

DETROIT REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT RECORDS

BOX 11 OF 16

FOLDER 10

CCC RESPONSE TO CASTLE
RESIGNATION

WORKING DRAFT

MCLL POSITION REGARDING CCC

February 14, 1972

Dear Planning Committee Members,

INTRODUCTION

The Motor City Labor League, as sponsors of Control, Conflict and Change, is compelled to make organizational response to the Feb. 8 paper written by Joann Castle. That paper, and a series of acts which have followed it and to which we shall address ourselves, have precipitated an organizational crisis in CCC. We must note, preliminarily that Joann, the coordinator of CCC, and Nancy Waggoner, s staff member of CCC-- both of whom are also on the Planning Committee-- have acted in a unilateral and divisive fashion. As this paper shall document: 1) both Joann and Nancy have acted in a manner that is unprincipled and contemptuous of CCC, and 2) Joann has done likewise with respect to the MCLL, an organization to which she belonged.

We recognize the hurt and pain, which to varying degrees we all share. We are, as an organization, personally aggrieved by the loss of a former comrade and by the lack of loyalty made manifest by the actions to which we shall speak. We do not take lightly nor are we insensitive to the scars that result from political struggle and from the objective conditions within which we have determined to struggle for socialist revolution.

We recognize and do pay tribute to the commitment, exemplary work assumption of administrative responsibility that has characterized much of the practice of both Joann and Nancy in CCC in the past. We recognize that our practice, organizationally, has been imperfect, and we have been and will continually be engaged in the much needed process of self-criticism and criticism.

At the same time, we point out our responsibility and commitment to the principled political resolution of the problems placed before us all. Our approach is not a personal one, but rather a political one. As the objects of untruths, distortions and innuendo, we direct this official statement to the Planning Committee.

Unlike those who precipitated the present conflict, we respect the integrity of the organizational role of this Committee. Throughout this paper we shall respond in detail to the falsehoods contained in Joann's February 8 letter and to the methods of distribution and other divisive tactics. But, fundamentally, we think it essential that we explicitly discuss the larger political questions raised by the current situation. Revolutionary movement grows or shrinks in a continuing process of struggle. We can only make this an opportunity for growth of MCLL and for CCC. The book club is a form developed by revolutionary organizations interrelating with serious individuals functioning in a manner consistent with our joint, perceived objectives for political growth. To examine all of this in a serious manner, the Planning Committee needs, we think, as full as possible a comprehension of CCC's historical origins and an explicit refutation of the mistruths and improper practices which we document herein.

ORGANIZATIONS: THEIR ACTIVITIES & RESPONSIBILITIES

We believe that the CCC Planning Committee in this crisis has three principal tasks and responsibilities: 1) to collect and review the relevant material; 2) to create a situation in which all parties to this CCC struggle can clearly present their positions; and 3) to take rapid and decisive action which will further the best interests of CCC.

There is a fundamental need to understand the inter-relationship between MCLL and CCC - and interrelationship that exists throughout the book club and in particular in this Planning Committee which is represented by our cadre, by Black Workers Congress cadre and by independents elected to the Committee by the independents in the General Staff of CCC.

To advance political understanding we offer our analysis, recognizing that subjective, divisive tactics create confusion rather than clarity.

Joann, a member of MCLL from its beginning, was assigned to the position of Coordinator of CCC first by Ad Hoc and then MCLL. Yet, it is clear that she perceived of CCC as "hers" rather than as an organization sponsored by MCLL, supported by the BWC, and comprised of several hundred individuals with a functioning GS and PC and a General Membership, many of whom were not politically affiliated.

Several points underscore her unpolitical perception and practice:

1. ON THE QUESTION OF WHO SUGGESTED, CREATED, IMPLEMENTED AND DEVELOPED CCC.

The statements of Joann's work are subjective and false. First, her work should have been perceived as MCLL and CCC work. While she and other cadre functioned in CCC, we also functioned in many other spheres complementary to a shared struggle for a socialist revolution. It is inaccurate to pit "me" (Joann) against "them" (MCLL). Joann did not throughout the first year "carry" the responsibility for the program almost totally." "For the first 5 months" Joann did not work basically "alone" and this understanding is contemptuous of the many hours of effort put forth by numerous other people. Yes, Joann had weighty responsibilities and was overextended. We, her then comrades, were too; we continue to be; and internally, as Joann well knows, we have been and are struggling with the organizational problem of overextended cadre, including her particular situation. Her entire tone of "me" this, "Nancy and I," "Michael and I" that, is misleading, untrue, unpolitical view of our lives and practice.

2. ON THE QUESTION OF HOW TO RECTIFY AND RESOLVE SERIOUS POLITICAL DIFFERENCES.

Throughout her paper Joann suggests that her efforts were subverted by MCLL cadre who are accused of a number of things: 1) laziness and a failure to work and support CCC; 2) political stupidity and obstructionism and the failure to understand CCC, help develop CCC, and the claim that cadre functioned as "consultants" who she was forced to simply tolerate.

These many accusations and insulting suggestions are totally false and again exemplify individualism and a non-comradely refusal to engage in principled political struggle. Let us expound by speaking to the conduct we see in evidence in her paper.

a. ON THE SUGGESTION THAT SHE WAS THWARTED BY MCLL AFTER INTERNAL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUGGLE AND ON HER UNWILLINGNESS TO PROCEED WITHIN CCC IN A PRINCIPLED AND POLITICAL MANNER.

As an assigned cadre of MCLL to CCC, owing principal political allegiance to MCLL, Joann had the responsibility of engaging in struggle within MCLL. Her practice is far short of that implicit by the action she has taken. This is exhibited by her February 8 letter.

