought Sheila belonged on the Central Committee, there can be only one explanation for his action. In the pettiest kind of bourgeois egoism, Frank wanted to reduce Sheila's vote and increase his chances of "coming in number one."

MCLL emerged from its first Convention with the sense of entering a qualitatively new stage. For those of us now in Changeover, the general mood seemed to be one of "let's tighten up the ship, there's much work to be done." But it eventually became clear that others were feeling and thinking something else. This became clear at the now famous Central Committee meeting of August 31. Frank Joyce (among others) took the position that the "Murphy Bloc" (a group of five who had, over dinner, discussed perspectives on the Central Committee elections on the Friday before the Convention) was, under the leadership of Sheila, punishing the organization for Brian's non-election to the Central Committee, that Sheila was a poor winner and a poor loser, and that it was impossible to struggle with, or criticize Sheila without various terrible things happening.

Other important aspects of this meeting have been discussed elsewhere. In terms of Frank Joyce's conduct it should be observed that he knew a major tension within the organization had surfaced - he took steps to effect its development and outcome. After the termination of the Central Committee meeting Frank, Valerie, and Buck Davis met because, to at least paraphrase Buck's later statement, "If we're perceived as a bloc, we might as well begin acting like one."

That evening Frank began trying to reach Justin Ravitz to set up a meeting as soon as possible. When he reached Justin he was very unspecific about the content, and very specific about the urgency of their getting together. A meeting was set for the next morning.

It should be obvious to all how crucially located Justin would be in any impending organizational crisis. The position of someone whose candidacy for public office was a major organizational effort might well be decisive. It is clear to all of us in Changeover, and especially to Justin, that Frank was delicately and cautiously trying to "organize" him.

In their meeting Frank never said anything about Valerie Snook's lies of the day before not of the crisis they had created in the Central Committee. Nor did he attempt any characterization of the previous day's Central Committee meeting which had degenerated into arguments about whether Sheila was or wasn't a number of things. Nor did he mention his meeting with Valerie and Buck. What he did say, among other things, was that he was sure the "Murphy bloc" had been meeting since the Convention, that he felt "forced to organize" after the elections, that the election could be partially characterized as "a revolt of the dipshits," and "that Sheila doesn't have to have all the power, does she?" Justin felt blitzed and confused. The meeting broke off without result. Soon afterward Justin concluded that the meeting had been utterly incorrect and began trying to reach Frank to tell him so.

The next morning the Central Committee met in emergency session to discuss people's criticisms of Sheila and to confront the question of Valerie's lies. The meeting had two widely disproportionate segments: 1) a prolonged, formalized (replete with citations from the Red Book by Frank), aimless and in our opinion indulgent attempt to make, or raise, or discuss, or air, or vent some criticisms of Sheila and the "Murphy bloc" many of which were quickly (and temporarily) retracted, and 2) a heated if superficial and quickly concluded discussion on the question of Valerie's lies. This revealed four members essentially in agreement with Valerie's "self-criticism" of her actions as "liberal and incorrect" while two, Sheila and Jack, considered her conduct grounds for dismissal from the Central Committee. Since each had concluded that they could not responsibly serve any longer on the Central Committee with Valerie, Sheila and Jack resigned from the Central Committee subject to the General Staff's action on the Snook question the next morning.

In retrospect a number of things can be said about those resignations. Their principle was correct: comrades should from the beginning understand that they viewed the question as either/or. But the anger in which they were offered was inherently disruptive and their timing was incorrect. And one thing more: they provided Frank Joyce with his grand opening.

What may until that time have been only (!) a desire to reduce the power of others and raise his own now became a quest for the possibility of hegemony, of decisive power.

Sheila and Jack took steps to inform all members of the General Staff of their actions. They met briefly with those of the General Staff who were now placed in the so-called "Murphy bloc" and reached most others by phone. No attempt was made to organize those who did not have a position on the questions at hand. The General Staff and then the General Membership was viewed as the proper sequence for the discussion and resolution of the question. There all parties would be present and the fullest discussion could occur.

Frank Joyce and others remaining on the Central Committee called an "organizational" meeting which had the following characteristics:

1) It systematically excluded at least eight members of MCLL (Sheila Murphy, Jack Russell, Bill King, Lynda Chabot, Kevin Murphy, Justin Ravitz, Brian Flanigan, and Marge Borys) who in their erroneous view were the "Murphy bloc" and it may have intentionally excluded two others (Sara Jane Karfonta and Randy Karfonta) who were thought to be sympathetic to the "bloc." Lies were told (though later corrected) to accomplish this.

