

DETROIT REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT RECORDS

BOX 11 OF 16

FOLDER 9

CCC JOANN CASTLE

RESIGNATION FEB 1972

CHRONOLOGY OF THE WEEK BEGINNING FEBRUARY 7th (MONDAY)

FEBRUARY 7th:

Planning Committee (PC) has a four hour meeting to discuss political character of CCC. Joann Castle attends for only 45 minutes, in part, as is later learned, because she is ~~doing on~~ ~~errands unrelated to CCC or her household.~~ It is generally thought to be one of the most productive and political meetings we've had.

After this meeting, two members of the MCLL General Staff meet with Margaret Borys and ask her if she would be willing to accept assignment as CCC Co-ordinator. Margaret affirms, thus completing at last the process which can free Joann from her CCC burdens as per her own request of January.

The generation of a new CCC Co-ordinator is communicated to Joann at the CCC GS preparation session. She ~~expresses her pleasure,~~ and agrees to come to a CCC Section meeting (MCLL work group) scheduled for Thursday morning.

FEBRUARY 8th:

Joann, ~~Without~~ without discussion with MCLL comrades and without any communication to the CCC Planning Committee, distributes two copies of her "history of CCC" with cover letters announcing her resignation from MCLL. These are given to Hugh White and Sandy Buist, both elected members of the PC. Despite the presence of all three MCLL CCC assigned cadre (Sheila, Sharon, and Jack) no effort ~~was~~ made to give them the letter addressed to the PC. Joann wants to make an announcement to the entire CCC membership concerning her resignation and thanking people for their support in her struggles. Hugh White and others convince her not to.

FEBRUARY 9th:

Hugh calls Jack Russell to ask about the letter. Learning ~~to his amazement~~ that Jack is ignorant of its existence, Hugh conveys some of its contents.

Jack calls Sandy to ask if she has ~~received~~ the letter. Sandy reads the cover letter to Jack and conveys some of the highlights of the three page "history of CCC".

Jack tries to call Chuck Rutledge, Bill Bunting, ^{Augusta} Gus Stevens, but is unable to reach any of them late Wednesday afternoon.

Jack ^{informs} calls Sheila and Sharon.

Sheila calls Joann and asks her what she is doing. ~~When Joann confirms the worst,~~ Sheila communicates her disgust and anger, w/ the method of dist. + content of letter.
Jack and Sheila pick up copies of the letter from 630 West Boston.

Sharon obtains her copy later that night. ~~from Joann's~~

Sheila sees Chuck at the NEWS (smashing success) session and tells him the situation. Chuck will contact Gus.

Emergency session of the MCLL General Staff meets late Wednesday night and discusses the recent events.

FEBRUARY 10th:

At the CCC section meeting (of MCLL CCC cadre) Joann distributes her completed statement on MCLL to Jack, Sharon, Sheila, and Margaret. Agreement is reached on the transfere of functions. Agreement is reached that the basic equipment of CCC will be removed from Joann's by Saturday.

The MCLL General Staff meets for seven hours. It engages in a prolonged self-criticism/criticism of our individual and collective relationship with Joann. We call for an MCLL general membership meeting for Friday morning.

FEBRUARY 11th:

At the general membership meeting we have a full discussion of Joann's papers. Then we turn to our course of action. There is unanimous agreement by individual voice vote on the general line which this paper should take. We agree that the membership will review this document at the meeting on Sunday. Then, when the mail is checked, it is discovered that Nancy Waggoner and Judy Hines have unilaterally called a meeting of the "volunteer workers" of CCC and distributed the Castle "history" of CCC to the CCC general Staff. By unanimous individual voice vote of all members present (two had left for their jobs) MCLL decides that the removal of CCC from 630 West Boston must be done immediately and that all members of the PC must be notified of the action.

CCC is moved to the LDC offices. We explain to Nancy Waggoner at 630 what our view of the situation is, try to be sensitive to the inevitable confusion of the Castle children, explain matters to Joann when she returns, and inform Nancy and Joann that we expect them to be at the Monday PC meeting to present their position. They reply that at this point their attendance is "unclear".

JOHNS
DAPER
2/MCLL
17

February 8, 1972

A MONTH AGO I OFFER^d MY EVALUATION TO THE MOTOR CITY LABOR LEAGUE STAFF. THIS WAS ACCOMPANIED BY A STAFF RESIGNATION. A FEW DAYS LATER I REQUESTED A LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO ALLOW TIME FOR NEEDED REST AND TO REASSESS SOME POLITICAL DIFFERENCES WITH MCLL POLICY. THIS LEAVE WAS REFUSED.

I HAVE NOT HAD MUCH EXPERIENCE IN WRITING AND THIS ARTICULATION WAS VERY DIFFICULT FOR ME BUT THE UNFOLDING OF THE WRITTEN WORDS HAS BEEN INVALUABLE IN SYNTHESIZING MY DEVELOPMENT OVER THIS PAST YEAR. THE PURPOSE OF THE PAPER IS TO FULLY EXPRESS WHAT IS MY ANALYSIS OF MCLL AND TO OFFER TO MY COMRADES THE PERSPECTIVE OF MY POLITICAL VIEWS. I URGE YOU, IF YOU SHARE THE CONTENT OF THIS PAPER TO STRUGGLE AGAINST ALL INCORRECT TENDENCIES IN THE ~~REVOLUTION~~ ^{organization &}

*Proceed with the
Revolution*

jc

I. HISTORY OF CCC

A year and a half has passed since CCC began. I have struggled fully and given totally to the realization of the program. The form has been initiated and implemented to the point of being referred to from time to time as an "institution" in Detroit. The process, of course, must continue to grow and the goals, in tune with the progress of history itself will necessarily change. It is time for someone else to take over the coordinating role. I must move on.

Throughout the first year I carried the responsibility for the program almost totally alone. Program directions were not charted nor fully understood. A reconstruction of the history of the beginnings of CCC may be helpful in understanding:

By early fall of 1970 I had become somewhat inactive in Ad-Hoc. The end of that summer found the Motor City Coalition, an attempt by Mike Hamlin for a coalition of the white left, a disaster. Mike was also active in the initiation of the Alliance and the first phases of MCLL.

Mike and I had spent some time in discussion of more feasible alternative ideas for political development of the white masses using a class analysis with working class proletariat-black vanguard ideology. Keeping in mind the diverse histories, & experiences of whites in this city and varied political potentials, we put together a design for the book club, a mass educational program. This seemed one idea that could accommodate all these diversities, put forth correct politics, offer areas for implementation of ideology into practice without becoming dogmatic and sectarian. These had been blatant problems in the Motor City Coalition and throughout the history of the white left in Detroit.

The direction of Ad-Hoc at this point was becoming somewhat unclear as objective conditions in the city continued to change. Having been issue oriented with great success, Ad-Hoc still had a base and seemed a logical place to begin. The idea was presented to Sheila and in turn I presented it to the steering committee. The three of us, Mike, Sheila and I, upon that approval, began to work on implementation. With the help of Black Star and a few hard working Ad-Hoc people, we distributed the brochures in October 1970.

