REUNIFICATION PROPOSAL

The Motor City Labor League reaffirms the position shared by Sheila, Nancy, Frank and Jack at their Tuesday, Sept. 19 meeting that a superficial reunification of the present divisions within MCLL is not in the best interests of anyone. We do not need a coalition in the name of reunification. We do need to continue the process of building a pre-party democratic centralist organization begun two years ago and accelerated as a result of this crisis.

The present crisis emerges out of long submerged political, personal and power conflicts within the organization. It is the result in part of the underdevelopment of the process of criticism and self-criticism which allowed them to fester and the secret ballot central committee election which forced them to the surface.

I. To determine whether the differences are irreconcilable or not, as well as to illuminate the original differences we think it essential to examine the behavior of the two sides since the walkout of Sept. 2nd occurred. Who has cooperated in the carrying out of external work since Sept. 2nd and who has not? In short, who has sought the best interests of the entire organization and who has not?

In support of our concrete unification proposal, we present the following facts:

A. ON COOPERATION IN EXTERNAL WORK.

1. MCLL cooperated in the following ways:

a. When Nancy Woodside called Sheila Murphy on Sept. 8th to request a meeting with her, Sheila replied by saying that she had assumed that Nancy was calling to cancel Jane Fonda and Tom Hayden as speakers at the first CCC session. To the contrary, Jane and Tom and Holly Near appeared. Their presence, together with the advance publicity in the Free Press and elsewhere made it necessary to turn people away at the door. It contributed to the establishment of a respectable CCC III enrollment as well as a substantial amount to the CCC treasury.

b. On its own initiative, MCLL, not without difficulty persuaded Jane to make time available for a Ravitz fund raiser which raised $850.00 and brought the campaign out of the red.

c. Members of MCLL fulfilled all our responsibilities vis-a-vis CCC including work on the Journey, making our dark room available for photo work on it, participating in setting up Central Methodist Church for the session, attending the GS preparation meeting and serving as table leaders for the session.

d. MCLL turned over to Justin Ravitz, at his request, on Sept. 4 the election results which were in our possession and on Sept. 12 some maps and other data that was in our possession. MCLL members attended the Sept. 18 Ravitz meeting, even though the months of preparation by RAAG for the meeting was not utilized or reflected in the format, although a contribution from RAAG to the meeting was acknowledged.

e. John Taylor was asked by Jack on Sept. 10 to help procure a union hall for the CCC organizers training program. He did in fact arrange for CCC to be able to use Local 212 and was informed on Sept. 20 that Sheila was pursuing Local 26 instead.

2. On the other hand:

a. Although Buck Davis spoke to Justin Ravitz about the matter on Sept. 3rd or 4th we never received any communication concerning the whereabouts of the typesetting equipment, or its ownership/leaseship by MCLL; or its availability to us for work we might need to do.

b. Very strenuous effort was necessary to get the CCC mailing list for a mailing about the Belle Isle fund raiser. Equally strenuous efforts to get the Ravitz mailing list for the same purpose proved futile.

c. Although Frank Joyce, encouraged Jordan Rossen to attend a campaign staff meeting, when Jordan coincidentially called him at home on the morning of Sept. 3rd and although RAAG cadre appeared, at the appropriate time and place, the noontime Sept. 3rd Ravitz Campaign meeting was cancelled.

d. At no time did the extraordinary work, created by the Indo-China Peace Campaign, receive offers of any form of assistance from any member of the Murphy collective. Only Sheila attended a single IPC event in the Detroit area, other than CCC or the Ravitz fund raiser. The external implications of this are symbolized by Gwen Roberts' remark to

Rita Valenti, after Sheila left: "Is Sheila still here?" Rita's reply was, "No, I think she's left." "That's too bad," said Gwen, "I wanted to ask her why we always go to their things and they never come to ours."

e. Prior to September 2, the entire Beech Street complex, that is, Buck, Camilla, Karen, and Sam, agreed to hold a Ravitz fund raiser on September 23. When the leaflet appeared from the Ravitz office on September 14, only Sam's name and address appeared.

f. Within CCC, Bruce Ewen was excluded from the Finance Committee and Nancy Woodside and Bruce Ewen were excluded from the training committee.

g. At the September 19 Women's Book Club Steering Committee meeting, Sheila and Margaret took a position in opposition to the addition of Brenda Reeber and/or Valerie Snook and/or Barbara Krickbaum for the Steering Committee. They did suggest that it was important for a woman from the National Lawyers Guild to be represented on the Steering Committee.

h. On September 2, Frank Joyce removed some personal items from the Ravitz campaign office. Subsequently, his name was removed from the bulletin board, a letter marked "Personal" sent to him by Jordan Rossen (which we believe to have arrived there on August 31)has never been delivered to him, and a lock on the door changed so as to render his key inoperable.

