

with any of their decisions, MCLL would reevaluate its position.

3. A continuation of discussion in the PC about the political form of CCC and the role of its participants in the context of the increased dialogue already discussed.

4. Give direction and support to the continued growth of PAC as it takes on the task of preparing the monthly CCC Update, securing volunteer workers, and identifying and responding to crises and situations around which real practical action can occur.

5. Issue a call to volunteers and staff to make themselves available to get day-to-day operations moving following this disruption.

6. Begin to develop a program for CCC III.

We accept the criticism that not all members of the GS have assumed their two minimal responsibilities, that is, attendance at the preparation session and attendance at the seminar. Indeed, if some GS members see their participation as something less than crucial to the maintenance of CCC, it is because there has been a lack of direction on the part of the PC. As we soon reach some conclusions in our PC discussions about the political role of CCC, etc., and relay these conclusions to the GS, it will be made clear the importance of the responsibilities we see for all GS members.

However, it is a misunderstanding to think that GS members who do not do volunteer work are not doing important work necessary to the growth and development of CCC, or to think that those who volunteer to work should govern the political direction of CCC. There are different levels of political development, time commitments, work capacities and abilities and interest among the membership of CCC and, hence, different work forms within CCC and its sponsoring organizations to accommodate these differences.

This has been a confusing, difficult time for us all. But revolutionary movements can grow through such political struggle as their participants increase their political consciousness. ~~We, therefore, ask you to look beyond personal friendships, realizing how painfully difficult this is, to resume our struggle for socialist revolution.~~ ?

Dear Planning Committee Member,

The unilateral and unprincipled actions of Joann Castle and Nancy Waggoner have precipitated a crisis in the program for which we are responsible. It is imperative that the Planning Committee 1) collect and feview the facts, 2) create a situation in which all parties to the debate can clearly present their positions, and 3) take the rapid and decisive action which the best interests of CCC require.

As the p~~ri~~mary sponsoring organization of CCC ~~and~~ as the object of untruths, distortions, innuendo, unsubstantiated allegation, and simple misquotation on the part of Joann Castle, the Motor City Labor League has decided that it must make this official statement to our comrades on the CCC Planning Committee. We intend to deal forthrightly and in detail with the content of Joann Castle's letter; but we also consider it essential that we explicitly discuss the larger political questions which are raised by the current situation. For however sad and personally troubling this crisis may be, there is a real way in which it provides us all -- Planning Committee, General Staff, and General Membership -- with the opportunity for a fundamental political advance.

A number of basic political questions are raised both by the content of Joann's paper and by her conduct during the past week. First, Joann has violated the most elemental principles of organizational responsibility, vis-a-vis both MCLL and the PC of CCC. This should be obvious. To resign without notification from an organization which has been making every effort to lessen



her burdens, to do so with a document which systematically distorts the truth -- such <sup>conduct</sup> speaks for itself. One gathers from Joann's paper that she waged long, deliberate struggle in MCLL. Any of our cadre will indicate this is untrue. Few of her contentions were even raised organizationally in MCLL. But her attitude toward the PC is even more troubling. Why did she not indicate her differences about CCC to the PC? Why did she not use the opportunity of the Monday meeting to struggle? Why did she distribute the letter as she did? Why did she almost make her unilateral announcement on Tuesday? And was Joann a participant in Nancy's and Judy's call for a meeting and mailing to the GS of CCC? These are questions she must answer.

But more importantly, it is clear from her paper that Joann fundamentally misunderstands the role of MCLL in CCC, and, more generally, the necessary and logical divisions of political work within the program.....

to be continued. (JR)

[ & of Black Vanguard ideology ]  
 Virtues of CCC.

- ① What constitutes struggle - consistent maintenance of one's political position. See Richard's Planning group + MCLL.
- ② Dick, Peter self-crit-crit. Review are accurate.
- ③ JTC + NW focus of indictment.
- ④ Summation.

- ① Nature of pol. work - conceptual pol. work is as imp as activity of producing mailings. Who are the workers of CCC.
- ② Why we are pol. leadership of CCC - MCLL + its bureaucratic function + for pol. direction of CCC. Logic of this series, PAC. We believe in more work.