For the first 5 months I worked basically alone approximately 15 to 17 hours a day. This commitment, pattern of work and dedication to the success of the program was never altered throughout this year and a half. Some support was forthcoming, initially from Babs and Sara and then from Sharon, Camilla and Nancy which relieved some of the extreme pressure for maintaining the mechanical operations and bookkeeping.

Nancy joined me full time in February at the suggestion of Mike. She has never missed a day of work. Her day begins regularly at 10 AM until 6 PM. She also works with the staff and attends extended meetings and extra work deadlines. In my experience her work and political commitment cannot be questioned. She is particularly skilled in statistical work. Sectarian criticism of Nancy by members of MCLL is one of the things that must be combated in this organization.

There have been many difficult times for her working with MCLL persons, yet her work has never faltered nor fallen behind. The original criticism of Nancy stemmed from sectarian attitudes left-over from Ad-Hoc toward PCAUR, when persons from both organizations were more closely associated. PCAUR (People Concerned About Urban Renewal) is a working class community group in the Southern White Area of Detroit in the Cass Corridor. Nancy is one of their more active support people.

We were unable to get PAC off the ground as announced in September as the basic work assignment was left undone. Finally in January of 1972, a model was introduced in the planning group for PAC which defines it as crisis organizing overly controlled, I feel by the planning group. PAC representatives now attend group meetings. I have many concerns about the organization of PAC for which there is no time or space here. This paper is much longer than I anticipated.

A new composition of the planning group, with four independent persons affiliated with neither of the sponsoring groups, has been a great asset. Dynamics in group meetings are still sometimes difficult but the direction of progress is forward in many areas where Nancy and I found it impossible to move last Spring. These areas are beginning to flourish. Yet, we have talked many times before and the thrust inside of the book club still lacks a focus of application and practice on the part of the planning committee members.

There has been another paper written on the history of the book club, prepared for discussion in the planning committee asserting about CCC "it was inevitable that a certain predominant liberal white attitude toward Blacks (sychophancy) would emerge and be problematic", reiterating the same charges made to me on many occasions personally. I reject this as absurd!

In discussion, people were asked to answer yes or no as to whether sychophancy and lack of political organizing were the book club experience. How could these points be valid for discussion at the omission of many others. I do not ask for a yes or no answer to whether political organizing or sychophancy existed nor that you come to any unanimous position but only that you reflect why our history in CCC has developed as it has. What were the historical conditions in the city of Detroit in 1971 and 1972? Let's not flagellate about the past but look to a future definition of realistic commitments and goals for middle class organizing within a broad look at our struggle with the enemy and so that we might also be about the organizing that is needed in the working class community.

* * * * *

A few weeks back I began this whole process of self-evaluation for presentation to the general staff of MCLL. I asked at that time for help with day to day responsibilities. I stated that I was prepared to continue until June. But if a decision is made to have a CCC III, it would make sense to have a new coordinator begin to work now.

I look at the book club as a success which has had both local and national implications. Requests for information, materials and aids to development of similar programs have come from across the country.

I have raised \$4,000 over this past year to keep it functioning. \$3,000 of that has just been acquired in the last 2 months so the finances are in order. Bookkeeping and materials are up to date and paid in full. There should be no problems in the transferring of the responsibilities.

Looking again at CCC progress, at the suggestion of Mike a planning committee was formed to disseminate responsibilities. Nancy was excluded from this group by Sheila. The group continued to meet formally for the full year but it never really functioned correctly and continued to create more problems than it was able to solve. A lightening of the workload was never accomplished, a political direction was never solidified.

Nancy and I constantly grappled with the avalanche of demands to maintain the program. It was necessary to create a means of handling the monthly seminars where hundreds attend, for selling materials and keeping accounts, always struggling to meet time deadlines; to prepare the staff, make travel arrangement and accommodations for speakers, keep correspondence with members and other interested persons from across the U.S. This past year we have consciously worked with publishers to lay a foundation for a book store in Detroit, which I had asked to begin in September.

Dynamics of the planning group discussions were problematic. There was no unity among the group. Tasks taken by many remained consistently undone. Solutions offered were more often than not, totally alien to day-to-day conditions and organizing problems. Lack of understanding of the reality of on-going operations by many persons in the group only added to the delima. Attitudes were often hostile. I can rightfully be accused by summer, as referring to the group as "consultants" with no base in practice. Mike left the group.

A valient attempt was made by Nancy and I in late Spring to do political organizing among the volunteers and to solidify staff responsibilities, but demands for the extensive logistical and mechanical functions and the continued need for further development of all the other operations was just too much. To fall behind in these tasks would preclude disaster.

There were some positive results of our organizing attempts which cannot be overlooked. Many volunteers with no previous political experience were drawn into political work and a close relationship with the operations of the program. Many of these people later became part of the general staff. Sandy Buist, Mariruth Ledyard, Sue Arnold, Rosemary Dalton, Audrey Tucker are examples.

THE MAJORITY OF VOLUNTEER WORK IN THE PROGRAM HAS ALWAYS BEEN DONE BY NON-MCLL MEMBERS.

By now it was summer and my children were all home from school, almost a year had passed since we started, my marriage had been severed and extreme fatigue had set in.

The split occured in the League and reorganization of the relationship of the two sponsoring groups around the book club gave MCLL major responsibility and BWC a supportive role.

Charges to me from within the group now began to be laid to me of sychophancy, patronism and lack of organizing experience. Support for the most part was non-existent. I was at a loss as to how to deal with all the problems.

By fall there was another reorganization of MCLL assignments and Val was moved out of the section and Jack Russell, a new member and new in Detroit, was moved in.

SELF-CRITICISM - CRITICISM

My input into the general staff has not been near what I anticipated. Most reasons for that are very clear to me.

It is certainly very clear that I am over-extended. Conditions of my life are very demanding and will be for some time. Sole responsibility for my six children, a 60 year old, 13 room home which houses a full-time 7 day a week MCLL office, and full-time coordination responsibilities for the book club left little time nor stamina to function within the staff structure as it is organized. Meetings were usually in my home, at times with my children there. Distractions were constant. Meetings often lasted up to seven hours on Sundays. It was difficult at times for me to even stay awake. Thoughtlessness on the most part as to the condition of the house when persons left and at times eating of food that I needed for the family added to the tensions. I was not coping well and recently moved to change this arrangement.

Continued heightening contradictions within the staff stemmed from ever-widening differences in political principles, methods used for staff decisions, communication with the membership and in general the direction of MCLL. These all further increased the pressures. I observed tendencies that I can best describe as typical white leftism yet I always felt that we would work things out as we matured as an organization. That was undialectical on my part.

Constant renewed efforts to cope with these problems were less than successful and only resulted in more frustration. It surely took much too long for me to be able to synthesize the whole picture, as I wanted to blame all the problems on my fatigue.

Style. I see myself as a worker with leadership responsibility. I like working with people and am anxious to share tasks and do organizing work. My style although very intensive, is not aggressive yet my history will show that I have been very aggressive with the enemy. I don't become defeated nor change my mind easily when I feel that I am correct. I would rather prove the correctness of my position by testing my beliefs or ideas in practice than to fruitlessly continue to argue. Articulation under fatigue conditions is difficult. All in all my style is not at its best at this time but I am not at all convinced that in essence it is wrong.