2) Many cadre were apparently encouraged to discuss their attitudes toward Sheila and others not present ("There is no member of the organization with whom we have talked who does not feel that they have been disrespected and consequently indeed, intimidated by the very people whom until recently they -- and indeed we -- respected most." -- Frank's Central Committee Report 9/2/72).

3) The perspective on what the "Murphy bloc" was supposed to have been doing about the Central Committee elections deepened from "punishing the organization for Brian's non-election" to "sabotaging" the elections because it was "unwilling and unable to accept the results."

4) One member who attended briefly and who wished to talk with Jack Russell that night was compelled by Frank and Valerie to pledge he would discuss none of the meeting with Jack.

5) In a quickie "rump session" of the three-man finance section Buck Davis and Ron Glotta decided to remove the absent member of the section as representative to the General Staff and replace him with Ron Glotta whose hatred of Sheila and other "Murphyites" was long-standing and whose vote on the Snook question could be counted on.

6) In the report written by Frank Joyce for the next day's General Staff meeting the possibility of an organizational split was raised. After the pro-formas about how sad that would be, Frank Joyce wrote: "Should a split occur we will not only survive, we will prosper. In merely contemplating the possibility with the membership, we have grown more in one day than in any preceding period." This is the first time the immediate possibility of a split had been raised organizationally.

During the Sunday, September 3rd, General Staff and General Membership meetings Frank Joyce continued to play out the logic of his strategy. The personalized and aimless attack on Sheila and others continued. The General Staff deadlocked on the question of Valerie's expulsion from the Central Committee. It decided to take the question to the membership meeting that night and to preface it with a general discussion of the issues involved.

The General Membership meeting adopted an agenda which provided for this and began. Frank and a few others arrived late and Frank, apparently confident that Saturday night's "organizing" was still in place, insisted that the meeting proceed immediately to the question of Valerie's expulsion. It was agreed that this be preceded by two "bloc" reports, one by Sheila and one by Frank. Discussion was to follow each report.

In the discussion which followed Frank's report (the second) it became obvious that Frank and others were attempting to avoid any substantial reporting by Justin of his fundamental disagreements with Frank's sanitized version of their Friday morning meeting. Repeatedly Justin was cut off and members protested Justin as "out of order." Throughout all this long meeting none of the participants in the Saturday night "organizational" meeting had made any attempt to explain why it was called or to criticize aspects of it which had come to light (such as the opportunistic change in the finance sections GS representation). By 1130 pm we who have become Changeover had had enough. We announced we were leaving MCLL and proposed the agreed upon procedures for re-examining the question over the next few weeks while the split remained an internal matter.

Since September 3rd we have not directly observed much of the conduct of Frank Joyce. We are told he has criticized himself; we are not surprised. We also know he has persisted in his fictions about our supposed conspiracies and sabotage regarding the Central Committee elections. According to Frank, Jack Russell was supposed to have encouraged Lynda Ann Ewen to run so that Valerie's power would be undercut! (Lynda Ann can speak to the reasons Jack encouraged her to run, reasons she has characterized previously as very principled and responsible.) According to Frank, the eight votes he didn't get were no doubt the votes of the "Murphy bloc" who left MCLL September 3rd. The facts are that over half of us voted for Frank Joyce, including Sheila and Jack.

At the end of the three week "internal" period we of Changeover had concluded that nothing sufficiently significant had occurred which would re-establish the level of trust and respect necessary for reunification. We knew Frank Joyce had been engaged in a personal power play. We were told by MCLL that Frank's conduct "although it contained elements, doubtless excessive of personal, bourgeois conflict, it was essentially the pursuit of power in the interests of the organization. We did not and do not accept that evaluation.

But before the afternoon of September 24th our position had been that a coalition with MCLL was possible and desirable. We were willing to discipline our judgement of MCLL leadership and Frank Joyce in the interests of mass work, especially CCC. Our coalition proposal is quoted elsewhere for all to read. It is fair and reasonable.