In part, doubtless as a result of these actions, questions began to be raised by non-MCLL members about the relationship of some MCLL cadre to the campaign.

On Wednesday, September 13, and again on Thursday, September 14, Sheila raised in conversations with Frank and Buck, respectively, the desire for a clarification from MCLL as to its relation to the campaign. A letter on this subject was hand-delivered to Sheila at the Fonda-Ravitz fundraiser on Saturday afternoon. The letter advised that MCLL members would attend the September 18 meeting, set forth a provisional post-reunification position on the campaign and took advantage of the letter to

advise, apparently unclearly, that MCLL did not intend at that time to write any subsequent papers on the crisis. The letter was subsequently cited, for reasons we still fail to comprehend, as "arrogant" and thus a reason why a private meeting Sheila had proposed involving Frank, herself, and Nancy should not take place. The other reason given was the paranoid fabrication that an as-yet-to-be-identified MCLL member (alleged at that time to be Michael Smith) had alleged Bill King to be an agent.

i. At the Tuesday, September 12 CCC session no projection from the podium whatsoever was made of either MCLL or the Alliance, who are sponsors of the program. This was accomplished even though Jack gave what he proported to be a capsule history of the evolution of CCC. No one, including Justin and Frank, was even identified as an MCLL member. Sheila, in announcing a forthcomming PACT program at which many people, including Frank Joyce, would speak, identified him not as an MCLL member but rather as "from CCC".

j. Prior to September 2, Jim Bish had spoken with Bill King about possibility of LDC assistance regarding a case in which a welfare client was beaten in welfare offices which later was reported in both the Free Press and the News. No response was ever received despite an inquiry by Jim at the September 10 CCC General Staff meeting.

k. On August 24, JT, Kevin Murphy and Bill Bunting met with Sam Stark and Mona Rothschild to discuss possible input to a forthcoming conference in Cincinatti to reactivate the Urban Affairs Council of the Council for Southern Mountains. On September 6, JT called Kevin to inquire about a follow-up meeting that had been set for September 7 and was informed by Kevin that JT would have to carry on the follow-through without Kevin's participation. Although Kevin remained friendly to Bill Bunting following Bill's post-September 2 return to Detroit, none of the joint work in which they had been engaged went forward.

It is true that public acknowledgment was given to IPC and the Peace

Treaty at CCC and at the Ravitz fund-raiser. It is also true that public acknowledgment was given RAAG at the September 18 Ravitz meeting and that the Peace Treaty's and CCC's activity at the State Fair was covered in a story in the Journey. Public acknowledgment, however, is far different from concrete actual co-operation in external work.

B. PERSONAL AND POLITICAL RELATIONS:

1. Nancy Woodside, after Sept. 2, continued to pursue and on Sept. 8, delivered to Sheila information about a possible apartment for which Sheila had been urgently searching.

2. Following the tense Sept. 11 General Staff meeting of CCC, Frank Joyce was leaving and found upon arriving at the door to the church parking lot that Wheila was close behind. He held the door and asked Sheila how she was doing. She replied, in her iciest tones, "I have nothing whatsoever to say to you." That remark, she said later in a private meeting with Nancy, was a "test" apparently of whether Frank would make an issue of the remark. He did not do so at the time, merely reporting it matter-of-factly to a few people in the context of a report of the general mood. It is not a particularly surprising thing for Sheila to have said. It is an issue now for what it symbolizes about the entire process since Sept. 2nd.

3. A letter, over the signature of Justin Ravitz, was sent to Buck Davis, a comrade with years of shared practice, BY REGISTERED MAIL. The content of the letter was pretentious and contemptuous in that it outlined a procedural schedule for an exchange of papers which implied that we should or would wait for them to write a paper to which we would respond as opposed to simultaneously writing a statement of our position as had been agreed upon at the Sept. 2nd GM meeting.

4. The Murphy collective in both its oral and written communications has characterized members of MCLL as "punks," "chickenshits," abject failures, etc. MCLL has never so characterized members of that collective. Indeed, the Central Committee report of Sept.2 says: "Even though one of our comrade's political integrity has been explicitly impugned, we continue to accept Jack and Sheila as political comrades with whom we wish to continue struggle. We believe that both of them, along with us, have contributed enormously to the development of the organization to its present unparalleled power and practice." (CC report, pg.7) The same document states further: "We believe the organization can, admittedly with

difficulty, stay together. We respect the talent, skill, leadership, experience, insight, power and committment of Sheila and her closest political allies." (CC report, pg. 8)

No such statements have ever appeared in any of the verbal or written statements of which we are presently aware, coming from the Murphy collective. Jack Russell did say in the Sept. 19th meeting between Sheila, Nancy, Frank and himself that he "didn't consider Frank's motives to be completely ignoble" and that he did not believe him ". . . to be completely trashed as a political animal."