I try to practice on the assumption that correct ideas come from the masses..that we must always listen more than we speak..that it is the responsibility of the organization not to be elitist but rather to encourage, unleash and coordinate the creative energy of the masses.

I believe that an organization with profound intellectual tendencies will offer abstract rather than correct concrete solutions. Decision made in isolation offer unrealistic solutions to problems.

I feel that many decisions made in the general staff are arbitrary and more due to a persuasive argument than a careful and considered political analysis and further that the views of certain persons are largely uncontested and others would align themselves to a different political position within a different atmosphere.

It is certainly obvious that participation on the staff, when one looks at the number of meetings scheduled and the extensive daytime hours, severely limit the possibility of workers participating in the decision making body. The present staff are either full time movement people or professionals.

All in all, there has been a difficult relationship between the book club and on-going MCLL organizing. CCC was firmly established before MCLL began and I believe in each direction development was hampered by the other. With less pressure on myself and in different material conditions these contradictions should not have occurred. I don't know yet if it was in fact necessary or avoidable under the existing situation. These difficulties were compounded by lack of support in my organizing responsibilities with CCC as described in that section of this paper, and all had much more effect than desired. It is a new process for me to have to grapple, define, filter all the why's and take an alternate position from my comrades. It is an exceedingly deep and agonizing experience.

III. THE STAFF SELF-EVALUATION

I spent many weeks in preparation of my evaluation that was to be offered in the general staff. I was very unsure of myself or why the intensifying differences. I demanded that it be honest to myself and others and as politically objective as possible.

Outside of the meetings I engaged in many discussions over this period of time, evaluating, measuring, considering with many comrades, not the content, but clarifications to myself of the formation of the why's of my analysis. Basically I was trying to understand what was personal and what was really political.

I am unclear if under the conditions in the staff the use of this means of solidifying my differences rather than in-staff confrontation could have been handled in any other way and certainly question the wisdom of this approach when there might be any other alternative. But there was a tenuous unity in the staff at best and too many individual dynamics at play in the meetings. I had agreed with Sheila when we talked in an outside discussion that the time when we could positively discuss these problems in the staff had not come.

The evaluation itself was a serious step in my political development. My outside discussions with Sheila, evolving out of our personal relationship for many years, had by now totally come to an impasse. I finally took some time away so that I might do undistracted work on the final articulation of the paper. The report was written and copies were made. It was read so that it might be thorough and coordinate.

Unfortunately my understanding of staff dynamics was not complete enough to expect the response that occurred at my presentation and it took me by near complete surprise. Unexpected hostilities and a unanimous position against my primary political concern had not been anticipated.

It was following this staff meeting and in the pinch of a babysitter that could not stay on, that I attempted to explain at least my primary difference to the membership..that difference being the relation of democracy to centralism in MCLL. A more coherent and full explanation is enclosed in this paper.

Some persons attempted to reach me later, wanting to talk and were expressedly afraid of being accused of "cornerism" which I feel is a control factor used by the organization.

I did not fully realize until after I presented the evaluation, the fullness with which I was struggling, the intensity of my belief that things were incorrect. The whole process had been very draining and fatigue had long been with me. My resignation from the general staff offered me nothing but three extra hours on Sunday morning and some alleviation of additional up-coming responsibilities, but the principled differences remained to be worked out. It afforded no relief from the fatigue, no time for a thoughtful new strategy. My goal is not necessarily less work, but a situation in the struggle that is more appropriate to my life conditions. Leaving MCLL had yet never been considered. Yet leaving the staff brought no clarification nor the quiet minutes to assimilate; to let the dialectic explain itself to me. Therefore I submitted at the beginning of that up-coming week, a request for a leave of absence until June to engage in that political process.

A representation from the general staff met with me a week later and refused my request. I promised to consider the proposed alternative although I believe that it was clear to all that the staff proposition did not meet the essence of the problem in any way. It was this meeting that was the turning point in my now clear understanding of the impossibility of working things out internally. It was also clear after I had taken some time to analyze what occurred at that meeting that it would be lack of respect for myself that would submit to another meeting of that caliber. So, although I am notifying the staff within the proper time I decided that I would write this position paper as my initial means of communicating my view. Ron was present at that meeting, more as an observer it seemed, and I think he should share its content with you.

Knowledge in the membership of such activities on the part of the staff is an important point. Positions of staff members and the rationale behind those decisions are a necessary part of democratic centralism. The organization will not grow if all these are kept secret. That an organization must mature to a certain level before this can be done is complete nonsense. If problems are aired they can be cleared up if they are kept hidden they will begin a process of decay. Such practices are endorsed in our society as policy by our enemy, the state.

As far as I can observe two major meetings participated in by members of the staff, namely the "PCAUR confrontation" and the joint meeting with BWC were reported to you incorrectly. Also the decision that Jack was to be liaison to BWC was never agreed upon by the staff and was to be announced as temporary (it was not) until a decision could be reached. These things could have been handled in a positive way and added to our revolutionary growth and experiences.

In a revolutionary organization discussions should be a measure for political development on the part of both staff and membership. Refusal to share at least the existence of problems and an honest rationale for decisions, including debates within the staff. Democratic centralism allows for a minority report. I feel the present policy not to disclose this information is lack of respect for persons in the membership, elitism, and a portrayal of real patronism of which I am so often accused. What but this could be the root reason in this organization for "cornering"?

Accusations spoken to me personally over the last several months were reaffirmed in my meeting with these staff representatives as I was labeled ultra-democratic, a spontaneist, patronizing, illusionary and sychophantic. It has since been pointed out to me that it is understood that the book club would have been an ultra-democratic fiasco if Sheila had not held it together all this time. It was stated that my politics and style have steadily declined and that my real problem is that I have had no experience in organizing. The political differences that prompted these remarks are included in this paper.

The meeting was an enlightening experience. I am glad to have had the opportunity, it forced me to do a great deal more thinking. The reason given that my leave of absence was refused: "It would set a precedent, we can't just have people coming and going". (The George Colman situation was not mentioned) and further "that MCLL is at a critical stage and I would not be able to make up the loss of political development." I presume from this type of logic that we will never again be able to have an expansion of the membership.

Aside from the political differences described in this paper there were other primary disagreements in a discussion of Nancy. I had indicated to her that I was asking for a leave of absence and some additional support with book club work because I was exhausted. This remark to her was termed by the group "a gross violation of political discipline". Yet the morning following our meeting, it was stated in a DIM staff meeting by Michelle to Jesse Christman, who was looking to buy another book, that I had dropped the book club, that the office was in the process of being moved and one couldn't know where a copy of Rawick's book could be found". DIM has been ordering books in bulk from CCC. Christman called me to say that he had heard there were some serious problems, was I alright ..could he help?

Also, within a matter of a few days, a derogatory quoted remark that Nancy was an unprincipled person, which was made in that closed meeting about Nancy found its way back to me, obviously with some questions, through general book club channels.

IV. POLITICAL DIFFERENCES

Reviewing my political analysis of major problems, I would offer the following considerations:

I stated in May of last year and still strongly believe that MCLL will never be a serious revolutionary organization until the MIC program or a similar program that relates to organizing in a workers community, within a working class perspective is implemented. I volunteered early last spring to spend some time in the community that surrounds Huber which I felt superceded in priorities the book club. A decision at that time by a vote, determined that the correct procedure should be first a statistical data analysis. My time and energy to relate to outside responsibilities has steadily declined since that time. I would have preferred to work with MIC after my responsibilities with the book club were complete.