4

In speaking to her role in the formation of and to her responsibility to the ongoing program in paragraphs 2-6, Joann minimizes the role of organizations and individuals in this process. It is true that Joann did dedicate a large number of hours over a long period of time to CCC, and without this time and dedication the success of CCC would not have been possible. However, there was a sincere and productive attempt to aid Joann on all levels on the part of many. This support was visible not only in the physical contribution of work, but also an ongoing participation on the part of many concerning the direction, purpose and content of the program. Her contention that she was "alone" is not only an expression of extreme individualism but also an insult to those organizations and individuals who were sincerely and consistently offering their support to Joann as coordinator.

It is true that Joann did a great deal of work but unfortunately often there was a misuse of energies, but not through conscious intention or slothfulness. This misuse of energies can be attributed to many factors: the mammoth task at hand; the newness of the operation; the confusion surrounding the role of the Planning Committee (PC); the inability of persons to give long, uninterrupted portions of their time; and at times Joann's inability to organize the available energies.

Joann's individualistic perception of the inception of CCC is totally fallacious. The idea of the book club was not the result of conversations held between two people. The need for a mass political educational program was one expressed by many individuals and groups in Detroit. The concept of a book club is not a new one having a long history as a useful form for political education. ~~The use of this form to meet a generally understood need, in fact,~~

X

| . ?

~~came up in a discussion between Mike Hamlin, Sheila Murphy, Lynda and Chabot. Joann entered the process when it was submitted to Ad Hoc and implementation began.~~

Instrumental in the implementation were Margaret Borys, Brian Flanigan, and Sara Karfonta, in addition to Joann, Sheila <sup>numerous other ppl.</sup> and Mike. The work included designing and printing the initial brochure, mailings, selling books, processing the membership, and bringing together the GS.

Shortly after the first session, the Planning Committee was formed.

The initial PC was faced with numerous questions, but pressing immediate fundamental issues- the most basic being the role of the Planning Committee. The first area of consideration was that of consolidation of the General Staff. However, this was short-lived in the face of coordinating administrative questions. Planning Committee meetings were all too swiftly taken up with discussions concerning things such as attendance, where the book table should be, etc. Participating in these discussions were administrative persons working in these areas whose needs were real, but unfortunately the PC was not the level at which such decisions could and should be made. The result was that the PC was not dealing with what it should, and what it was dealing with, it could not handle in the most effective manner.

There were CCC organizational questions addressed in a secondary manner. These included: a discussion of goals and purpose; CCC II; the summer program; a possible satellite program; the GS educational and most importantly, the formulation of a new PC.

The events leading up to the changing of the coordinator for

CCC are clear. On Jan. 16, Joann requested removal from the General Staff of MCLL which was agreed to. The reasons given by Joann in a straight-forward manner were those of time and specifically not political, external, differences cited in the first paragraph of her letter. Help with day to day responsibilities was not requested as she asserts in paragraph 23.

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 to remain as coordinator of CCC.

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.

*summary  
B. A.  
2/1/71*

In the light of this assessment, on Jan. 26, the General Staff proposed to Joann that she would be replaced as coordinator of CCC as soon as practically possible and could remain as a member of MCLL with a three week leave of absence. At the end of the three weeks, a reassessment would occur. By Feb. 7, developments within MCLL allowed the assignment of Margaret Borys to position of coordinator. Joann was informed of this and agreed with it.

On Feb. 8, Joann's paper went out.



In relation to factual and tonal misrepresentations found in paragraph 11 -- we should first speak to Michael Hamlin's role as a Planning Committee member. 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 as his role of Chairman of the Black Workers Congress and the effects of the split took up incredible amounts of time. <sup>So</sup> the situation was not as we are led to believe in Joann's paper that because of a lack of PC unity, problematic group dynamics, ineffective solutions offered, hostilities, or lack of understanding by individuals of the administrative operations of CCC Mike left.

For a moment let's look at the charges laid against the Planning Committee in this document. A brief history of the PC may provide a coherent frame in which to answer these accusations. A planning group was formally constituted shortly after CCC began. It was originally (as stated earlier) composed of people from MCLL, LRBW, and others. For the first month (Jan. 1971) there were two persons not in MCLL on the PC, one of whom joined MCLL by Feb. 71. During this initial PC period - there were a number of reassignments of MCLL people on and off the PC. It reflected the maturing (sometimes confusing) process thru which any emerging political form must pass.

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

"I can rightfully be accused by summer, as referring to the group as 'consultants' with no base in practice."

*This is a most serious charge and one that reflects a non-*

dialectical perspective of MCLL, CCC and the Planning Committee. It suggests that those persons a) don't do anything, or b) do nothing in relationship to CCC. Or does she mean that all members of the Planning Committee do not participate monthly in the mailing of CCC literature? It is completely unclear. Does this hold for all the planning committees which have existed or is it an accusation against individual members of the PC?