While we were writing this proposal MCLL was breaking our solemn agreement to keep the matter internal by meeting on Friday night with Alliance representatives to the Planning Committee to "explain" the internal situation in MCLL. While we were writing our coalition paper they were heightening the personalized attack on some Changeover people while trying to re-establish warm relations with others. While we were waiting for a phone call on Sunday to arrange the agreed upon meetings Frank Joyce and others were busy raiding the LDC/CCC offices and setting in motion the series of events discussed at the beginning of this paper. Any possibility of coalition was thus destroyed.

Frank Joyce is a particularly complex person. He has done fine things in the past. But he is also habitually prone to ~~the~~ devious, personalized, and -- if you wish -- bourgeois machinations we have described. Frank has engaged in a power play. In describing his conduct we are not retreating into personalized conflict but insisting on a cold assessment of some very unsocialist behavior, an assessment which some of MCLL's cant about "personality" has been intended to deflect.

Frank Joyce has engaged in a strategem which has ruptured an important organization, which has endangered much mass work, and which has created a situation in which any progressive racial relations in Detroit are in the most fundamental jeopardy. He will be held particularly responsible for what occurs.

SECTION 4: REUNIFICATION PROPOSAL - FACTUAL INACCURACIES

RE Cooperation in external work (page 1)

The concern that MCLL expresses in opposing a "superficial reunification" is valid and their characterization of external work carried on in the interim period (between September 3 and September 24) is indicative of that superficial view of reunification.

The primary motivation of the members of the Changeover group has always been to participate in the development of a revolutionary white movement. This concern was the basis for our participation in MCLL, for our split from MCLL, and for the work we engaged in during that interim period. Our primary criterion, therefore, in participating in MCLL, splitting, in establishing Changeover and in participating in external work was not what was in "the best interests of the entire organization" but rather what was in the best interests of the movement.

RE Fonda at CCC 3 (page 1)

No one denies the presence of Jane, Tom and Holly at the September CCC nor the advance publicity nor the large CCC 3 enrollment and money added to the CCC treasury. What is omitted is the work and sacrifices made by many other people including the CCC coordinator, Jack Russell, and 2 other Planning Committee members who made personal loans to CCC so it could have operating funds. Also, PAC functioned throughout the summer to prepare for the first issue of Journey. It was a combined effort that made the September session so successful.

RE Fonda at the Ravitz fund raiser (page 1)

It is true that Jane Fonda's presence at the Ravitz fund raiser financially aided the Ravitz campaign effort (about \$850 was donated). It is not true that the \$850 "brought the campaign out of the red." The Ravitz campaign debts were more than \$1400.

RE Ravitz campaign meeting of September 18

The September 18 Ravitz campaign meeting was attended by many people in addition to MCLL. RAAG's data was utilized in preparation of the Mini-Manual. Much of Sharon Gold's research has been incorporated either directly or indirectly as a foundation for some of the sections. The Mini-Manual closely follows the original outline as proposed by RAAG. Maps prepared by RAAG have been used by the campaign staff as well as precinct poll workers seeking information about their precinct. RAAG data on sub-community organizing never had a clear direction as to how its use would result in community organizing actually occurring hence its value was less clear. To state that "months of preparation by RAAG for the meeting was not utilized or reflected in the format" is not true. Both MCLL and Changeover agree that "a contribution from RAAG to the meeting was acknowledged."

RE typesetting equipment (page 2)

The typesetting equipment was originally leased to Changeover Productions, specifically to its director, Brian Flanigan. Our last paper, where we proposed a coalition with MCLL, contained an offer from us to MCLL explaining how MCLL could also make some use of Changeover equipment and personnel.

RE Ravitz and CCC mailing lists for IPC fund raiser (page 2)

MCLL characterized their efforts to get the CCC mailing lists for the Indochina Peace Campaign (IPC) fund raiser as "very strenuous". Saturday morning Jack placed a call to Margaret asking her for a copy of the CCC mailing list, since CCC had used its last copy for mailing Journey. Checking the master file of lists, it was discovered that only the CCC originals existed. Margaret made efforts to contact someone at Justin's law firm to Xerox the originals but was unsuccessful because on Saturdays the office is closed early. Nancy was contacted that same afternoon by Margaret at her home; the situation was explained to Nancy and both agreed that Monday would be OK.