The newspaper has been a fine disciplined product. If, however, it has no base nor foundation in the working class community such as MIC it will loose its purpose. Persons in the book club, the Alliance and similar contacts have already the means to such information as is communicated. The newspaper must be a suppliment to organizing, it cannot organize on its own. Our organizational papers read:

"In accordance with Maoist thought "theoretical production" and ideological refinements cannot be the main work of a revolutionary party. The measuring rod must be the level of practice, and practice must constitute more than the printing and distribution of newspapers and leaflets. We must develop with programs, activities and services responsive to the needs of working people in the plants, in the unions and in the community."

I worry about the future of MCLL if the MIC project is scrapped without an alternative. We have been working on MIC for almost a year. I think our priorities have been wrong or non-existent. We had scheduled time on the week-end to discuss priorities but this as far as I know has never occurred. Conclusions that a project is impossible sometimes come from attempting to have all the answers before the questions can be concretely posed by the situation. There is also the other extreme of being unprepared which I am not advocating. One must however, go from the simple to the complex, most of all, one must begin. Parties are not organized out of the sky but from the workers.

2. We spend too much time in our staff meetings internalizing, speculating, and perfecting the abstract and not enough time in positive practice. Our organizing papers state:

"Plant and community projects must point the way to organizational activity."

We have reorganized the structure at least four times this year because things are not flowing properly. The revolution will not begin nor even take shape with organizing secretaries around a discussion table. Needs and opportunities for correct procedure develop from actual practice in working class situations. The revolution will come from the masses and our work within the proletariat, the production workers. I'm afraid we are isolating ourselves and alienating the masses. We are spending too much of our lives in meetings and study to develop the perfect analysis in the abstract.

3. My primary disagreement comes however on the relationship of democracy to centralism in our organization. Often before major decisions are made that will affect the whole organization open and full discussion is necessary. All the membership and staff have had experiences that could apply to the shape of that decision before it is made. This kind of discussion can create unity. This would eliminate such gross errors as putting Jim Bish in the Anti-War section as we had done, or the tabling of MIC which was not put before the membership. Of course this could not apply to crises decisions. We should make an intensified effort to master the dialectical approach.

After the staff makes a decision, the rationale for that decision and differences between staff members on important issues should be aired. Democratic centralism uses broad democracy and cannot exist without it. It also allows the right of a minority report.

People cannot be forced to become revolutionaries. They cannot take a rational position without having time to apply dialectics. Confrontation politics will not do. "Cornering" would be eliminated as a concern and would cease to exist.

This whole process would develop strength, confidence, imagination and political understanding for all. I have been told the component structure suffices. I know that components seldom have material to assess before it goes to the staff unless their own project is involved. Persons in the A & P component did not even know that the MIC project was in jeopardy. History of the organization deems this has been the rule rather than the exception.

4. Intellectualism. Basic Marxist theory teaches that intellectuals speak from and to intellectuals and cannot organize workers without first going through an intense process of re-education. The intensity of intellectualism in MCLL is contrary to our organizational papers.

I question the educational schedule for orientation of new members where emphasis is placed on Mandel, Trotskyite intellectual, with no prior political readings for candidates as a basis for correct politics, no primary time has been spent with dialectics and history as a basis for interpretation of what is read. Not only is Mandel a Trot and difficult to read, but he is strictly an intellectual and endorses the intellectual position. This distorts and confuses our goals to new members.

When I asked Jack Russell why we are not reading more Mao, the response was that "China does not apply to our situation. China's was a peasant, not an urban revolution". It is my opinion that the Soviet experience was only a beginning and must be up-dated with the newer knowledge and experiences in China, Cuba and Vietnam. People's relationships and the handling of contradictions emphasized in China are VERY related to our problems of individuality and lack of unity in the organization.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO is fine but followed by six weeks of discussions on Mandel is hardly an introduction to working class organizing. This is the orientation schedule for new members. It is my opinion that this is in contradiction with our goals.

Our organizing papers call for working class revolution led by the proletariat..to the black vanguard and the building of a multi-national revolutionary party. Is this consistent with Mandel's analysis? What is the organizational position on China?

Our organizational papers warn of the dangers of intellectualism or organizational elitism and the pitfalls of theory without practice and lack of programs for workers.

IN CONCLUSION. The development of the concept of the Book Club from scratch, the commitment of time and energy, the necessary creativeness to implement the concept; to coordinate the tasks, to spend time with sincere fucked over people, just out there being screwed by our society who need someone to talk to; these meticulous exhausting tasks of the book club was something I had no doubt that I could do and did. The book club has had international implications. Requests for information, materials and aids to development of similar programs, or people from those programs have come from across the United States.

On the other hand, the internal battle over political principles and the ego based struggles in the organization must be overcome. I cannot win at this time by working internally but perhaps I can pass this struggle on to others, which is the purpose of this paper. I am absolutely exhausted and my request for a leave, after explaining the necessity in a most principled manner was turned down. I have neither the time nor the energy to give to being ground up.

Yet I feel a strong responsibility to other members. It concerns me that I am not able to take a stronger leadership towards an alternative. I hope that this paper will offer some insights and stimulate struggle against all incorrect tendencies.

In the meantime there are many positive alternative places that I can work, creative energy that I can offer in the continued development of the revolutionary process. My fears of being without an organization have been overcome. I look forward to beginning full time work in the fall with as much fervor as before.

The revolution will come, despite the pre-party forms that come and go in the white left. I will find my place, a place to give totally within a revolutionary party when it is the right time for me and my children. My sincere comrades will be with me.

On the other hand, I hope that MCLL will find a way to deal with its internal contradictions. The talents, the commitment, the history of practice, the sincerity of the members will not be lost but will continue to grow dialectically. I was asked why I feel that the membership works so hard if the policy is so incorrect. My answer is that persons are sincere and believe that revolution must come. Many were attracted to MCLL because they saw a previous history of practice on the part of many individuals who now form the organization. This has lent itself to a situation of trust. The organization must now master a new technique of working, learning and developing together in a correct political manner. Present policy and practice should be realigned and reoriented with the original purpose and organizing goals as the basis of a revolutionary party.

There will be the expected unity and opposites in MCLL growth and development, as unity with me manifested itself in one-to-one relationships within some of the staff and then became an opposite unity against me when I took a political position opposed to policy. The organization will continue to unify and divide until it works itself out.

I have listened and considered all that has been offered to me by my comrades. My decision has been well thought out.

At the meeting with general staff representatives subsequent to my request for a leave of absence until June, the following arrangements were explained to me. A new book club coordinator would begin in three weeks (by the 16th), I would be training that persons and the office would then be moved. This gave me three week-ends off, if I was not working on book club business or preparing for the transfer. At this time I would be expected back in full participation with MCLL.

So, within this time schedule offered by MCLL staff and the "two weeks notice" determined within that meeting as appropriate "for Nancy or anyone" (I was objecting that Nancy's very livelihood, all other political considerations aside, depended on the book club) This was hardly a building of a new society. I here, within the spirit of my representatives, offer my two weeks notice to MCLL. This coincides with the organizational schedule run to me.