1) She violated the most elemental principle of organizational responsibility by resigning from the organization

via her February 8 letter addressed not to MCLL but to the PC of CCC. She had not informed the MCLL of her intention to resign. We learned of her resignation only after her letter was distributed.

2) In like manner, she evinced organizational contempt toward CCC by not taking her differences or concerns to the PC.

3) In further support of her unwillingness to engage in principled and collective struggle with comrades, let us examine and then speak to the recent chronology of events, bearing in mind her failure at every juncture to consult and struggle with comrades:

a. On January 16, 1972 Joann requested that she be removed from the General Staff of MCLL and that she be relieved of her assignment to CCC by June or earlier. She expressly stated to us all that she requested these changes due to personal and family problems and specifically stated that this was not due to political differences about either our internal or external practice.

b. On Jan. 19, in a section meeting (an internal division of MCLL), Joann requested a leave of absence from MCLL (i.e., not attending organizational meetings) until June and asked that her only responsibility be continuance as coordinator of CCC until June or until such earlier time as we might be able to select a cadre-replacement as coordinator and remove the CCC office from her home.

c. On Jan. 20, the General Staff of MCLL discussed this request. The opinion was that Joann as a member of MCLL had played and should continue to play a crucial role in the continuing development of MCLL. Her contribution to CCC had been of utmost importance, but in fact if a choice had to be made her contribution to MCLL on the organizational level would in the long run be more beneficial to the continuing work of CCC without the day to day responsibilities.

d. On Jan. 26, in conformance with the Jan. 20 view, the General Staff suggested to Joann that she be replaced as coordinator as soon as practically possible and that she remain as an active member of MCLL after taking a three week leave of absence. Joann agreed with this proposal and asked that it be open for re-evaluation at her request, should she so desire, after the termination of the three week period. MCLL agreed to this. Joann then commenced her leave of absence during which time we heard nothing organizationally from her.

e. By Feb. 7, developments within MCLL allowed the assignment of Margaret Borys to the position of coordinator, and this decision was made as early as possible so as to assist Joann who, like all of our cadre, was clearly overextended.

• Thereafter, the following acts ensued;

FEBRUARY 7:

Planning Committee (PC) had a four hour meeting to discuss the political character of CCC. Joann attended for only 45 minutes. It was generally thought to be one of the most productive and political meetings held by the PC.

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

The generation of a new CCC Co-ordinator was communicated to Joann at the CCC GS preparation session. Joann agreed to come to a Section meeting (MCLL work group) scheduled for Thursday morning.

FEBRUARY 8:

Without discussion with MCLL comrades and without any communication to the CCC Planning Committee, Joann distributed two copies of her "history of CCC" with cover letters announcing her resignation from MCLL. These were given to two 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 wanted to make an announcement to the entire CCC membership concerning her resignation and thanking people for their support in her struggles.

FEBRUARY 9:

We learned of Joann's resignation from a member of the PC. We went to 630 Boston and requested copies of her letter. We informed all members of the PC of Joann's resignation.

Emergency session of the MCLL General Staff met late Wednesday night and discussed the events.

FEBRUARY 10:

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

The MCLL General Staff met. We engaged in a prolonged self-criticism/criticism of our individual and collective relationship with Joann. We called for an MCLL general membership meeting for Friday morning.

FEBRUARY 11:

At the general membership meeting we had a full discussion of Joann's papers. Then we turned to our course of action. There was unanimous agreement by individual voice vote on the general line which a response should take. We agreed that the membership would review a written response at the meeting on Sunday. We checked the mail and discovered that Nancy Waggoner and Judy Hines had unilaterally called a meeting of the "volunteer workers" of CCC and distributed Joann's paper to the CCC General Staff. By unanimous individual voice vote of all members present (two left for their jobs) MCLL decided 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.

We moved CCC to the LDC offices. We explained to Nancy Waggoner at 630 what our view of the situation was, trying to be sensitive to the inevitable confusion of the Castle children, explained matters to Joann when she returned and informed Nancy and Joann that we expected them to be at the Monday PC meeting to present their position. They replied at this point that their attendance is "unclear."

3. THE QUESTION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MCLL AND CCC.

There are a number of fundamental political questions raised by the content of Joann's paper and by her conduct during this recent period.

Perhaps the central contention is the nature of political "work." CCC is a mass form sponsored by a cadre organization. As such it provides several different areas and levels of political involvement: general membership, volunteer workers, general staff, hired staff, PAC, and planning. Such a structure is, of course, deliberate, and attempts to meet the differing levels of political experience, work capacities, time commitments and simple interest which will undoubtedly exist in any mass formation. Most will participate only as members, while others will wish to contribute more substantially.

As Joann herself observes, there have been a number of members who have found a place to work, grown, and moved to positions of increased responsibility. But no one level of work is ~~more~~ inherently more worthy from another. Without volunteer workers willing to spend long hours, CCC would not function as well as it does. Without politically experienced cadre willing to spend long hours, CCC would not develop into the essential and permanent revolutionary institution which it can become.

It is a misunderstanding to imply that those who volunteer to work should govern the political development of CCC.

MCLL has deliberately created forms - the general Staff, the organization of the Planning Committee with four independents --through which members and volunteers can increase their responsibility and influence as, through practice, development is increased and respect and political trust is built on all levels.

But MCLL will not abdicate its responsibilities as the primary sponsor of CCC. We will select its coordinator from our cadre, hire or dismiss its staff. We will, of course, discuss with the Planning Committee these questions, but we must decide. Other questions concerning the composition of the General Staff, the procedure of the sessions and the week by week functioning of CCC are the province of the Planning Committee.