MCLL has also made a false characterization of efforts to get the Ravitz list as "equally strenuous" and "futile." On Monday Jean Rooney came to Ravitz Headquarters, picked Margaret up and took her to Justin's law firm to Xerox Ravitz and CCC labels, specifically for the Belle Isle fund raiser for IRG. Xeroxing took a little more than 1 hour. It was discussed with Jean and she agreed that the Precinct Delegate list could not be reproduced because of the shortage of labels and that they probably would not be of much use for purposes of the fund raiser considering the financial and physical effort it would have taken to reproduce and mail over 1,000 names most of whom were not likely to respond with either money or their presence having little familiarity with IPC or PPT.

RE Ravitz campaign staff meeting of Sept. 4 (page 2)

On September 4 the morning after the walkout from the MCLL meeting by Changeover people, there was little business as usual. The only people who apparently felt that the Ravitz campaign staff meeting would still be held were Jim Dubuar and Pat Korth who appeared at Justin's office at noon. In fact, Frank (who had already removed some items from the Ravitz Headquarters on September 3 anticipating that he would not return soon), did not come to the noon meeting expecting it to be held. He even communicated to Jordan Rossen that morning that there were some internal MCLL problems but that Jordan should continue to work on the campaign. Justin talked to Jim and Pat and suggested that MCLL and RAAG should discuss and evaluate their roles in the campaign and that Justin did not want to manipulate any of them and that business as usual would not go on until the differences were resolved.

RE Changeover's assistance to IPC fund raiser (page 2)

Assistance from the Changeover group for the IPC fund raiser was in the shape of guidance from Margaret to Nancy as to how to rent the Casino, who to call, and problems to be expected from Casino management. There was also discussion about beer and wine concessions and how to proceed on that.

It should be clear that IPC events in the Detroit area were apparently not widely known to people not closely related to PPT activities. Most members of the Changeover group had little knowledge of other IPC events in the area other than the IPC Belle Isle fund raiser and the Jane/Justin cocktail party.

But to suggest that Changeover people in the past did not frequent or aid in the work of the PPT is a blatant lie. We often interrupted our own work to attend PPT demonstrations held in the middle of the afternoon or on a week end afternoon (GM demo, Glass House demo, etc.). Changeover people were primarily responsible for the layout of Peace and Unity Press as well as substantial editing work, all the typesetting and most of the graphics. We all have given as much time as we could afford without damaging our own cadre work assignments to aid PPT in propagating anti-war sentiment and activities.

Justin was the attorney who provided legal assistance in many cases involving trespass by anti-war demonstrators at PPT demos and he was responsible for the acquittal of the people (including Frank) who were arrested in front of the Federal Building. It should be clear that anti-war work was not the primary responsibility of people now in the Changeover group and that we channeled anti-war activism into the PPT form.

RE Ravitz fund raiser on September 23

Communications from Sam Moray to Bill King and others concerning the content of the invitation for a Ravitz fund raiser on September 23 did not include the fact that all of the Beech Street people were sponsoring the party. In fact none of the 3-4 Changeover people who worked on and communicated to Sam about the party were ever told that the party was a jointly sponsored affair. When Sam received the invitations no one informed us that the information was incorrectly printed. We did know that other residents of Beech Street were opening up their houses and preparing some food but that was the extent of their involvement as we understood it.

RE CCC sub-committees

Within the Planning Committee of CCC, Bruce Ewen did attend one Finance Sub-committee meeting early in the summer. He said that his continued participation in the Finance Sub-committee as well as the PC was scheduled to change. He spoke of time problems on several occasions in the PC and said his participation would be diminished. When sub-committees were established at one PC meeting, Bruce was not present and Nancy had not yet been selected as a PC representative from the Women's Book Club. Both Bruce and Nancy were informed at a later PC meeting that sub-committees had been set up. It was logical that Nancy would serve on the Women's Book Club Sub-committee and she did. Nancy did express a desire to have "conversations" with members of the Training and Education Sub-committee. No PC member was "excluded" from any internal sub-committee which were only set up to facilitate work divisions inside the PC.

RE Women's Book Club Steering Committee (page 3)

At the Women's Book Club (WBC) Steering Committee on September 19, Sheila and Margaret did take a position "in opposition to the addition of Brenda Reeber and/or Valerie Snook and/or Barbara Krickbaum (sic) for the Steering Committee," on the basis that structural integrity be maintained within the forms that we as a group decided upon. At the first WBC meeting the responsibilities of the Steering Committee were discussed and women were asked to consider volunteering and that further discussion would take place at the next meeting.