I feel strong bonds within the membership and some members of the general staff and intend to keep that relationship a growing and positive one. If any of this paper is offensive, or considered incorrect we should engage in dialogue. I would appreciate your criticism. I hope to be permitted to remain with the staff of the book club as extra support on book club seminar evenings or as a table leader. I hope that I have been able to explain satisfactorily, I feel positively that by making the decision to leave, I am not avoiding struggle that could be more fruitful if I remained within the organization. Only history will prove the correctness of my decision.

I see the changes as a means to offer the most positive contribution to the struggle over a long period of time; to respond to physical health demands for some rest, and for the further political development of myself and my children who will be revolutionaries at an even more intense time, and all of those with whom I am in contact. It is necessary for me to begin in a better way, to offer more, and to be more effective in our struggle against the enemy. I have been suffocated by conditions but now I am stimulated by the future.

WE ARE GOING TO WIN!

Joann Castle

~~What's w.c.!~~

① and + # of notes
② What is theoretical work?

12

February 8, 1972

A MONTH AGO I OFFERED MY EVALUATION TO THE MOTOR CITY LABOR LEAGUE STAFF. THIS WAS ACCOMPANIED BY A STAFF RESIGNATION. A FEW DAYS LATER I REQUESTED A LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO ALLOW TIME FOR NEEDED REST AND TO REASSESS SOME POLITICAL DIFFERENCES WITH MCLL POLICY. THIS LEAVE WAS REFUSED.

I HAVE NOT HAD MUCH EXPERIENCE IN WRITING AND THIS ARTICULATION WAS VERY DIFFICULT FOR ME BUT THE UNFOLDING OF THE WRITTEN WORDS HAS BEEN INVALUABLE IN SYNTHESIZING MY DEVELOPMENT OVER THIS PAST YEAR. THE PURPOSE OF THE PAPER IS TO FULLY EXPRESS WHAT IS MY ANALYSIS OF MCLL AND TO OFFER TO MY COMRADES THE PERSPECTIVE OF MY POLITICAL VIEWS. I URGE YOU, IF YOU SHARE THE CONTENT OF THIS PAPER TO STRUGGLE AGAINST ALL INCORRECT TENDENCIES IN THE REVOLUTION.

Proceed with the Revolution
organization &

- ① **Educationalists** as too abstract
Speculate + abstraction
Anti-intellectualism
"I" formulation + individualism
Subjectivism - factual inaccuracies
Self-censorship, pol. min. - readings raised + squashed
- ② **Anti-struggle position** - leave struggle to others.
- ③ **Position that she puts a #.**

I. HISTORY OF CCC

A year and a half has passed since CCC began. I have struggled fully and given totally to the realization of the program. The form has been initiated and implemented to the point of being referred to from time to time as an "institution" in Detroit. The process, of course, must continue to grow and the goals, in tune with the progress of history itself will necessarily change. It is time for someone else to take over the coordinating role. I must move on.

Throughout the first year I carried the responsibility for the program almost totally alone. Program directions were not charted nor fully understood. A reconstruction of the history of the beginnings of CCC may be helpful in understanding:

By early Fall of 1970 I had become somewhat inactive in Ad-Hoc. The end of that summer found the Motor City Coalition, an attempt by Mike Hamlin for a coalition of the white left, a disaster. Mike was also active in the initiation of the Alliance and the first phases of MCLL.

Mike and I had spent some time in discussion of more feasible alternative ideas for political development of the white masses using a class analysis with working class proletariat-black vanguard ideology. Keeping in mind the diverse histories & experiences of whites in this city and varied political potentials, we put together a design for the book club, a mass educational program. This seemed one idea that could accommodate all these diversities, put forth correct politics, offer areas for implementation of ideology into practice without becoming dogmatic and sectarian. These had been blatant problems in the Motor City Coalition and throughout the history of the white left in Detroit.

The direction of Ad-Hoc at this point was becoming somewhat unclear as objective conditions in the city continued to change. Having been issue oriented with great success, Ad-Hoc still had a base and seemed a logical place to begin. The idea was presented to Sheila and in turn I presented it to the steering committee. The three of us, Mike, Sheila and I, upon that approval, began to work on implementation. With the help of Black Star and a few hard working Ad-Hoc people, we distributed the brochures in October 1970.

For the first 5 months I worked basically alone approximately 15 to 17 hours a day. This commitment, pattern of work and dedication to the success of the program was never altered throughout this year and a half. Some support was forthcoming, initially from Babs and Sara and then from Sharon, Camilla and Nancy which relieved some of the extreme pressure for maintaining the mechanical operations and bookkeeping.

Nancy joined me full time in February at the suggestion of Mike. She has never missed a day of work. Her day begins regularly at 10 AM until 6 PM. She also works with the staff and attends extended meetings and extra work deadlines. In my experience her work and political commitment cannot be questioned. She is particularly skilled in statistical work. Sectarian criticism of Nancy by members of MCLL is one of the things that must be combated in this organization.

There have been many difficult times for her working with MCLL persons, yet her work has never faltered nor fallen behind. The original criticism of Nancy stemmed from sectarian attitudes left-over from Ad-Hoc toward PCAUR, when persons from both organizations were more closely associated. PCAUR (People Concerned About Urban Renewal) is a working class community group in the Southern White Area of Detroit in the Cass Corridor. Nancy is one of their more active support people.

Looking again at CCC progress, at the suggestion of Mike a planning committee was formed to disseminate responsibilities. Nancy was excluded from this group by Sheila. The group continued to meet formally for the full year but it never really functioned correctly and continued to create more problems than it was able to solve. A lightening of the workload was never accomplished, a political direction was never solidified.

Nancy and I constantly grappled with the avalanche of demands to maintain the program. It was necessary to create a means of handling the monthly seminars where hundreds attend, for selling materials and keeping accounts, always struggling to meet time deadlines; to prepare the staff, make travel arrangement and accommodations for speakers, keep correspondence with members and other interested persons from across the U.S. This past year we have consciously worked with publishers to lay a foundation for a book store in Detroit, which I had asked to begin in September.

Dynamics of the planning group discussions were problematic. There was no unity among the group. Tasks taken by many remained consistently undone. Solutions offered were more often than not, totally alien to day-to-day conditions and organizing problems. Lack of understanding of the reality of on-going operations by many persons in the group only added to the delima. Attitudes were often hostile. I can rightfully be accused by summer, as referring to the group as "consultants" with no base in practice. Mike left the group.

A valient attempt was made by Nancy and I in late Spring to do political organizing among the volunteers and to solidify staff responsibilities, but demands for the extensive logistical and mechanical functions and the continued need for further development of all the other operations was just too much. To fall behind in these tasks would preclude disaster.

There were some positive results of our organizing attempts which cannot be overlooked. Many volunteers with no previous political experience were drawn into political work and a close relationship with the operations of the program. Many of these people later became part of the general staff. Sandy Buist, Mariruth Ledyard, Sue Arnold, Rosemary Dalton, Audrey Tucker are examples.

THE MAJORITY OF VOLUNTEER WORK IN THE PROGRAM HAS ALWAYS BEEN DONE BY NON-MCLL MEMBERS.