In taking this position we are not lazy consultants maintaining our position by the work of others, but leadership who accept the implications of that responsibility. Anyone close to CCC knows the program would suffer irreparably at all levels without the dedicated work of MCLL cadre.

Finally, it should be observed that ^{there} ~~this~~ is not "constitution" of CCC, that no categories are necessarily permanent, and that there are areas where the relationship of MCLL to CCC will need to be worked out. Such is the nature of transitional forms.

ON THE QUESTION OF BWC PARTICIPATION ON THE P.C.

The first formulation for CCC came in discussions between Mike Hamlin and people from Ad Hoc. Instrumental in the implementation were Mike, Joann, Lynda Chabot, Sheila Murphy, Margaret Borys, Brian Flanigan, Sara Karfonta and others--under the sponsorship of Ad Hoc and the then League of Revolutionary Black Workers. The work included designing and printing the original brochure, mailings, selling books, processing the membership and bringing together the G.S.

Due to a major political split within the League of Revolutionary Black Workers over the summer Michael's responsibilities and priorities shifted. He could not spend as much time with CCC because of his role as Chairman of the Black Workers Congress and because the effects of the split took up incredible amounts of time. So the situation was not as we are led to believe in Joann's paper. The BWC changed its cadre assignment to the P.C. Michael left the P.C. Two other BWC cadre were assigned.

Due to time pressures in submitting this paper it is not possible to respond to every error in fact within Joann's letter. Nor is it possible to discuss the political implications of such errors.

As we said earlier in this paper - revolutionary movement grows or shrinks in a continuing process of struggle. The Constant self-critical evaluation is essential to this process. An examination of what constitutes principled criticism and behavior can be nothing but productive.

SS/Plott

MOTOR CITY LABOR LEAGUE POSITION PAPER

ON THE CONTROL, CONFLICT & CHANGE

CRISIS OF FEBRUARY, 1972

The Motor City Labor League, as primary sponsor of Control, Conflict and Change, is compelled to make an organizational response to the Feb. 8 paper written by Joann Castle. That paper and a series of acts which have followed it have precipitated an organizational crisis in CCC. We must note, preliminarily, that Joann, the coordinator of CCC, and Nancy Waggoner, a staff member of CCC -- both of whom are also on the Planning Committee -- have acted in a unilateral and divisive fashion. As this paper shall document: 1) both Joann and Nancy have acted in a manner that is unprincipled and contemptuous of CCC, and 2) Joann has done likewise with respect to the MCLL, an organization to which she belonged.

We are, as an organization, personally aggrieved by the loss of a former comrade and by the lack of loyalty made manifest by the actions to which we shall speak. We know full well that the political struggle imperative to our tasks will inevitably bring personal trauma. We bear scars. But for revolutionary socialists no bond of friendship, no concern for individual comrades, no misguided impulse to ignore the truth must ever prevent the full and principled resolution of differences within cadre organizations.

We recognize and do pay tribute to the commitment, exemplary work, and administrative excellence that has characterized much of the practice of both Joann and Nancy in CCC in the past. We recognize that our practice, organizationally, has been imperfect, and we have been and will continually be engaged in the much needed process of self-criticism and criticism.

At the same time, we reiterate our commitment to the resolution of the problems placed before us all. Our approach is not personal, but political. As the objects of untruths, distortions and innuendo, we direct this official statement to the Planning Committee.

Unlike those who precipitated the present conflict, we respect the integrity of the organizational role of this Committee. Throughout this paper we shall respond in detail to the falsehoods contained in Joann's February 8 letter and to the methods of distribution and other divisive tactics. We also think it essential to explicitly discuss the larger political questions raised by the current situation. We pledge ourselves to this.

We believe that the CCC Planning Committee in this crisis has three principal responsibilities: 1) to collect and review the facts; 2) to create a situation in which all parties to this

CCC struggle can clearly present their positions; and 3) to take rapid and decisive action which will further the best interests of CCC.

There is a fundamental need to understand the inter-relationship between MCLL and CCC - an inter-relationship that exists throughout the book club and in particular in this Planning Committee. (PC).

To advance political understanding we offer our analysis, recognizing that subjective, divisive tactics create confusion rather than clarity.

Joann, a member of MCLL from its beginning, was assigned to the position of coordinator of CCC first by Ad Hoc and then MCLL. Yet, it is clear that she perceived of CCC as "hers" rather than an organization sponsored by MCLL, supported by the BWC, and comprised of several hundred individuals with a functioning General Staff (GS) and PC and a General Membership.

Several points underscore her unpolitical perception and practice:

1. ON THE QUESTION OF WHO SUGGESTED, CREATED, IMPLEMENTED AND DEVELOPED CCC.

The statements of Joann's work are subjective and false. First, her work should have been perceived as MCLL and CCC work. It is inaccurate to pit "me" (Joann) against "them" (MCLL). Joann did not throughout the first year carry "the responsibility for the program almost totally." "For the first 5 months" Joann did not work basically "alone" and this understanding is contemptuous of the many hours of effort put forth by numerous other people. Yes, Joann had weighty responsibilities and was over-extended. We, her then comrades, were also and continue to be. Internally, as Joann well knows, we have been struggling with the organizational problem of over-extended cadre, including her particular situation. Her entire tone of "me" this, "Nancy and I," "Michael and I" that, is misleading, untrue, and an unpolitical view of our lives and practice.

2. ON THE QUESTION OF HOW TO RECTIFY AND RESOLVE SERIOUS POLITICAL DIFFERENCES.

Throughout her paper Joann suggests that her efforts were subverted by MCLL cadre who are accused of a number of things: laziness and a failure to work and support CCC; political stupidity and obstructionism and the failure to understand CCC; and the claim that cadre functioned as "consultants" who she was forced to simply tolerate.