At the second WBC meeting, 4 women were approved by the group as a whole as well as 3 women from the Planning Committee. Ample opportunity was given for interested women to put themselves forth as candidates for the Steering Committee. We argued that because some one person was "interested" that that alone was not sufficient political criteria for altering the structure already agreed upon at the WBC meeting as well as in the Planning Committee. Neither Sheila nor Margaret specifically or generally spoke in support of a woman from the National Lawyer's Guild to be represented.

RE September 12 CCC 3 session (page 4)

At the September 12 CCC 3 session, Jack did not give a "history

of the evolution of CCC" but rather some brief introductory remarks and general political frame for the first CCC session to the audience most of whom had never attended a CCC session before. Both MCLL and the Alliance's names appeared in the brochures as sponsors and everyone had an opportunity to pick one up when registering.

RE Sheila's remark to Frank, September 11 (page 5)

MCLL quotes only part of Sheila's comment to Frank the night of the CCC General Staff meeting. The full remark was: "I have nothing whatsoever to say to you except in the most formal of contexts." (underlined part omitted in Reunification Proposal).

RE Murphy grouping (page 9)

"There has always been a Murphy grouping from the earliest days of MCLL. There has always been a grouping of people around Sheila who share a common history of struggle in Detroit, who live in close proximity to one another, and who function closely together in meetings and in other organizational activities."

It is true that Sheila Murphy who because of her historical relations based on struggle has achieved the admiration and respect of principled people on the left in Detroit and nationally. Few dispute the qualities she possesses that make her a trustworthy, courageous and politically astute mass leader. Many people are personally committed to her. We do not feel that their commitment is incorrect. We recognize the dangers of mystifying leaders and holding them up as god-like figures incapable of error or critical evaluative processes. It is our position that people in Changeover are comrades with Sheila because of mutual respected practice and some of that practice does have a history spanning over a period of years. In addition to people in the Changeover group who share a common history with Sheila are MCLL cadre who worked with her in Ad Hoc (Jim Bish, Donna Bish, and Babs Belvitch).

It is inconsistent for MCLL to "criticize" the existence of a "Murphy grouping" while not recognizing the existence of a similar Joyce grouping also with historical roots later transmitted to MCLL. Frank has had historical relationships with several MCLL cadre: Valerie Snook, Valerie Brannas, Les Biederman and Bonnie Biederman (formerly of MCLL).

RE Brian and Frank's conversation (page 9)

Frank did ask Brian to speak to Sheila about their discussion of how to get Jack off the Central Committee. Frank said that he did not have time to ask Sheila himself because he had to catch a plane.

RE Justin and Frank's conversation (page 9)

Frank did tell Justin at their lunch meeting at the Diplomat Motel Restaurant that a second "Murphy Collective" meeting took place on August 28 after the poll workers' meeting. Frank's evidence was an unopened wine bottle on one of the desks which was proof that such a meeting occurred. No such meeting occurred.

RE Criticism and self-criticism at the Aug. 28 cadre meeting (page 9)

"In other words, criticism-self-criticism as practised on August 28 was a complete political failure." In retrospect we agree. Our (campaign staff) practice at that meeting was correct but RAAG seemed unable to appropriately respond to the criticisms of their practice except by guilt. Later that evening at the poll workers meeting, several RAAG personnel were going around to Ravitz staff kissing and hugging them and saying that they were "sorry."

RE Departmentalism and possessiveness of work (page 10)

When the "old" MCLL divided itself into sections in late 1971, it was specifically to divide ourselves up so that work could be accomplished more efficiently. The sections would be one of the primary units of the organization where criticism, discussion of organizational proposals and any other forms of input cadre had could be integrated into the MCLL decision-making process. Many of us now in Changeover worked together in the same sections; many Changeover people also worked with other cadre as well in the same and other sections.