By now it was summer and my children were all home from school, almost a year had passed since we started, my marriage had been severed and extreme fatigue had set in.

The split occured in the League and reorganization of the relationship of the two sponsoring groups around the book club gave MCLL major responsibility and BWC a supportive role.

Charges to me from within the group now began to be laid to me of sychophancy, patronism and lack of organizing experience. Support for the most part was non-existent. I was at a loss as to how to deal with all the problems.

By fall there was another reorganization of MCLL assignments and Val was moved out of the section and Jack Russell, a new member and new in Detroit, was moved in.

We were unable to get PAC off the ground as announced in September as the basic work assignment was left undone. Finally in January of 1972, a model was introduced in the planning group for PAC which defines it as crisis organizing overly controlled, I feel by the planning group. PAC representatives now attend group meetings. I have many concerns about the organization of PAC for which there is no time or space here. This paper is much longer than I anticipated.

A new composition of the planning group, with four independent persons affiliated with neither of the sponsoring groups, has been a great asset. Dynamics in group meetings are still sometimes difficult but the direction of progress is forward in many areas where Nancy and I found it impossible to move last Spring. These areas are beginning to flourish. Yet, we have talked many times before and the thrust inside of the book club still lacks a focus of application and practice on the part of the planning committee members.

There has been another paper written on the history of the book club, prepared for discussion in the planning committee asserting about CCC "it was inevitable that a certain predominant liberal white attitude toward Blacks (sychophancy) would emerge and be problematic", reiterating the same charges made to me on many occasions personally. I reject this as absurd!

In discussion, people were asked to answer yes or no as to whether sychophancy and lack of political organizing were the book club experience. How could these points be valid for discussion at the omission of many others. I do not ask for a yes or no answer to whether political organizing or sychophancy existed nor that you come to any unanimous position but only that you reflect why our history in CCC has developed as it has. What were the historical conditions in the city of Detroit in 1971 and 1972? Let's not flagellate about the past but look to a future definition of realistic commitments and goals for middle class organizing within a broad look at our struggle with the enemy and so that we might also be about the organizing that is needed in the working class community.

* * * * *

A few weeks back I began this whole process of self-evaluation for presentation to the general staff of MCLL. I asked at that time for help with day to day responsibilities. I stated that I was prepared to continue until June. But if a decision is made to have a CCC III, it would make sense to have a new coordinator begin to work now.

I look at the book club as a success which has had both local and national implications. Requests for information, materials and aids to development of similar programs have come from across the country.

I have raised \$4,000 over this past year to keep it functioning. \$3,000 of that has just been acquired in the last 2 months so the finances are in order. Bookkeeping and materials are up to date and paid in full. There should be no problems in the transferring of the responsibilities.

SELF-CRITICISM - CRITICISM

My input into the general staff has not been near what I anticipated. Most reasons for that are very clear to me.

It is certainly very clear that I am over-extended. Conditions of my life are very demanding and will be for some time. Sole responsibility for my six children, a 60 year old, 13 room home which houses a full-time 7 day a week MCLL office, and full-time coordination responsibilities for the book club left little time nor stamina to function within the staff structure as it is organized. Meetings were usually in my home, at times with my children there. Distractions were constant. Meetings often lasted up to seven hours on Sundays. It was difficult at times for me to even stay awake. Thoughtlessness on the most part as to the condition of the house when persons left and at times eating of food that I needed for the family added to the tensions. I was not coping well and recently moved to change this arrangement.

Continued heightening contradictions within the staff stemmed from ever-widening differences in political principles, methods used for staff decisions, communication with the membership and in general the direction of MCLL. These all further increased the pressures. I observed tendencies that I can best describe as typical white leftism yet I always felt that we would work things out as we matured as an organization. That was undialectical on my part.

Constant renewed efforts to cope with these problems were less than successful and only resulted in more frustration. It surely took much too long for me to be able to synthesize the whole picture, as I wanted to blame all the problems on my fatigue.

Style. I see myself as a worker with leadership responsibility. I like working with people and am anxious to share tasks and do organizing work. My style although very intensive, is not aggressive yet my history will show that I have been very aggressive with the enemy. I don't become defeated nor change my mind easily when I feel that I am correct. I would rather prove the correctness of my position by testing my beliefs or ideas in practice than to fruitlessly continue to argue. Articulation under fatigue conditions is difficult. All in all my style is not at its best at this time but I am not at all convinced that in essence it is wrong.

I try to practice on the assumption that correct ideas come from the masses..that we must always listen more than we speak..that it is the responsibility of the organization not to be elitist but rather to encourage, unleash and coordinate the creative energy of the masses.

I believe that an organization with profound intellectual tendencies will offer abstract rather than correct concrete solutions. Decision made in isolation offer unrealistic solutions to problems.

I feel that many decisions made in the general staff are arbitrary and more due to a persuasive argument than a careful and considered political analysis and further that the views of certain persons are largely uncontested and others would align themselves to a different political position within a different atmosphere.

It is certainly obvious that participation on the staff, when one looks at the number of meetings scheduled and the extensive daytime hours, severely limit the possibility of workers participating in the decision making body. The present staff are either full time movement people or professionals.

All in all, there has been a difficult relationship between the book club and on-going MCLL organizing. CCC was firmly established before MCLL began and I believe in each direction development was hampered by the other. With less pressure on myself and in different material conditions these contradictions should not have occurred. I don't know yet if it was in fact necessary or avoidable under the existing situation. These difficulties were compounded by lack of support in my organizing responsibilities with CCC as described in that section of this paper, and all had much more effect than desired. It is a new process for me to have to grapple, define, filter all the why's and take an alternate position from my comrades. It is an exceedingly deep and agonizing experience.

III. THE STAFF SELF-EVALUATION

I spent many weeks in preparation of my evaluation that was to be offered in the general staff. I was very unsure of myself or why the intensifying differences. I demanded that it be honest to myself and others and as politically objective as possible.

Outside of the meetings I engaged in many discussions over this period of time, evaluating, measuring, considering with many comrades, not the content, but clarifications to myself of the formation of the why's of my analysis. Basically I was trying to understand what was personal and what was really political.

I am unclear if under the conditions in the staff the use of this means of solidifying my differences rather than in-staff confrontation could have been handled in any other way and certainly question the wisdom of this approach when there might be any other alternative. But there was a tenuous unity in the staff at best and too many individual dynamics at play in the meetings. I had agreed with Sheila when we talked in an outside discussion that the time when we could positively discuss these problems in the staff had not come.

The evaluation itself was a serious step in my political development. My outside discussions with Sheila, evolving out of our personal relationship for many years, had by now totally come to an impasse. I finally took some time away so that I might do undistracted work on the final articulation of the paper. The report was written and copies were made. It was read so that it might be thorough and coordinate.

Unfortunately my understanding of staff dynamics was not complete enough to expect the response that occurred at my presentation and it took me by near complete surprise. Unexpected hostilities and a unanimous position against my primary political concern had not been anticipated.

It was following this staff meeting and in the pinch of a babysitter that could not stay on, that I attempted to explain at least my primary difference to the membership..that difference being the relation of democracy to centralism in MCLL. A more coherent and full explanation is enclosed in this paper.