C. Unity and Construction versus strife and destruction:

As the Central Committee report and our paper "Struggle Within" makes clear, the objective of MCLL and its leadership was to strive for unity while struggling around the personal, power and political conflicts which had arisen. The following are additional quotes from those papers:

"We believe that every part of the organization . . .contributes and will contribute to the common interest of organizing and leading our class to victory." (CC report p. 7) And "We believe that the leadership of the organization should be shared and the membership's wishes respected even if comrades are simultaneously struggled against as liberal, non-struggle and under-developed as indeed, recent events have shown our own to be. We are fully prepared to accept if necessary, that the divisions around methods of internal work are so severe that a split is necessary. We would all be the losers. . ." (CC report p. 7&8).

And "We believe that we are proceeding from unity through struggle to unity. The class overcomes its divisions because it must in order to defeat the bourgeoisie. MCLL needs itself and the struggle needs MCLL. We are acutely aware of how all of the programs of the organization have suffered as a result of the present division. It is clear that a higher level of unity, resolving many long submerged conflicts within the organization is both necessary and possible." (Struggle Within p.1)

Our paper "Struggle Within" is a political discussion of underdeveloped techniques and political issues within the organization. The Murphy Collective's paper promises politics later--and that we suspect was an afterthought--and dwells on personalities and speculation about their motives. It proposes no direction or solution for the future. It concentrates almost exclusively on procedural rather than substantive errors. It never seeks to relate its allegations to a historical or contemporary perspective on what is necessary to defeat the ruling class and achieve socialism. It is full of uncomradely distortions, innuendo, mis-representations, lies contempt and deceit as follows:

1.The Murphy Collective Paper:

The problem with the "factual analysis" presented by the Murphy collective is that there are not enough facts and very little analysis. The paper is permeated with a tone of contempt for the people it is directed against, a tone characterized by familiar and colloquial terms, by false statements, by innuendo and by misleading characterizations of events and statements.

False and misleading statements are in themselves contemptuous but in this instance they are also typical of the contempt for the MCLL membership which has pervaded many of the Murphy collective's actions throughout this entire episode. For example, we find the statement on Page 3, paragraph 23, that "Frank proceeded to play-

off of your....discomfort at not having struggled with Sheila" extremely contemptuos and objectionable. The implication is that Frank manipulated a membership already enervated and biased by its cowardly failure to struggle with Sheila. We totally reject the assertion that MCLL cadre were merely the willing tools of Frank and Valerie. The organization was faced with a crisis precipitated by the arrogant and comtemptuous resignations of two Central Committee members. Faced with a crisis, and realizing there was still a functioning Central Committee and a functioning organization, members took appropriate political action. We attended an emergency meeting to deal with a dangerously divisive crisis and when we discovered the facts, we organized to face the crisis and hold the organization together. This was a correct political response to a political emergency and we refuse to apoligize for it. We also refuse to accept the characterization of our actions as either those of intimidated, misled and manipulated ciphers or as unpricipaled "vultures" determined to take cowardly revenge on a single comrade regardless of the merits of the case. These kinds of characterizations, which comprise much of the substance and thrust of the Murphy collective's paper; demonstrate a deep political contempt and mistrust of MCLL membership, which we contend derives wholly from a style of political leadership based on incorrect political principles.

It is this contempt for MCLL members and MCLL processes which we find so distressing and which we hope this internal struggle will solve.

In the remainder of this section of our reunification proposal we will specifically demonstrate and illustrate the false and misleading nature of many of the statements contained in the Murphy collective's factual"analysis/" We will quote from their paper wherever possible and will also refer to specific page and paragraph numbers as an aid to comprehension.