The false characterization of "departmentalism and possessiveness of work" referring to Brian is an outrageous statement. In the former Changeover Section of MCLL, Brian trained himself, MCLL cadre, and non-cadre people in the arts of building a propaganda apparatus. Brian and others taught interested people the skills of putting out leaflets, mimeographing, writing, layout, editing, etc. Classes were conducted for MCLL cadre and others who wanted to print newsletters or newspapers at their place of work or for mass organizing work, e.g., Open Forum (a newsletter for health workers), Peace and Unity Press (the PPT State Fair paper), Journey (the CCC newspaper), thousands of Eldon leaflets around the Sims election at Local 961, anti-war leaflets and on and on. Historically Brian has given technical assistance to progressive attempts to organize and develop propaganda units, e.g. Black Star Publishing, Detroit Organizing Committee's RPM, the Welfare Employees Union newspaper, etc. He, and other members of the Changeover section, cooperated with other Detroit community newspapers by providing graphics, poetry, Changeover rewrites or features, and photos. It is hard to stretch the shoe of "departmentalism and possessiveness of work" to fit Brian. We do agree that it "had been common in MCLL." Witness Joann Castle's psychological attachment to CCC as her program.

RE Ron Glotta as an "abject failure" (page 11)

Ron Glotta's practice as campaign treasurer was an abject failure. To say that over "\$6,200 was raised during the six weeks prior to the Primary election while Ron was treasurer" implies that Ron himself raised the money. Most of the funds were contributed to the Ravitz campaign through a.) mail, b.) personal solicitation from Justin, c.) fund raisers, Responsibilities that Ron did not fulfill were: a.) keeping proper accounting of money received, from whom, when, and how much, b.) failing to attend Ravitz Campaign staff meetings and activities, c.) failing to make phone calls as Campaign Treasurer asking people to send in contributions previously committed on their volunteer cards, d.) not aggressively searching out support or funds for Ravitz among the legal community.

The contribution from the Jane/Justin fund raiser was certainly helpful and appreciated but was not the primary source of funds. Without it the campaign would still continue to function and not be "virtually penniless" as MCLL states. Contributions after the Primary have continued to come in and some have been in sums greater than the \$250 from that fund raiser.

RE Valerie's statements at the CC meeting (page 11)

We understand Valerie's statements to Sheila to be what they are - lies, "conscious and deliberate lies." When Valerie got off the telephone at that CC meeting, she came back into the meeting and said "is this still the CC meeting? If it is then I might have misled Sheila."

MCLL states: "we severely criticize Valerie...but we do not feel it is grounds for expulsion from the CC, or...even grounds for censure." MCLL is not willing to impose strict standards of behavior upon its cadre, specifically Valerie, but is willing to bring charges against Jack. These charges would be "formal", introduced to the full membership of MCLL, charges which are not explained, investigated or factually substantiated. The statements by MCLL about Jack are vindictive, subjective and characterize a shooting from the hip kind of academic formulation that predominates through much of the Reunification Proposal.

RE Collectively dealing with Sheila (page 12)

There is nothing objectionable to a CC "collectively" discussing the practice of another cadre. The qualification that MCLL attaches to this collective dealing is "if the motives and practice are politically correct." It is precisely here that Changeover people disagree. We feel that at least one CC member, Frank, was motivated primarily by a self-seeking power grab by attempting to discredit what he viewed as a threat or contender for power, Sheila. At least one other CC member was confused, (as Linda Ann admitted). As to the "practice" of the CC, at no time did the CC (or even the old GS), undertake meaningful criticism or discussion of Sheila or anyone else who functioned as leadership. We can only guess as to what "practice" they refer in this paragraph.

Many of the statements made in MCLL's Reunification Proposal are simply stated, wrong. Many of the questions as to discrepancies between MCLL's and Changeover's recollection and interpretation of facts can be ultimately reduced to "who are you gonna believe." Other clarifications regarding factual or tonal inaccuracies have been detailed here. We hope that it has been helpful in understanding some of the differences that divide us.

Our concern is with the continued growth of a progressive revolutionary white movement in Detroit understanding and overcoming the racial, sexual and class contradictions that sometimes create decay. There is much work that needs to be done and we are going to move on and do it. The election of Justin C. Ravitz to Recorder's Court will occur November 7 and we all must work to assure that success.

EPILOGUE/payment in full

I
when you trust

someone, you can't
make enough water
to cry
when the knife
slides between ribs
and turns quietly.

reach behind
& feel liquid oozing
into yr buttocks/
"ass, it was
an in/side job.

you've been done
by some body who
said, "i'm like you.

& when you ask them
why

they say

"you didn't
pay us enough.

b.p. Flanigan/fooled:

October 2, 1972