These many accusations and insulting suggestions are totally false and again exemplify individualism and a non-comradely refusal to engage in principled political struggle.

3. ON THE SUGGESTION THAT SHE WAS THWARTED BY MCLL AFTER INTERNAL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUGGLE AND ON HER UNWILLINGNESS TO PROCEED WITHIN CCC IN A PRINCIPLED AND POLITICAL MANNER.

As an assigned cadre of MCLL to CCC, owing principal political allegiance to MCLL, Joann had the responsibility of engaging in struggle within MCLL. She did not do this in practice as is shown by her February 8 letter.

She violated the most elemental principle of organizational responsibility by resigning from the organization via her February 8 letter addressed not to MCLL but to the PC of CCC. She had not informed the MCLL of her intention to resign. We learned of her resignation only after her letter was distributed.

In like manner, she evinced organizational contempt toward CCC by not taking her differences or concerns to the PC.

In further support of her unwillingness to engage in principled and collective struggle with comrades, let us examine the recent chronology of events, bearing in mind her failure at every juncture to consult and struggle with comrades:

a. On January 16, 1972 Joann requested that she be removed from the General Staff of MCLL and that she be relieved of her assignment to CCC by June or earlier. She expressly stated to us all that she requested these changes due to personal and family problems and specifically stated that this was not due to political differences about either our internal or external practice.

b. On January 19, in a section meeting (an internal division of MCLL), Joann requested a leave of absence from MCLL (i.e., not attending organizational meetings) until June and asked that her only responsibility be continuance as coordinator of CCC until June or until such earlier time as we might be able to select a cadre-replacement as coordinator and remove the CCC office from her home.

c. On January 20, the General Staff of MCLL discussed this request. The opinion was that Joann as a member of MCLL had played and should continue to play a role in the continuing development of MCLL. Her contribution to CCC has been very important, but if a choice had to be made between CCC and MCLL, the best interests of both Joann and MCLL would require her continuing participation in the cadre organization.

d. On January 26, in conformance with the January 20 view, the General Staff suggested to Joann that she be replaced

as coordinator as soon as practically possible and that she remain as an active member of MCLL after taking a three week leave of absence. Joann agreed with this proposal and asked that it be open for re-evaluation at her request, should she so desire, after the termination of the three week period. MCLL agreed to this. Joann then commenced her leave of absence during which time we heard nothing organizationally from her.

e. By February 7, developments within MCLL allowed the assignment of Margaret Borys to the position of coordinator, and this decision was made as early as possible so as to assist Joann who, like all of our cadre was clearly overextended.

Thereafter, the following acts ensued:

FEBRUARY 7:

Planning Committee had a four hour meeting to discuss the political character of CCC. Joann attended for only 45 minutes. It was generally thought to be one of the most productive and political meetings held by the PC.

After this meeting, two members of the MCLL General Staff met with Margaret Borys and asked her if she would be willing to accept assignment as CCC coordinator. Margaret accepted thus completing the process which could free Joann from her CCC burdens as per her own request of January.

The generation of a new CCC coordinator was communicated to Joann at the CCC GS preparation session. Joann agreed to come to a section meeting (an MCLL work group) scheduled for Thursday morning.

FEBRUARY 8:

Without discussion with MCLL comrades and without any communication to the CCC Planning Committee, Joann distributed two copies of her "history of CCC" with cover letters announcing her resignation from MCLL. These were given to two 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 wanted to make an announcement to the entire CCC membership concerning her resignation and thanking people for their support in her struggles, but was persuaded not to by one of the Planning Committee members to whom she had distributed her document.

FEBRUARY 9:

We learned of Joann's resignation from a member of the PC. We went to 630 Boston and requested copies of her letter. We informed all members of the PC of Joann's resignation.

Emergency session of the MCLL General Staff met late Wednesday night and discussed the events.

FEBRUARY 10:

At the CCC section meeting (of MCLL CCC cadre) Joann distributed her completed statement on MCLL to Jack, Sharon, Sheila, and Margaret. Agreement was reached on the transfer of functions. Agreement was reached that the basic equipment of CCC would be removed from Joann's by Saturday, February 12.

The MCLL General Staff met. We engaged in a prolonged self-criticism/criticism of our individual and collective relationship with Joann. We called for an MCLL general membership meeting for Friday morning.

FEBRUARY 11:

At the general membership meeting we had a full discussion of Joann's papers. Then we turned to our course of action. There was unanimous agreement by individual voice vote on the general line which a response should take. We agreed that the membership would review a written response at the meeting on Sunday. We checked the mail and discovered that Nancy Waggoner and Judy Hines had unilaterally called a meeting of the "volunteer workers" of CCC and distributed Joann's paper to the CCC General Staff. By unanimous individual voice vote of all members present (two left for their jobs) MCLL decided 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.

We moved CCC to the LDC offices. We explained to Nancy Waggoner at 630 what our view of the situation was, trying to be sensitive to the inevitable confusion of the Castle children, explained matters to Joann when she returned and informed Nancy and Joann that we expected them to be at the Monday PC meeting to present their position. They replied at this point that their attendance was "unclear."

FEBRUARY 13:

An MCLL general membership meeting gave approval to the initial draft of our statement to the CCC Planning Committee. We decided that a delegation of three should go to the meeting called by Waggoner and Hines and that they should read a statement expressing MCLL's view that "the calling of this meeting, the method of selection, and the disregard for the Planning Committee of CCC and the organization as a whole is unfortunate and unprincipled behavior." This was done and a statement distributed to all present at the Waggoner/Hines meeting.