Page 1, para. 3

It is incorrect to say "there was no Murphy bloc prior to the convention". There has always been a Murphy grouping from the earliest days of MCLL. There has always been a grouping of people around Sheila who share a common history of struggle in Detroit, who live in close proximity to one another, and who function closely together in meetings and in other organizational activities. To ignore this is to ignore history. We do not deny the importance and value of personal loyalties among revolutionary comrades, but we feel such loyalties have important limitations which must be always observed and never exceeded:

> Leadership must struggle with each other and with cadre toward political as well as personal loyalty. As the party is built and the struggle intensifies, there will be casualties and too personal a loyalty becomes a burden. Excessively personal loyalty strains comradeship which must be based on shared political objectives. As the struggle intensifies, we will increasingly find ourselves working with people we do not know closely, but whom we must trust. Intense personal loyalty can, will, and should exist. It must not, however, be used, especially by leaders, as a standard of greater political comradeship." (Struggle Within, page 10)

Page 1, para. 3

Frank did not ask Brian to speak to Sheila about their discussion of "how to get Jack off CC". Brian took this initiative himself.

Page 1, para. 5

Frank did not tell Justin that "as a matter of fact" a second Murphy Collective meeting took place August 28.

Page 2, para. 10,11,12

The Murphy Collective's statement of the process of criticism and self-criticism which took place in the August 28 RAAG is a prototypical, indeed a stereotypical, statement of the underdevelopment and abuse of this fundamentally important revolutionary process in MCLL prior to the present crisis. We believe we now have a better understanding of the proper use and function of criticism and self-criticism in a democratic centralist organization. We believe that our paper, Struggle Within, is a clear statement of our conception of the correct use of criticism and self-criticism. And we are certain that taking comrades "to task" is no part of that process. Yes, Lynda Ann, Pat and Jim accepted the harsh (not "hard") criticisms of the campaign staff, but this is only another example of organizational failure in criticism and self-criticism. The criticisms

were accepted under incorrect criteria and no attempt was made by the campaign staff to struggle with the difficult problems that RAAG was encountering in the development of its work process. The result was, and is, continuing tension and hostility between RAAG and the campaign staff. In other words, criticism and self-criticism as practised on August 28 was a complete political failure. Yet the Murphy Collective self-righteously speaks of this episode as vindication of their "correct" practise.

Page 2, para. 12

We agree that few "have worked as hard for us as BP". Our question is who is the "us" referred to? Is "us" MCLL or is it the Murphy Collective? We raise the question because we believe departmentalism and possessiveness of work is counter-revolutionary practise which has been common in MCLL. All will surely agree that failure to maximize the work of each cadre has been and is an important and serious organizational criticism. We are also certain that there are many in MCLL who have worked as hard for the organization as Brian Flanigan--a compliment to them and to Brian.

> Leadership is not possessive; its skills, insights and talents are the property of the class and organization or party. It assumes that the process by which others acquire the skills of the leaders is a part of the process which is necessary to growth and expansion. (Struggle Within. page 9)

Page 2, para. 14

Frank Joyce has accepted the criticism that he failed to question Sheila regarding her early and unexplained exit from the Thursday Central Committee meeting. We point out that Sheila voluntarily criticized herself on that point during the September 3 General Staff meeting. This is a past and non-substantive matter and we cannot understand why it is mentioned by the Murphy Collective unless as a part of a smokescreen of false and misleading innuendo.

Page 2, para. 16

It is misleading and false to state that Jack did not "focus organizational problems on the one absent CC member". Jack initiated the Thursday afternoon discussions of "divisions and tensions" in MCLL and, indeed, pressed for them. Are we to believe that Jack did not realize that this

discussion would inevitably concern itself with Sheila Murphy? It is ahistorical and myopic, to say the very least, to contend that such a discussion could occur without mentioning one of the strongest, most forthright, and, by her own admission, one of the most contentious members of MCLL?

Page 2, footnote 2

We totally reject the characterization of Ron Glotta's practise as campaign treasurer as an "abject failure". The facts refute the assertion. The fact is over $6,200 was raised during the six weeks prior to the Primary election while Ron was treasurer, a little over $1,000 a week. Ron resigned as treasurer on August 10, 1972 after Sheila characterized his performance as "barely adequate". The fact is that from August 10 to August 30 the campaign deposited $125 in the bank. And the fact is that Jane Fonda raised around $850 for the campaign and without that money Ravitz for Recorders Court Judge would be virtually penniless.

Page 3, para. 18

We do not understand Valerie's statement to Sheila on the telephone to have been "conscious and deliberate lies" and disagree with that characterization of them. We believe Valerie's conduct to have been that of an individual intimidated and confused by a prior history (shared by many) of "locks" or threats of "locks" by Sheila and other members of the Murphy Collective. We severely criticize Valerie for this non-struggle and non-exemplary leadership, but we do not feel it is grounds for expulsion from the CC, or taken by itself in historical organizational practise, even grounds for censure.