Apparently Joann doesn't know or hasn't the courage or capacity to make an unambiguous statement. Her paper is non-dialectical on its face because it does not speak to the inter-relatedness of the needs of MCLL in relation to the needs of CCC.

Paragraph 9 is a misrepresentation of the facts to say that Sheila excluded Nancy from the planning committee. At the time that the suggestion was made this body was composed of MCLL people, LRBW and one very in-close AD Hoc person who came into MCLL shortly thereafter. MCLL was not a public formulation at this time and indeed was in the most early stages of its development. If one can comprehend the complexity of building a cadre organization and simultaneously the development and maintenance of a highly successful mass educational form, one can see that the planning committee decision was indeed proper.

In Sept. 1971 the planning committee was redefined because of the maturity of MCLL and the increasing political participation of independent persons in CCC. That redefinition was formulated by the then MCLL-BWC planning committee to include four elected independent members of CCC-GS, four assigned cadre from MCLL and two assigned from BWC cadre. At the time that discussion was held within the PC as to who should be encouraged to run as an independent, Sheila in fact supported the suggestion that Nancy run as an independent.

Nancy Waggoner is referred to frequently in Joann's paper, and this speaks directly to paragraph 7 and 8 and partially 9. The outright lie in paragraph 9 is dealt with in the prior discussion. It should be stated straight up that there is a fundamental distinction between legitimate political differences and "secterian criticism." Joann refers to "secterian 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.

1.2



(A)

Ronald Gedda

Following the murder of Charles Calloway by Rowland Schler (2), 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 DPD, the mayor or the "civil liberties" within and without the DPD. Ad Hoc deferred to PCAUR because Ad Hoc was not opposed to community orientation and indeed supported as best we could the demo in Precinct Two. The "more working class than thou" attitude of some persons affiliated with the PCAUR effort made matters somewhat more difficult. Indeed there are some criticisms to be made of AdHoc. Some subsequent follow-up was not done.

opposed /  
Ad Hoc's  
position

Ad Hoc not only did not function in a sectarian manner, i.e. withhold support from PCAUR activities but assisted in many ways with the PCAUR agenda for the Second Precinct. At an earlier point in Ad Hoc history, Sam Stark, who also had a relationship to PCAUR and PCAUR related activities, was on the staff of Ad Hoc. He did an excellent job of research and compilation for the Compiled Data on the City of Detroit. Ad Hoc was in a period of transition and Sam could not get the kind of organizing experience and support which he desired. He eventually went to PCAUR. ~~There was a level of hostility because of some inter-staff experiences but it is impossible to pinpoint because it was about two years ago.~~

B-8

(A)

Nancy Waggoner has performed in an exemplary manner vis a vis her day to day administrative functions. But this does not speak to her politics or to organizing expertise.

As a matter of information Nancy Waggoner was asked by Sheila Murphy shortly after she began to relate to CCC if she was a member of PCAWR. She answered no. Subsequently, it was found out that indeed she did have a relationship--somewhat vague complex of personal friendships and political relationships. She informed Joann that she misunderstood Sheila's question. At Joann's recommendation this matter of honesty was not pursued by Sheila or anyone else.

>

As clearly as one is able to determine Nancy Waggoner's politics it appears that she has ultra-democratic tendencies. She and Judy Hines signed the cover letter which has been disseminated throughout the CCC-GS prior to a discussion of this document in the planning committee. The inference is that had they not taken this "courageous action" in deference to the democratic right of the CCC-GS members, GS members would not have received this document. A ludicrous implication to say the least.

B-9

8

Paragraph 14 addresses the question of the "volunteer" work and participation of MCLL. The term "volunteer work" is one very difficult to understand. The total work of MCLL is an integrated process. Within this process are categories of tasks. One of these categories are interim tasks performed not directly timewise in conjunction with the monthly session. Included are transcripts, mailings and some of the bookkeeping. These tasks represent a portion of the total work process that have been carried out by non-CCC-GS persons and those on the CCC-GS. That non-CCC-GS persons or non-MCLL persons participate in the work of CCC has been cited by Joann as a positive result of the program. Such work has been an important avenue to bring persons into fuller participation in the organization.