Some persons attempted to reach me later, wanting to talk and were expressedly afraid of being accused of "cornerism" which I feel is a control factor used by the organization.

I did not fully realize until after I presented the evaluation, the fullness with which I was struggling, the intensity of my belief that things were incorrect. The whole process had been very draining and fatigue had long been with me. My resignation from the general staff offered me nothing but three extra hours on Sunday morning and some alleviation of additional up-coming responsibilities, but the principled differences remained to be worked out. It afforded no relief from the fatigue, no time for a thoughtful new strategy. My goal is not necessarily less work, but a situation in the struggle that is more appropriate to my life conditions. Leaving MCLL had yet never been considered. Yet leaving the staff brought no clarification nor the quiet minutes to assimilate; to let the dialectic explain itself to me. Therefore I submitted at the beginning of that up-coming week, a request for a leave of absence until June to engage in that political process.

A representation from the general staff met with me a week later and refused my request. I promised to consider the proposed alternative although I believe that it was clear to all that the staff proposition did not meet the essence of the problem in any way. It was this meeting that was the turning point in my now clear understanding of the impossibility of working things out internally. It was also clear after I had taken some time to analyze what occurred at that meeting that it would be lack of respect for myself that would submit to another meeting of that caliber. So, although I am notifying the staff within the proper time I decided that I would write this position paper as my initial means of communicating my view. Ron was present at that meeting, more as an observer it seemed, and I think he should share its content with you.

Knowledge in the membership of such activities on the part of the staff is an important point. Positions of staff members and the rationale behind those decisions are a necessary part of democratic centralism. The organization will not grow if all these are kept secret. That an organization must mature to a certain level before this can be done is complete nonsense. If problems are aired they can be cleared up if they are kept hidden they will begin a process of decay. Such practices are endorsed in our society as policy by our enemy, the state.

As far as I can observe two major meetings participated in by members of the staff, namely the "PCAUR confrontation" and the joint meeting with BWC were reported to you incorrectly. Also the decision that Jack was to be liaison to BWC was never agreed upon by the staff and was to be announced as temporary (it was not) until a decision could be reached. These things could have been handled in a positive way and added to our revolutionary growth and experiences.

In a revolutionary organization discussions should be a measure for political development on the part of both staff and membership. Refusal to share at least the existence of problems and an honest rationale for decisions, including debates within the staff. Democratic centralism allows for a minority report. I feel the present policy not to disclose this information is lack of respect for persons in the membership, elitism, and a portrayal of real patronism of which I am so often accused. What but this could be the root reason in this organization for "cornering"?

Accusations spoken to me personally over the last several months were reaffirmed in my meeting with these staff representatives as I was labeled ultra-democratic, a spontaneist, patronizing, illusionary and sychophantic. It has since been pointed out to me that it is understood that the book club would have been an ultra-democratic fiasco if Sheila had not held it together all this time. It was stated that my politics and style have steadily declined and that my real problem is that I have had no experience in organizing. The political differences that prompted these remarks are included in this paper.

The meeting was an enlightening experience. I am glad to have had the opportunity, it forced me to do a great deal more thinking. The reason given that my leave of absence was refused: "It would set a precedent, we can't just have people coming and going". (The George Colman situation was not mentioned) and further "that MCLL is at a critical stage and I would not be able to make up the loss of political development." I presume from this type of logic that we will never again be able to have an expansion of the membership.

Aside from the political differences described in this paper there were other primary disagreements in a discussion of Nancy. I had indicated to her that I was asking for a leave of absence and some additional support with book club work because I was exhausted. This remark to her was termed by the group "a gross violation of political discipline". Yet the morning following our meeting, it was stated in a DIM staff meeting by Michelle to Jesse Christman, who was looking to buy another book, that I had dropped the book club, that the office was in the process of being moved and one couldn't know where a copy of Rawick's book could be found". DIM has been ordering books in bulk from CCC. Christman called me to say that he had heard there were some serious problems, was I alright ..could he help?

Also, within a matter of a few days, a derogatory quoted remark that Nancy was an unprincipled person, which was made in that closed meeting about Nancy found its way back to me, obviously with some questions, through general book club channels.

IV. POLITICAL DIFFERENCES

Reviewing my political analysis of major problems, I would offer the following considerations:

I stated in May of last year and still strongly believe that MCLL will never be a serious revolutionary organization until the MIC program or a similar program that relates to organizing in a workers community, within a working class perspective is implemented. I volunteered early last spring to spend some time in the community that surrounds Huber which I felt superceded in priorities the book club. A decision at that time by a vote, determined that the correct procedure should be first a statistical data analysis. My time and energy to relate to outside responsibilities has steadily declined since that time. I would have preferred to work with MIC after my responsibilities with the book club were complete.

The newspaper has been a fine disciplined product. If, however, it has no base nor foundation in the working class community such as MIC it will loose its purpose. Persons in the book club, the Alliance and similar contacts have already the means to such information as is communicated. The newspaper must be a suppliment to organizing, it cannot organize on its own. Our organizational papers read:

"In accordance with Maoist thought "theoretical production" and ideological refinements cannot be the main work of a revolutionary party. The measuring rod must be the level of practice, and practice must constitute more than the printing and distribution of newspapers and leaflets. We must develop with programs, activities and services responsive to the needs of working people in the plants, in the unions and in the community."

I worry about the future of MCLL if the MIC project is scraped without an alternative. We have been working on MIC for almost a year. I think our priorities have been wrong or non-existent. We had scheduled time on the week-end to discuss priorities but this as far as I know has never occurred. Conclusions that a project is impossible sometimes come from attempting to have all the answers before the questions can be concretely posed by the situation. There is also the other extreme of being unprepared which I am not advocating. One must however, go from the simple to the complex, most of all, one must begin. Parties are not organized out of the sky but from the workers.

2. We spend too much time in our staff meetings internalizing, speculating, and perfecting the abstract and not enough time in positive practice. Our organizing papers state:

"Plant and community projects must point the way to organizational activity."

We have reorganized the structure at least four times this year because things are not flowing properly. The revolution will not begin not even take shape with organizing secretaries around a discussion table. Needs and opportunities for correct procedure develop from actual practice in working class situations. The revolution will come from the masses and our work within the proletariat, the production workers. I'm afraid we are isolating ourselves and alienating the masses. We are spending too much of our lives in meetings and study to develop the perfect analysis in the abstract.

3. My primary disagreement comes however on the relationship of democracy to centralism in our organization. Often before major decisions are made that will affect the whole organization open and full discussion is necessary. All the membership and staff have had experiences that could apply to the shape of that decision before it is made. This kind of discussion can create unity. This would eliminate such gross errors as putting Jim Bish in the Anti-War section as we had done, or the tabling of MIC which was not put before the membership. Of course this could not apply to crises decisions. We should make an intensified effort to master the dialectical approach.

After the staff makes a decision, the rationale for that decision and differences between staff members on important issues should be aired. Democratic centralism uses broad democracy and cannot exist without it. It also allows the right of a minority report.

People cannot be forced to become revolutionaries. They cannot take a rational position without having time to apply dialectics. Confrontation politics will not do. "Cornering" would be eliminated as a concern and would cease to exist.