Page 3, para. 19

It is false and it is misleading to say that Valerie's statement regarding her phone conversation with Sheila "did not begin to suggest the full nature of Valerie's lies to Sheila." The truth is that Valerie did inform the entire Central Committee, including Jack Russell, of the substance of the conversation. It is therefore not true that Jack did not learn the true nature of the conversation until later that night in a conversation with Shelia. Jack Russell knew the truth all along and has apparently concealed it from the Murphy collective.

Page 3, para. 20

The misleading impression is given that Valerie's question "Well what are going to do about this?" refered to the CC discussion of "divisions and tensions", and that Jack Russell forthrightly stated he would not participate in a discussion centered on Sheila. Valerie, in fact, was referring to her phone conversation with Sheila. A call to Sheila at that point by any of the five CC members present informing her that a meeting was taking place would have been the appropriate political response. No one, including Jack Russell, made the phone call, and it is for this serious abdication of leadership responsibility that we censure all the CC.

Page 3 para. 23

We object to the characterization of the CC report as the "Joyce paper". and to such phrases (refering to Frank) as "he writes" and "his paper". The report was collectively formulated, discussed and read to the CC.

Page 3 para. 24

We disagree, that Jack "made it immediately clear that he was not part of any group which was going to collectively deal with Sheila." Does Jack feel that as self-styled "intermediary" to Sheila from the rest of the CC he was not necessarily part of the "group"? If he wasn't part of the group why did he stay and participate in the discussions? And if he did not see himself as part of the "group" then we assert that his taking on the role of "intermediary" was a cowardly act of self-insulation from political struggle.

In any event, what is the political objection to any group "collectively dealing" with any individual if the motives and practice are politically correct? We can see none. It is misleading to imply that such a course of action is somehow wrong.

Page 4 para. 25

It is true that Frank has retracted portions of his criticism of the manueverings of the Murphy collective around the CC election. It is also true that Frank has never retracted his main criticisms of their abuse of the CC election process. We are puzzled by the statement that some of Franks criticisms were "belatedly abandoned". Is it incorrect in their view to modify one's opinions as facts become more clear? And if Frank's interrelation of the August 28th RAAG-Campaign Staff meeting was baseless, why did hostilities and tensions remain in those secations?

Page 4, para. 27

It is misleading to say Justin's calls "were never returned" by Frank. Frank tried to return the calls, but was unable to reach Justin. It is also a complete mischaracterization and extremely misleading to attribute to Frank the statement that the CC election results represented a "revolt of the dipshits". No one in MCLL believes any of us are "dipshits". The expression simply stated the manner in which, in fact, the Murphy collective perceived many MCLL members, a perception they still hold judging by the contemptuous tone of their paper, especially its last five paragraphs.

Page 4, Para. 29

The only thing"proved" by Frank's failure to mention Valerie's misconduct to Justin was that he did not feel it was the central issue.

Page 4, Para. 32

It is implied that Justin, on Saturday, was "unaware of all that was transpiring" and that he was not a member of the "bloc" then and, further, was not a member when he entered the Sunday night membership meeting. This ignores the fact of his Friday meeting with Frank. This ignores his statement on Sunday that he had called Sheila and reported an "incorrect meeting." And it is significant that the paper states that he called Sheila but is silent regarding the date of the call. We believe Justin was, in fact, a member of the Murphy collective on Sunday.

Page 5, Para. 34

It is misleading and contemptuous to assert that the agenda of Sunday night's GM meeting was changed by Frank's initiative and that this act helped prove that people were not "forthright and principled." Frank moved an agenda change; the membership supported and voted for the motion by a 22-14 vote. The Murphy collective apparently does not accept the principle of majority rule.

Page 5, Para. 36

We do not agree that proper criticism/self-criticism requires that criticism be asked for, or that the criticizor ask specifically if the

criticism is aacepted. We reject this mechanistic and formalized application of the process.

Page 5, Para. 40

We stand by the statement that no MCLL member with whom we talked had not been disrespected and intimidated by various members of the Murphy collective. We do point out that we did not claim this was true of every member of MCLL. There were a substantial number who missed all or most of the Saturday night meeting.

Page 5, Para. 41

We do not accept the statement that no MCLL member was decent enough or courageous enough to describe the content of the Saturday night membership meeting to the Murphy collective. And it is simply not true that we "laid silent" when Justin said he had some facts to report. (page 6, para. 44). Several persons struggled with him to obsserve the agenda that had been voted for by the membership. We had approved an agenda and we were trying to move it. We'll never know if the subject would have been reached because the Murphy collective walked out just when the substantive issues of Valerie's expulsion and the two resignations were about to be discussed.