FEBRUARY 14:

At an eight-hour, two session meeting of the Planning Committee,

MCLL presented a working draft of its position paper in which we did accept certain of the criticisms made by Joann but systematically rejected and deflated most of them. After a minimal oral response by Joann, a lengthy questioning of Joann and Nancy Waggoner ensued. Despite their general vagueness and reluctance to meet questions squarely, it was clearly established in the minds of most that Nancy and Joann had been dishonest, that their indictment of MCLL was unfounded, and that they had consciously been acting in a divisive manner. The following actions were taken by the Planning Committee:

- 1) The PC concurred unanimously with the appointment of Margaret Borys as CCC coordinator.
- 2) Joann resigned as a member of the GS at the recommendation of the PC.
- 3) Nancy resigned as a paid member of the staff.
- 4) By unanimous decision (Nancy abstained), Nancy was released from participation on the PC.
- 5) With one dissenting vote, Nancy was released from participation on the GS.
- 6) Judy Hines is to be asked to appear before the PC to have an opportunity to present a statement regarding her actions so that the PC can make a decision on this matter.

The PC assigned two members (both independents) to draft a PC statement to the general staff; MCLL agreed to make no statement to CCC until the PC draft could be evaluated.

FEBRUARY 17:

The PC draft is amended and approved. BWC cadre took no organizational position on the paper because they were awaiting an MCLL communication before deciding. The proposed CCC GS special meeting was moved from Tuesday, February 22 to Friday, the 25th, so that BWC could reach an organizational position on the entire matter prior to the GS meeting.

4. ON THE QUESTION OF SECTARIANISM

It should be stated that there is a fundamental distinction between legitimate political differences and "sectarian criticism." Joann refers to "sectarian attitudes left over from Ad Hoc toward PCAUR when persons from both organizations were closely associated." We would characterize the situation between Ad Hoc and PCAUR as one in which a legitimate political and organizing difference emerged.

Following the murder of Charles Calloway by Ronald Gedda, a Detroit cop in the Second Precinct where PCAUR is located, PCAUR began to organize as did Ad Hoc. PCAUR's approach was community oriented. Ad Hoc took the position that community based demos would not (a) mobilize significant numbers of people

throughout the city and (b) could not bring the proper pressure on the power structure to even expose the bankruptcy of the Detroit Police Department (DPD), the mayor or the "civil libertarians" within and without the DPD. Ad Hoc deferred to PCAUR because Ad Hoc was not opposed to community orientation and indeed supported the demonstration in the Second Precinct.

5. ON THE QUESTION OF "ANOTHER PAPER WRITTEN ON THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK CLUB" AND REFERENCES TO SYCOPHANCY.

Joann's paper suggests that another document has been written that provides a lengthy history of CCC. The paper referred to is actually a one-page writing entitled "Some Notes on the Political History of CCC and the Current Tasks of Its Planning Group." Joann ignores the context of the discussion, significantly misquotes the passage cited and completely misrepresents the discussion had in the PC. We only wish that Joann had been better able to distinguish between personal and comradely criticisms made in private discussions with her and statements made in reference to the organization, CCC.

The writer of "Some Notes" felt that sycophancy, although not predominant in CCC, was a problem -- one that needed more attention than it was getting. A simple, and we believe correct, statement was made: "But whatever the character of the Black participation in CCC, it was inevitable that certain aspects of the predominant liberal white attitude toward Blacks (e.g. sycophancy) would emerge and be problematic. This dynamic requires our continuing attention."

The statement does not seem controversial to us. The discussion that ensued in the PC was anything but fractious or threatening. Joann, who was present less than one hour of that four hour meeting, falsely characterized the discussion.

What did occur? Sheila Murphy put forth a perspective on the nature of political organizing. This perspective was a bit cumbersome so she asked Committee members if they felt, yes or no, that political organizing had occurred in CCC, and why. ("Sycophancy" was not even a part of the question framed). Thereafter, an excellent discussion followed.

6. ON THE QUESTION OF BWC PARTICIPATION ON THE PLANNING COMMITTEE.

The first formulation for CCC came in discussions between Mike Hamlin and people from Ad Hoc. Instrumental in the implementation were Mike, Joann, Lynda Chabot, Sheila Murphy, Margaret Borys, Brian Flanigan, Sara Karfonta and others -- under the sponsorship of Ad Hoc and the then League of Revolutionary Black Workers. The work included designing and printing the original brochure, mailings, selling books, processing the membership and bringing together the General Staff.

Due to a major political split within the League of Revolutionary Black Workers over the summer Michael's responsibilities and priorities shifted. He could not spend as much time with CCC because of his role as Chairman of the Black Workers Congress and because the effects of the split took up much of his time. So the situation was not as we are led to believe in Joann's paper. The BWC changed its cadre assignment to the PC. Michael left the PC. Two other BWC cadre were assigned.

Once again we see factual and tonal misrepresentations found in Joann's paper. The Chairman of the Black Workers Congress, a national organization with chapters throughout this country, could not be expected to function as a PC member. The situation was not as suggested in Joann's paper and it is ludicrous to suggest that Michael left the PC because of lack of unity, troublesome group dynamics, the failure of PC to formulate efficacious solutions, hostilities or a lack of understanding by individuals of the administrative operations of CCC. Genuinely political people are always growing, and this often means assuming new and more important responsibilities. There is a fundamental misconception of this process, we believe, and we shall speak to it shortly.