This whole process would develop strength, confidence, imagination and political understanding for all. I have been told the component structure suffices. I know that components seldom have material to assess before it goes to the staff unless their own project is involved. Persons in the A & P component did not even know that the MIC project was in jeopardy. History of the organization deems this has been the rule rather than the exception.

4. Intellectualism. Basic Marxist theory teaches that intellectuals speak from and to intellectuals and cannot organize workers without first going through an intense process of re-education. The intensity of intellectualism in MCLL is contrary to our organizational papers.

I question the educational schedule for orientation of new members where emphasis is placed on Mandel, Trotskyite intellectual, with no prior political readings for candidates as a basis for correct politics, no primary time has been spent with dialectics and history as a basis for interpretation of what is read. Not only is Mandel a Trot and difficult to read, but he is strictly an intellectual and endorses the intellectual position. This distorts and confuses our goals to new members.

When I asked Jack Russell why we are not reading more Mao, the response was that "China does not apply to our situation. China's was a peasant, not an urban revolution". It is my opinion that the Soviet experience was only a beginning and must be up-dated with the newer knowledge and experiences in China, Cuba and Vietnam. People's relationships and the handling of contradictions emphasized in China are VERY related to our problems of individuality and lack of unity in the organization.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO is fine but followed by six weeks of discussions on Mandel is hardly an introduction to working class organizing. This is the orientation schedule for new members. It is my opinion that this is in contradiction with our goals.

Our organizing papers call for working class revolution led by the proletariat..to the black vanguard and the building of a multi-national revolutionary party. Is this consistent with Mandel's analysis? What is the organizational position on China?

Our organizational papers warn of the dangers of intellectualism or organizational elitism and the pitfalls of theory without practice and lack of programs for workers.

IN CONCLUSION. The development of the concept of the Book Club from scratch, the commitment of time and energy, the necessary creativeness to implement the concept; to coordinate the tasks, to spend time with sincere fucked over people, just out there being screwed by our society who need someone to talk to; these meticulous exhausting tasks of the book club was something I had no doubt that I could do and did. The book club has had international implications. Requests for information, materials and aids to development of similar programs, or people from those programs have come from across the United States.

On the other hand, the internal battle over political principles and the ego based struggles in the organization must be overcome. I cannot win at this time by working internally but perhaps I can pass this struggle on to others, which is the purpose of this paper. I am absolutely exhausted and my request for a leave, after explaining the necessity in a most principled manner was turned down. I have neither the time nor the energy to give to being ground up.

Yet I feel a strong responsibility to other members. It concerns me that I am not able to take a stronger leadership towards an alternative. I hope that this paper will offer some insights and stimulate struggle against all incorrect tendencies.

In the meantime there are many positive alternative places that I can work, creative energy that I can offer in the continued development of the revolutionary process. My fears of being without an organization have been overcome. I look forward to beginning full time work in the fall with as much fervor as before.

The revolution will come, despite the pre-party forms that come and go in the white left. I will find my place, a place to give totally within a revolutionary party when it is the right time for me and my children. My sincere comrades will be with me.

On the other hand, I hope that MCLL will find a way to deal with its internal contradictions. The talents, the commitment, the history of practice, the sincerity of the members will not be lost but will continue to grow dialectically. I was asked why I feel that the membership works so hard if the policy is so incorrect. My answer is that persons are sincere and believe that revolution must come. Many were attracted to MCLL because they saw a previous history of practice on the part of many individuals who now form the organization. This has lent itself to a situation of trust. The organization must now master a new technique of working, learning and developing together in a correct political manner. Present policy and practice should be realigned and reoriented with the original purpose and organizing goals as the basis of a revolutionary party.

There will be the expected unity and opposites in MCLL growth and development, as unity with me manifested itself in one-to-one relationships within some of the staff and then became an opposite unity against me when I took a political position opposed to policy. The organization will continue to unify and divide until it works itself out.

I have listened and considered all that has been offered to me by my comrades. My decision has been well thought out.

At the meeting with general staff representatives subsequent to my request for a leave of absence until June, the following arrangements were explained to me. A new book club coordinator would begin in three weeks (by the 16th), I would be training that person and the office would then be moved. This gave me three week-ends off, if I was not working on book club business or preparing for the transfer. At this time I would be expected back in full participation with MCLL.

So, within this time schedule offered by MCLL staff and the "two weeks notice" determined within that meeting as appropriate "for Nancy or anyone" (I was objecting that Nancy's very livelihood, all other political considerations aside, depended on the book club) This was hardly a building of a new society. I here, within the spirit of my representatives, offer my two weeks notice to MCLL. This coincides with the organizational schedule run to me.

I feel strong bonds within the membership and some members of the general staff and intend to keep that relationship a growing and positive one. If any of this paper is offensive, or considered incorrect we should engage in dialogue. I would appreciate your criticism. I hope to be permitted to remain with the staff of the book club as extra support on book club seminar evenings or as a table leader. I hope that I have been able to explain satisfactorily, I feel positively that by making the decision to leave, I am not avoiding struggle that could be more fruitful if I remained within the organization. Only history will prove the correctness of my decision.

I see the changes as a means to offer the most positive contribution to the struggle over a long period of time; to respond to physical health demands for some rest, and for the further political development of myself and my children who will be revolutionaries at an even more intense time, and all of those with whom I am in contact. It is necessary for me to begin in a better way, to offer more, and to be more effective in our struggle against the enemy. I have been suffocated by conditions but now I am stimulated by the future.

WE ARE GOING TO WIN!

Joann Castle

February 15, 1972

To the General Staff of CCC,

The contradictions within MCLL, also affecting CCC, that have forced me into the position I am presently in, still have not been dealt with. The present attack by the organization has temporarily united those contradictory forces against me. My reasons for leaving MCLL were political not personal reasons.

My action of giving two of the planning group, the core of CCC, a copy of the CCC section of my position paper upon resignation from MCLL is easily explainable. Upon speaking with Hugh White at the seminar I realized that I was further confusing an already awkward situation and withheld the remainder of the papers.

More than a month ago I asked for a leave from MCLL and support in the Book Club, a new coordinator was to be named. A decision in that organization, unjustly I felt, was made that no one should know of the impending changes. I abided until my resignation, to that organizational decision. This is now under discussion in the planning committee.

The CCC paper was written as an internal document, the first of a five section paper. That section in isolation and read by persons who had little knowledge of the existing internal contradictions may have been confusing. My interpretation of the planning committee discussion on political organizing and sychophansy and whether it existed in the organization, was based on outside discussions with MCLL members and its meaning should not be imposed upon the other members of the planning committee.

The remainder of the CCC paper, difficult as it was to write, remains fact that can be supported. Any of the malicious innuendoes I am being accused of were definitely unintended. Working with the CCC program this past year and a half has been an enriching political experience. I feel especially close to the volunteer workers. Without their efforts and contributions we could have never accomplished the success that CCC has become. Their work was key.

All actions I have taken were non-antagonistic. Persons must learn to judge individuals by their practice not their way with words. Upon my practice I submit myself to the judgement of the general staff of CCC and to the MCLL membership and organizational staff, with whom I have not been afforded the opportunity to speak.

In the Struggle,

Joan Castle