2. Private Negotiations and Meetings

There is more than the paper. We have sought private meetings and discussions at many levels:

a. Frank sought, through Buck, on Sept. 3 or 4, to meet with Justin. Justin refused.

b. Les and Sheri met privately with Jack. Their reports characterized his remarks and tone as "totally negative," "personal," "defensive," "competitive," "vindictive," and "unpolitical."

c. Numerous people were absent during parts of the August 30-Sept. 2 process and sought information to get "both sides." Les and Valerie Brannas met with Sheila and others. Another cadre met with Jack and with Michele. Pat had discussion with Justin and Bill King.

d. With the full approval of the Central Committee, Nancy sought out private discussions with Sheila. Sheila reluctantly agreed to two such meetings, one of which took place at the peak of the Indochina Peace Campaign in which Nancy was critically involved. The Central Committee held that discussion with Sheila was a high priority item in this period as essential to reunification.

Nancy made concessions on behalf of MCLL and its leadership in these meetings which are reflected in "Struggle Within" and in the criticism section of this paper. Respecting the integrity of those private discussions, concessions and clarifications of positions of deepest importance to MCLL and the City of Detroit were made by both sides. In retrospect, at this writing, it is clear that political concessions made by Sheila have been retracted.

e. No attempts for private clarification were ever initiated by members of the Murphy collective, with two exceptions:

1. Jack Russell called Bill Bunting and in the course of the conversation told him that he and others were available for discussion should Bill so desire. Bill indicated at the CCC meeting to Jack that he was interested in meeting. Jack said he would call. He never did.

2. On Saturday, Sept. 16, Sheila suggested to Frank on the phone that they meet. Frank agreed it would be good. Later that day, Frank asked if Sheila objected to Nancy being present. She did not and they agreed to talk by phone Monday morning, Sept. 18, to establish time and place. On Sept. 18, Frank called Sheila for that purpose. Sheila

indicated she no longer wished to meet for reasons of the Sept. 16 Ravitz campaign letter and the Bill King agent allegations mentioned previously. Frank pressed for the meeting and cleared up at least some misconceptions on both points. Sheila agreed to reconsider. Frank called later and Sheila agreed to meet for one hour the following morning. When Frank and Nancy arrived at the appointed place, they discovered Jack was present, though there had been no prior request of informing about his attendence.

The discussion itself was not particularly productive. Sheila asserted that her basic position that Frank had engaged in a purely personal power play had not changed. She further stated that trust with Frank, and by implication most members of MCLL, would not be possible in the forseeable future, if ever, and that she supported reunification only for reasons of what we would characterize as mechanistic carrying-out-of-work -- in short, a coalition under the guise of reunification.

f. MCLL has conceded that the process of criticism and self-criticism was abused and that a power struggle was an underlying factor. The Murphy collective at this writing has conceded that Sheila is infrequently impatient (Their paper, pg. 3, para. 22) and that Sheila erroneously asserted on Aug. 27 that a "bloc" other than her own existed which didn't (their paper, pg. 1, para. 6)

g. The Sept. 16 Ravitz campaign letter advocated the resolution of the organizational issues within one week. The Tuesday Sept. 19 meeting agreed tentatively to an exchange of various papers on Friday, Sept. 22 prior to a full organizational meeting on Sunday, Sept. 24. MCLL almost always meets on Sunday night. Without saying why, the Murphy collective requested that the meeting be held Sunday afternoon or morning because Sunday night was difficult for some of them. When subsequently asked why, they replied that Bill and Lynda had a family obligation and that perhaps Brian and Sheila had other things to do. This attitude that their own situation, be it work or personal matters, is more important and worthy of the disruption of the entire organization's schedules, is unfortunately typical. MCLL has worked extremely hard in this period on BOTH external programs and the attempt to bring about reunification. This week alone, the General Staff has met on three successive nights until 3:00 AM. The General Membership held a 7:00 AM meeting on Saturday. Members of the family, in two instances the mothers of cadre, were either prevented from coming to Detroit from out of town, or pushed to leave earlier than they expected to so that cadre could devote more time to the organizational crisis. We are deeply angered by the attempt to change the meeting to suit the personal convenience of two members of the Murphy collective.

* * * * * * * *

We are angry and disappointed at the pattern demonstrated in the preceding pages of the Murphy collective behavior throughout this period. The answers to our introductory questions are all too clear. We are not perfect. We did not automatically arrive at our own practice in this period. There were those among us who advocated boycotting CCC to show our power, including removing Fonda and Hayden as speakers. There were those who thought we should not argue with Jane to do the Ravitz fund-raiser. There were those who proposed sending letters to the Murphy collective by registered mail because they had. There were those who said we should retain all the Ravitz campaign material for "leverage." Some did not think we should attend the Monday night Ravitz meeting. IN EVERY INSTANCE, SUCH VIEWS WERE STRUGGLED AGAINST AND DEFEATED BECAUSE WE DID AND DO DESIRE REUNIFICATION AND HAVE NO INTENTION TO DAMAGE EXTERNAL WORK. We do not believe that contradictions within the organization should be treated as though they were contradictions with the enemy.