We get the sense from Joann's paper that she misperceives the political and organizational role of first, the League of Revolutionary Black Workers, and now, the Black Workers Congress, in much the same way she personalizes rather than politicizes her relationship to both CCC and MCLL. This is attributable to her references to Michael in her paper and her suggestion that he resigned from the PC for reasons which he himself never raised--which would reflect an anti-struggle practice--and her total silence as to Michael's BWC responsibilities. Further, so far as we know, Joann also acted contemptuously as to BWC by failing (once again) to struggle or confer with their designated cadre assigned to the Planning Committee of CCC.

7. ON THE QUESTION OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE EARLY ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MCLL AND CCC.

We note at the outset the allegation stated: "I can rightfully be accused by summer, as referring to the group as 'consultants' with no base in practice." It is now late the following winter when this reference, for the very first time surfaces. What type of political leader writes such a condescending statement and what does it mean that the coordinator of a program, supposedly struggling with comrades, makes such a divisive criticism not openly, but sub rosa. To whom was the criticism made?

The Planning Committee has gone thru a number of stages. It would be constructive to rigorously analyze each of the stages, the reasons for the evolution, and the individual practice of all involved, but no such analysis appears in Joann's paper. Rather there are simply numerous suggested broadsides. We accept the criticism that

some tasks were not done. We reject the notion that this was a consistent pattern.

The initial planning group was formally constituted shortly after CCC began, and it was comprised of people from MCLL, LRBW and others. For the first month (January, 1971) there were three persons not in either cadre organization on the PC, and two of these persons were in MCLL by May, 1971; the third left the PC in one of the reassignments of personnel. There were, in fact, a number of reassignments of MCLL cadre on and off the PC. This reflected the maturing and sometimes confusing process thru which any emerging political form must pass.

It is both misleading and unpolitical to state that Sheila excluded Nancy from the Planning Committee. The personal reference, again, guises the political process, both with respect to CCC and the PC. At the time referred to, the PC was comprised of cadre from both organizations plus one unaffiliated person who shortly thereafter came into MCLL. MCLL had not yet surfaced. It is central to a political analysis of this process to comprehend the complexities of building a cadre organization and simultaneously developing and maintaining a highly successful mass educational form.

We always have had the objective of building the relationship between our organization and serious, political people willing and able to interrelate through CCC as well as other forms. In the book club, this process was effectuated, in part, in September, 1971, when the PC was redefined. By that time we had matured and relationships had developed in a manner that made it appropriate, in our judgment, to expand the political participation of independent persons in CCC. That redefinition was formulated by the then MCLL-BWC-comprised PC so as to include four elected independent members from the General Staff of CCC. Moreover, at a discussion then held in the Planning Committee Sheila welcomed the possibility that Nancy would run as an independent.

8. ON THE POLITICAL QUESTION: THE CURRENT ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MCLL AND CCC.

We do not assert that our practice has always been beyond reproach. We do assert that it has been principled, conscious and mostly correct. We assume responsibility for our activities in CCC and invite all to address their criticisms to us.

In our judgment Joann is seriously deficient in her understanding of the question of leadership and democracy. Our criticism is highlighted by her emphatic and capitalized sentence which reads: "THE MAJORITY OF VOLUNTEER WORK IN THE PROGRAM HAS ALWAYS BEEN DONE BY NON-MCLL MEMBERS." We shall state the facts and principles from which our assessment of this question flows:

a) Perhaps the central contention is the nature of political "work." CCC is a mass form sponsored by a cadre organization. As such it provides several different areas and levels

of political involvement: general membership, volunteer workers, general staff, hired staff, Political Action Committee (PAC), and planning. Such a structure is, of course, deliberate, and attempts to meet the differing levels of political experience, work capacities, time commitments and simple interest which will undoubtedly exist in any mass formation. Most will participate only as members, while others will wish to contribute more substantially.

b) As Joann herself observes, there have been a number of members who have found a place to work, grown, and moved to positions of increased responsibility. But no one level of work is inherently more worthy than another. Without volunteer workers willing to spend long hours, CCC would not function as well as it does. Without politically experienced cadre willing to spend long hours, CCC would not develop into the essential and permanent revolutionary institution which it can become.

c) It is absurd to imply that those who volunteer to work should govern the political development of CCC.

d) MCLL has deliberately created forms - the General Staff, PAC, the organization of the Planning Committee with four independents - through which members and volunteers can increase their responsibility and influence as, through practice, development is increased and respect and political trust is built on all levels.

e) But MCLL will not abdicate its responsibilities as the primary sponsor of CCC. We will select its coordinator from our cadre, hire or dismiss its staff, and develop the primary political direction of CCC. We will, of course, discuss with the Planning Committee these questions, but we must decide. Should any major resistance to our decisions in these areas be raised by any member of the PC, MCLL will very seriously rethink its position. Other questions concerning the composition of the General Staff, the procedure of the sessions, and the week by week functioning of CCC are the province of the Planning Committee.

f) In taking this position we are not lazy consultants maintaining our position by the work of others, but leaders who accept the implications of that responsibility. Anyone close to CCC knows the program would suffer irreparably at all levels without the dedicated work of MCLL cadre.

g) Finally, it should be observed that there is no "constitution" of CCC, that no categories are necessarily permanent, and that there are areas where the relationship of MCLL to CCC will need to be worked out. Such is the nature of transitional forms.

9. ON QUESTIONS OF DEMOCRACY AND ULTRA-DEMOCRACY.

We consider some of Joann's actions and some of the implied positions in her paper ultra-democratic. We should define the concept and indicate why we think Joann's practice is ultra-democratic.