The statement however has greater implications. It implies that members of MCLL have been slothful or lax. MCLL members have and continue to contribute greatly to the ongoing work behind CCC. It would be too lengthy to provide an exhaustive list of every contribution, but some examples can be cited:

1. MCLL cadre participation on the CCC-PC
2. MCLL cadre participation in the CCC-GS
3. The fantastic reproduction work done by Brian Flanigan from the designing of brochures and leaflets to the running off of mountains of material for CCC
4. The complete handling from administration to presentation of the CCC-GS educationals by Jack Russell

|



MCLL's sponsorship of CCC is a fundamental expression of our commitment to political organizing. That commitment has not been a "paper" declaration, but has manifested itself through continual work and participation on all levels. This is not through an "idealistic" concept of duty, but through the belief in the importance and validity of CCC.

The total misrepresentation of paragraph 17 are as follows: the comrade in MCLL, a personal friend and also a member of the planning committee, has had a number of private, political conversations with Joann on the problems of sychophancy, paternalism and organizing methods. This cannot be characterized as charges made within the group of the CCC-PC.

Paragraph 18 speaks to admitted problems concerning shifting of MCLL personnel on the CCC-PC. In addition the assignment of Jack Russell as a "new member and new to Detroit" throws into question the advisability of this move. It is unnecessary to validate the wisdom of this assignment by listing Jack's credentials because practice and history have shown its correctness through the substantive contribution he has made on all levels to CCC II.

In paragraph 19 we find a kernel of truth, a justified criticism. Sheila Murphy had the responsibility for formulating a PAC working paper for the PC. It was not prepared when it was promised on a number of occasions. This criticism was never made in a meeting nor was any initiative taken by Joann or Nancy to formulate a PAC model. But when Sheila Murphy's model was completed and presented for PC discussions, vague confusing criticisms of the model were made by Joann which did not help the discussion.

In relation to paragraph 21 -- the factual inaccuracies go so far as to include direct misquotation as well as tonal misrepresentation. Joann's paper suggests that an exhaustive document had been prepared, when in fact it is a one page piece entitled: "Some Notes on the Political History of CCC and the Current Tasks of Its Planning Group". She neglects to explain that the purpose of this paper was to define a set of concerns *and* *issues* for the planning group to begin concrete discussion of its role and responsibilities vis-a-vis all aspects of CCC. In fact this document would have the reader believe that the main point of this "*other* history" is to conclude that "it was inevitable that a certain predominant liberal white attitude towards Blacks (sycophansy) would emerge and be problematic"-- quote, directly from Joann Castle's paper. This statement is taken out of context and then misquoted, apparently to serve her own ends. The direct quote (in context) is as follows:  
"But what ever the character of the Black participation in CCC, it was inevitable that certain aspects of the predominant liberal white attitude toward Blacks (e.g., sycophansy) would emerge and be problematic. This dynamic requires our continuing

attention." This statement was very carefully made because the writer of notes on political history of CCC felt that sychophansy was not predominant in CCC but was a problem and one that needed more attention then it was getting. It would appear that Joann's individualistic conception of her centrality in CCC makes her unable to distinguish between individual political discussion and criticism among comrades and , b) a working paper for a planning group that did not make "charges" about anything, let alone the fundamental nature of CCC.

In the entirety of paragraph 22 there is a gross misrepresentation of the facts. As every member of the Planning Committee knows Joann was present for less than 1 hour in a 4 hour meeting held on February 7. She had "other business" to attend to, throughout the day. Joann said nothing of any consequence in the 45 minutes she was present. People were not "asked to answer yes or no" as to whether sychophansy and lack of political organizing were the "book club experience." What in fact occurred is as follows: Sheila Murphy put forth a perspective on the nature of political organizing. This perspective was a bit cumbersome so she asked persons <sup>did</sup> - folks feel yes or no that political organizing had occurred in CCC and why.

What followed was an excellent Planning Committee discussion. It was not a voting situation or a court room as the tone of Joann's paper would suggest. The rest of the paragraph is too incoherent for a response. It would point to a level of inarticulate<sup>ness</sup> and political confusion.

JOANNS  
PAPER

February 8, 1972

Dear Planning Committee Member,

Because of our close working relationship in the CCC Planning Committee, I want to communicate to you personally that I am resigning from MCLL due to internal differences.

I had not intended at first to leave the organization but requested a leave of absence until June to get some rest and to reassess the best way to resolve these internal contradictions. This was found "not possible". I am being relieved as coordinator of the book club this coming week.