Should the forthcoming paper and reunification proposal from the Murphy collective indicate a departure from the pattern we describe as existing before and after Sept. 2, we are still prepared to negotiate seriously around our concrete proposals.

However, our primary work is external. It has suffered too much in this period. MCLL has work to discuss Sunday night and we are not prepared to meet for the sake of meeting. We propose that Sheila Murphy and two others, not to include Jack Russell, meet with Frank, Linda Ann and Buck at 11:00 AM or 3:00 PM, whichever is more convenient, Sunday, at the Jefferson Ave. Clock restaurant for the purpose of setting procedures and agenda for the Sunday night meeting or negotiating the terms of a split around such questions as CCC, the typesetting equipment, the Changeover name, etc.

* * * * * * *

II. We have reviewed every paper, every meeting and every discussion in this process, as well as our own political position.

Our concrete reunification proposals are as follows:

A. Regarding the Central Committee:

1. That Jack Russell, Frank Joyce, Valerie Snook, Linda Ann Ewen, and Buck Davis be censured for their uncomradely behavior toward Sheila in failing to stop the Thursday Aug. 31 meeting or notify Sheila that it was taking place following Valerie's admission that she had lied to Sheila on the telephone.

(Censure refers to a disciplinary measure short of suspension or expulsion. It is beyond criticism and self-criticism although accompanied by it implicitly or explixitly. It is a collective, written and official organizational document that the comrade or comrades being censured so breached revolutionary behavior that raising consciousness and struggle around the error is not sufficient to protect the organization. Censure of a comrade for such an act or series of acts means that the comrade has harmed the organization and that a repitition of the same or similar acts presumes even more serious disciplinary action. The section on discipline on page 17 of "Struggle Within" together with the section on criticism and self-criticism, hopefully clarifies this distinction further.)

2. That Frank Joyce, Valerie Snook, Linda Ann Ewen, and Buck Davis be criticised for succumbing in the Sept. 2 Central Committee report to the distraction of the issues created by Sheila's and Jack's resignations and therefore devoting virtually no attention to Valerie's phone response and the Central Committee response at the time.

B. Regarding Valerie Snook:

1. That Valerie Snook be severely criticized for her uncomradely lie to Sheila on the phone.

2. That Valerie Snook further be criticized for her role in the hasty, confusing and misleading presentation on Sunday morning, Sept. 2, to Mary and Hugh White, especially around the issues surrounding Hugh's replacement on the General Staff by Ron Glotta.

Why? After much discussion, we conclude that the collective action of the five members of the Central Committee, including Valerie, after the phone call, was far more harmful than Valerie's response on the phone in and of itself. Valerie's original action, we believe, was spontaneous and unconscious. The nature of the meeting in progress, as Jack had initiated it, was ambiguous. Valerie's relationship to Sheila had not been one of comradely struggle on either side for some time. The criticism is severe, nevertheless, because she is an elected leader and personal as well as political accountability to other leaders is essential. The collective action of the five was much more reprehensible. It was more conscious. The five criticized or agreed to criticism of Valerie and then went on committing the same error. Hence the censure.

C. Regarding Jack Russell:

1. We accept the standing decision of the General Staff to accept Jack Russell's resignation from the Central Committee.

2. We reserve our most serious charges for Jack Russell. In the event of reunification, charges of opportunism, including sexism, will be formally introduced to the full membership of MCLL. Charges against Jack Russell will be made in four areas:

A. Personal projection of organizational work for individual gain.

B. A series of security and discipline violations.

C. Opportunism includes the use of one's political position for the advancement of sexually exploitative relations:

1) numerous instances of sexist characterization of female cadre and female close comrades .

2) unsubstantiated charges of ultra-feminism by Jack

3) numerous unprincipled attempted sexual advances

4) divisiveness among comrades, both male and female, on the basis of sexual relations.

D. Disunity Role in the Current Crisis.

It is our position that Jack has played a major role in the initiation of the current crisis and the course of resolutions between the Murphy Collective and MCLL since the August 30 CC meeting. Jack has functioned to fan the flames of the complex of subjective disputes and real contradicitions within MCLL in this crisis. Jack has exacerbated the bourgeois aspects of the process rather than utilizing his self-proclaimed ideological role within MCLL to clarify and define the real political issues before and between us. Jack has stood in the way of a healthy reunification process in our crises between the two sides. In view of the above and the facts below, it is our firm position that Jack Russell's opportunism and his continued participation in this process is one of the single most important obstacles to achieving real reunification.