Ultra-Democrats hold that everybody has essentially the same capacities; where small differences do exist, they view the primary task as the equalization of the levels of development rather than the continued growth of both, a growth which may well preserve or even extend the "development gap" but will also add to the total capacity being brought against the enemy.

Ultra-Democrats believe that no process need be alienating -- it is only our "bad practice," our "faulty characters," which keep us here and now from eliminating alienation. They would be shocked to learn that even socialism will not eliminate alienated labor because they do not understand the structural sources of alienation and conflict. Our tasks and our survival require that we be hard-assed, and being hard-assed is an act of responsibility.

Ultra-Democrats think that conflicts are only the result of personality conflicts and not antagonism based on real and principled political differences. "Since we all want the same thing and since people are basically good, these conflicts we have must be because of a few bad apples." Thus they tend in practice to make petulant attacks on leadership, both because they are the easiest targets (they are out front) and simply because they are leadership.

Ultra-Democrats recognize no real lines of authority and command, or if they do, believe that these lines may be violated at the least suspicion that leadership may be in error. Thus their acceptance of collective discipline is always accidental -- it's simply that for the while they may agree with the course of things; with their first serious difference with collective perspective, their acceptance of discipline is suspended.

Ultra-Democrats are extreme individualists and super-voluntarists. They tend to see all things as immediately possible if only we can shed our "petty, bickering" selves and act. They tend to see themselves in heroic terms, issuing calls to the masses, seizing the time, speaking truth to authority, shaking the empire with the purity of their motive.

When conflicts arise in an organization infected with ultra-democrats, the natural extension of their individualism is the unprincipled, often covert, attack of leadership. Their sense of responsibility is only abstract; let any difficult reality intrude, let any real conflict arise, and ultra-democrats collapse back into unfettered individuals.

A careful reading of Joann's letter and a review of her recent conduct should make their ultra-democratic character clear:

- 1) She refused to struggle, concealing both the substance of most of her criticisms and her intention to resign. When confronted with the distortions of her letter at the February 14 Planning Committee meeting, she was evasive in the extreme.

- 2) She implies that MCLL has -- save herself -- been

non-working commandist directors in CCC, that the real work was done by non-MCLL people, and that they should be the one's who run the program -- all despite the fact that MCLL, itself, created the means by which independents could begin to exercise more and more legitimate authority in CCC.

3) Without ever having had the courage and good practice to raise many of her criticisms of Sheila Murphy and other MCLL leadership, she nevertheless openly denounced them in a document given to comrades not in MCLL.

4) She apparently knew of Nancy Waggoner and Judy Hines attempt to "organize" divisively in CCC General Staff, an attempt which totally rejected the legitimacy of the PC, and yet she did nothing to dissuade them.

5) The entire tone of Joann's paper, the contention that she virtually created CCC, the consistent magnification of her role, her capacities, her political understanding -- all are clearly the egocentricity characteristic of ultra-democrats.

10. ON THE QUESTION OF SHEILA MURPHY.

We have expressed our belief that a great deal of Joann's paper and actions are predicated upon a deep subjectivity. One can discern that much of this flows from personal animus that Joann feels toward Sheila. No one need arbiter personal differences between political people; but when one of our comrades is personally attacked under the guise of political criticism, we are obliged to not only answer the "political" claims, but to also express our full support to the cadre challenged: Sheila Murphy is a comrade and a revolutionary and an attack on her is an attack on all of us. We are proud of her political history and practice, and her political legitimacy can never be put to serious challenge by the actions of those who fail to properly understand the role and costs of leadership.

Working draft of Planning Committee response to present crisis in CCC.

INTRODUCTION

Control, Conflict and Change is an important part of the people's struggle in Detroit. The members of the Planning Committee (PC), the body responsible for the ongoing functioning of CCC, view Joann Castle's February 8 letter of resignation from MCLL and her release from coordinator of CCC, per her request, and subsequent events as particular aspects of that struggle. We feel Joann, Nancy Waggoner and Judy Hines acted irresponsibly and effected divisive feelings within CCC. It is our responsibility to respond to this crisis, clarify it, and to work to see that it contributes to positive growth in our collective struggle.

The growth and development of CCC is a dialectical process. Changes continually occur; questions arise and we work to see through and to actively respond to them. In order for us to work out this crisis, the PC wants to articulate our understanding of a number of relationships in CCC.

- X 1. The Motor City Labor League, a revolutionist democratic centralist organization, is the primary sponsoring group of CCC. This role carries with it three major responsibilities:
 - A. Development of the primary political direction of CCC.
 - B. Selection of an MCLL member to act as coordinator of CCC.
 - C. Selection of the paid staff of CCC.
2. The Black Workers Congress is the secondary sponsoring organization and basically maintains supportive roles and responsibilities.

3. The PC is a 10 member body responsible for the functioning and form of CCC. It is also responsible for and to the General Staff (GS), the Practical Action Committee (PAC) and all other components of the CCC program. The PC is composed of four MCLL members, two BWC members and four independent members voted to it from the independent GS. The organizational members represent organizational positions on major issues. The independent members are meant to represent positions and interests of non-organizational affiliated people. We all represent the full membership.

The PC for the last month has been intensely involved with numerous questions on CCC staff, interrelationships of ourselves with the general membership and the GS, PAC, etc., and the continuing ~~team~~ of CCC. This work is incomplete, but must be done quickly. It is in the midst of this work that the present struggle arose.

New Paragraph

WHAT HAS HAPPENED

1. Monday, February 7: Regularly scheduled meeting of PC where for four hours those present discussed the political character of CCC. At this time, the PC had not been notified of a possible change in the coordinator and office location for CCC.