I am enclosing one part of my policy paper to the organization that relates to the book club so that I might explain to you as thoroughly as I am able to put it into words at this time.

This is my overview of my internal experiences within the CCC program and not primary to my other differences in the organization of MCLL itself. Although it would be absurd to say that these things don't interrelate.

I do not feel that this is any breach of political discipline as persons not affiliated with MCLL have participated in the planning both years of the program, struggling with the enclosed issues.

I have done much considering before I made my decision and I am convinced that my struggle will be more fruitful and contributory to the revolution on the outside of the organization. Only history will prove the correctness of my decision. It is necessary for me to begin in a better way to be more effective and to continue to develop. I have neither the time nor the energy to give to being ground up. There are many positive and stimulating alternatives, creative energy that I can offer to the continued development of the revolutionary process.

I look forward to beginning full time political work in the Fall with as much fervor as before. My commitment to the revolution as a basis for the rest of my life, remains and will remain unchanged.

IN THE STRUGGLE,



## 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 accomodate 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 dilemma. 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 valiant 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 occurred 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.

POSITION PAPER OF PLANNING COMMITTEE OF  
~~CONTROL, CONFLICT AND CHANGE~~  
CONCERNING EVENTS OF FEBRUARY, 1972

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.

1. The Motor City Labor League, a revolutionary 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.

(The League of Revolutionary Black Workers and then the Black Workers Congress since mid-1971 provided the primary political direction and made major input into the content of CCC for the first two years' programs. The growth and development of both the BWC and the MCLL since mid-1971 has brought about a dialectical change in their respective roles with CCC. BWC is intensely involved in its own organizational work locally and nationally and all members are greatly extended. MCLL has concurrently developed the capacity and ability to accept primary sponsorship responsibility for CCC. It must be clarified here that the use of the terms primary and secondary indicate the most effective and desirable placement of the burden of work for the ongoing growth of CCC and not a subjective degree of importance.)

3. The PC is a ten 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 form of CCC. This work is incomplete, but must be done quickly. It is in the midst of this work that the present struggle arose.

#### 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.

There was a criticism of MCLL and accepted by MCLL for not relaying this information to PC members following this meeting with Margaret.

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 $\frac{1}{2}$  Monroe (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.) MCLL sent a delegation of three members to read a statement which said in part that it was their position that "the calling of this meeting...is unfortunate and unprincipled behavior." After reading their statement, they left.

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 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.

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. Both have been dedicated to improving and expanding the operations of CCC. They have given a tremendous amount of time and energy at subsistence pay. We believe Joann and Nancy are fundamentally devoted to our commonly shared goal of socialism.

#### 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 not 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, selection of books and speakers, 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 with any of their decisions, MCLL would reevaluate its position.
3. A continuation of discussion in the PC about the political form of CCC and the role of its participants in the context of the increased dialogue already discussed.
4. Give direction and support to the continued growth of PAC as it takes on the task of preparing the monthly CCC Update, securing volunteer workers, and identifying and responding to crises and situations around which real practical action can occur.
5. Issue a call to volunteers and staff to make themselves available to get day-to-day operations moving following this disruption.
6. Begin to develop a program for CCC III.

We accept the criticism that not all members of the GS have assumed their two minimal responsibilities, that is, attendance at the preparation session and attendance at the seminar. Indeed, if some GS members see their participation as something less than crucial to the maintenance of CCC, it is because there has been a lack of direction on the part of the PC. As we soon reach some conclusions in our PC discussions about the political role of CCC, etc., and relay these conclusions to the GS, it will be made clear the importance of the responsibilities we see for all GS members.

However, it is a misunderstanding to think that GS members who do not do volunteer work are not doing important work necessary

to the growth and development of CCC, or to think that those who volunteer to work should govern the political direction of CCC. There are different levels of political development, time commitments, work capacities and abilities and interest among the membership of CCC and, hence, different work forms within CCC and its sponsoring organizations to accommodate these differences.

This has been a confusing and painfully difficult time for us all. But revolutionary movements can grow through such political struggle as their participants increase their political consciousness. We, therefore, must look beyond to our continuing common struggle for socialist revolution.

In the interest of advancing this common struggle, it is imperative that all members of the GS as politically conscious people understand the political issues raised by the content of Joann's paper and the methods employed by Joann and Nancy. And further that we as a body are prepared to act on that shared understanding by individually affirming here tonight, February 25, the official position of the PC of Control, Conflict and Change.