1) Errors of omission and comission in reporting the Thursday, August 31, CC meeting to Sheila:

a. He initiated discussion of tensions within the organization

b. He did not insist Sheila be called back after learning of Valerie's lies

c. He did not communicate his agreed-to role as intermediary

d. He did not communicate everyone's desire and his responsibility for setting up another meeting

e. He failed to communicate that Lynda Ann did not take the same position as other members of the CC and had said she would talk to Sheila personally.

2) Played a non-productive, sychophantic role toward Sheila in the Saturday, Sepatember 3 General Staff meeting.

3) An example of opportunistic behavior is the declaration of expediant political principles not sincerely held to justify one's motives. Jack Russell has historically, through numerous public and private discussions, indicated his understanding that power is complex and is often a function of many factors. Yet, when Frank suggested in the September 3 General Staff meeting that Jack may have sought to increase his power by solidifying a relationship to the Murphy Collective in the process of the split, Jack's response to that formulation was to the effect that this was obviously erroneous since he was giving up power by giving up his position on the Central Committee. We know that Jack shared an understanding with many members of MCLL that at this point in the organization it was unclear just <u>where</u> real power in MCLL lay - Central Committee, General Staff, personalities or with "blocs".

4) Jack assumed a vindictive role in conversations with Sherry, Babs, Les and George which were characterized by intensity, negativism, and contempt.

5) He, in his behavior as well as through conversation with cadre, projected his position that the organization was irrevocably split.

6) Finally, and most recently, it becomes clear that despite the opportunism of Jack Russell political issues within MCLL have been clarified, struggled around, and produced substantial organizational growth. We infer that Jack has moved in desparation to solidify his position of personal power in relation to the Murphy Collective. We

further infer that he fabricated a story that it had come to his attention that one of the cadre of MCLL had said that since Bill King was strapped anf formerly in military intelligence, that he must be an agent. When Jack was informed in the meetings at Howard Johnson's with Sheila, Frank,and Nancy that the MCLL considered this an extremely serious matter requiring discipline of the cadre, Jack retreated and said he may have been confused--he vaguely remembered at sometime way back some reference to the shape of people's faces being a means to identify agents. However, when pressed by Nancy for a specific name, date, place, and statement, he said he would have to recheck his information. This incident set set off a reaction in the Murphy Collective which made sensitive levels of personal, power, and political negotitations between MCLL and the Murphy Collective more difficult and created one more crisis altering progress in negotiations.

D. Regarding Frank Joyce:

1. That Frank Joyce be criticized for abusing the process of criticism and self-criticism in attempting to pursue an inner organizational political power struggle and for failing to press for the development of criticism and self-criticism as an organizational tool.

2. Further, that Frank Joyce be criticized as a leader for failing to conclude sooner that there was a political basis for the tensions and divisions within the organization and act accordingly.

3. Further, that Frank Joyce be criticized for failure to struggle harder with B.P. around B.P.'s mis-representation of their discussions around defeating Jack Russell's election to the Central Committee.

4. Further, that Frank Joyce be criticized for his hasty, misleading and confusing presentation on Sunday morning to Mary and Hugh White, especially around the issues surrounding Hugh's replacement on the General Staff by Ron Glotta.

E. Regarding Sheila Murphy:

1. That Sheila Murphy be censured for the act of her Central Committee resignation and for leading the walkout at the Sunday night General Membership meeting. Both acts operated to throw the organization into a crisis of deepening proportions, which impaired the primary work of the organization, which is external. Both acts, because of their precipitous nature, were violations of democratic centralism. Both acts were an abdication of struggle around the very principles Sheila espoused. Both acts symbolized contempt for the procedures of the organization to deal with the issues and impugned the integrity and development of the members. Specifically, Sheila, at the General Membership meeting and again in their paper, accused the membership of having their minds made up about the issue of Valerie's expulsion before the issue had even been debated.

2. That Sheila Murphy be severely criticized for demanding Valerie's expulsion absent any criteria for expulsion (which at this writing we have yet to hear); for her failure to take into account the context of Valerie's action and the history of her practice; and most important, for her individualistic failure to take into account the implications of Valerie's AND THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE's actions AND SHEILA's response for the entire organization as distinct from Sheila's personal sense of betrayal, disloyalty, uncomradeship or whatever.