Following the PC meeting, two of MCLL's representatives to the PC met with Margaret Borys and asked her if she would be willing to accept assignment as CCC coordinator; Margaret accepted this assignment. Thus, a request made by Joann to MCLL in January, that she be relieved of the responsibility that she had assumed for a year and a half and that had exhausted her energies, was fulfilled. ~~additional sentence~~ X

2. Tuesday, February 8: Joann distributed to two independent members of the PC, Hugh White and Sandy Buist, her three page document on the history of CCC with its accompanying cover letter. Joann's intention, as stated to the PC on 2/14, was to distribute the document to all PC members that evening and to make a statement to the entire membership concerning her leaving as coordinator and to thank people for their support. However, Hugh suggested this matter should come before the PC first; a statement was not made and no more copies of the document were distributed that evening.

3. Wednesday, February 9: Nancy Waggoner and Judy Hines mailed copies of Joann's document, with an additional cover letter of their own, to all members of the GS of CCC.

4. During this week from Tuesday evening through Saturday, PC members received the document from Joann.

5. Thursday, February 10: Nancy and Judy called for a meeting of selected persons from the PC, GS, and general membership who do volunteer work. That meeting was scheduled for Sunday evening, February 13.

6. Friday, February 11: MCLL removed CCC records and materials from 630 W. Boston and set up temporary office at 510 1/2 Monore (LDC office). This move had been scheduled for Saturday, February 12 by agreement between Joann and MCLL but the above events prompted MCLL to proceed a day earlier.

7. Sunday, February 13: Meeting of volunteers was held at which time participants raised questions concerning the relationship of MCLL to CCC as a sponsoring organization, the role of the PC and the lack of communication between the PC and the GS. (It is our intention to answer those questions in this paper.) X

8. Monday, February 14: Meeting of the PC where for over eight hours members engaged in discussion, analysis, self-criticism, and criticism. Joann and Nancy were given an opportunity to

explain their actions of the past week; they were asked to make any statements they felt would help us to understand their positions. The following decisions were reached at this meeting:

A. The PC concurred unanimously with the appointment of Margaret Borys as CCC coordinator.

B. Joann resigned as a member of the GS at the recommendation of the PC.

C. Nancy resigned as a paid member of the staff.

D. By unanimous decision (Nancy abstained), Nancy was released from participation on the PC.

E. With one dissenting vote (~~Nancy abstained~~), Nancy was released from participation on the GS.

F. Judy Hines is to be asked to appear before the PC to have an opportunity to present a statement regarding her actions so that the PC can make a decision on this matter.

X It was expressed to Joann and Nancy the hope that they will remain members of CCC and will continue to participate in the Staff educationals. ~~We recognized the tremendous amount of time both have put into CCC, at subsistence pay. Because of the knowledge they possess of the tasks necessary to the day-to-day functioning of CCC, we hope they will volunteer their services in the continuing work of CCC.~~ *Added sentence*

WHY HAS THIS HAPPENED

The causes of the present crisis in our struggle can be best identified and analyzed through the process of personal and collective self-critical evaluation. We in the PC have done and are doing this. This process, however, would be incomplete and incorrect if it did not involve all of us who are a part of CCC.

In response to the question "Why has this happened?", we offer the following results of our self-critical evaluation:

1. All people's practice and development are different. This is true both quantitatively and qualitatively. In the growth of CCC the individuality of people has been expressed in many ways. People have moved from the general membership to doing volunteer work, to the GS, to PAC, to the PC and moved within these. People have moved based on their experience and practice. CCC requires many kinds of work to exist and function. Most importantly, it needs to be recognized that all people cannot do all things. Time, energy, ability, experience and practice determine what individuals can and should do.

2. Alienation does exist amongst many individuals within the many forms for doing work in CCC. Open communication has been lacking by oversight and no intent. All of us have been lax in our responsibility to initiate the raising of questions and

articulating of problems when we sense them. Independent members, in particular, of the GS and PC have taken little or no initiative to do political organizing among themselves so that independent input into the whole program and process of CCC is more meaningful. We must not, however, confuse real input, communications and organizing with ultra-democracy. The individualism that is dominant in ultra-democracy must be struggled with and overcome so that our individuality contributes to a collective struggle.

3. CCC has gone through tremendous growth and development in its short life. The work of the PC has not kept pace with this process. We realize this and are working to overcome it. Forms for doing work and the nature of interrelationships need to be clarified and strengthened.

4. The discipline of people doing work within CCC and all its forms is inadequate. People's practice is generally bad. CCC is a serious part of the struggle in Detroit and the nation. Our level of discipline needs to equal that seriousness of the task before us.

These criticisms are intentionally void of personal, individualistic dynamics. They do not deal with specific personal differences because we view this as unprincipled politically and incorrect. We offer them in the spirit of a socialist revolutionary struggle and hope they contribute to our positive collective growth.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE

One of the desires expressed by the volunteers at Sunday night's meeting was that there be no further alienation among the staff. Because for some the book club is the only organization in which they can comfortably engage in struggle, they felt it imperative that the book club continue. The PC feels equally as strong about that very thing and we believe this is the sincere desire of all our members.

We of the PC see the following as our immediate responsibilities:

1. Make a concerted effort to see that the mechanisms for input to the PC already in existence be used. We wish to see dialogue between independents and their representatives on the PC and to convey that any member can by letter or personal contact request an appearance before the PC.
2. Continue to make decisions regarding the composition of the GS, the day-to-day operations and procedure of seminars, and the political form, recognizing that MCLL will maintain its responsibility of the primary political direction of CCC, for selecting the coordinator from its membership and the hiring and dismissal of the paid staff. MCLL acknowledges that the PC is a working body and that should there be serious disagreement among the PC