LAE

For revolutionaries, the past must always be understood, analyzed and its consequences accepted, but it must never be dwelt upon. Our view is toward the future.

Our task is to unify the working class from which we come, to overcome the divisions within it. MCLL is, for the moment divided. To resolve those divisions is in our view to strike a mighty blow at the ruling class. Their power, after all, rests on the suspicion, mistrust, individualism, hostility and lack of political struggle and development which they are able to foster and sustain within the proletariat.

We do not seek to evade the concrete issues facing the organization nor the conflict around them. Indeed, avoidance and suppression of such conflict is precisely what has produced the present crisis.

MCLL is, despite its small size, a complex organization. Nearly half of our members moved to the Detroit area. The range of educational, political, racial, military and work-place experience is great. The history of the organization evolves out of a number of strains of political activity, primarily in Detroit. The somewhat divergent origins of Ad Hoc, PAR, CCC, the Alliance, PPT and indeed the Motor City Labor League itself may be unified at a higher level as a result of this crisis. There is potential great strength in the varied experience of the membership which applies to Detroit, its suburbs and beyond.

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.

We accept with some modification the pre-conditions which have been transmitted to us. First we agree that the issues must be clarified. This paper is our attempt to do so. Its significance is not only in what it says but also in the extraordinary process which has produced it. Never before has so much of the membership participated so fully nor grown so swiftly as in this period. The process has not been without internal conflict of a sharp and principled nature. Indeed, we understand more fully the value of the internal struggle which has taken place in the evolution of the Murphy group. We have examined and tested ourselves and each other as never before and are stronger individually and organizationally as a result. We have, we think, eliminated

much of the bourgeois subjectivity which has characterized all of our thought and actions in the past. We understand more about the history of our organization and the revolutionary and bourgeois struggles and conflicts which have built it to its present strength and power.

Secondly, there is no question but what the process of criticism and self-criticism has been both misused and abused, particularly as directed at Sheila Murphy. The reasons are varied, but certainly include inexperience, ignorance, mistrust and untimeliness because of long suppressed conflict.

Finally, it is certainly true that Frank Joyce was pursuing power within the organization in this period. If hegemony means power then indeed it was in the pursuit of hegemony. Power struggle can and should develop around political disagreements on internal or external matters within the organization. Leadership should assert itself at times of crisis. Just as the power of MCLL must derive from the class as we are able to articulate its needs and desires and lead its struggle; so internal power must derive from the articulation and leadership of correct politics for the membership. We do not concede that the power struggle engaged in by Frank Joyce was for personal hegemony, nor was it unprincipled and unpolitical. To the contrary, although it contained elements, doubtlessly excessive of personal, bourgeois conflict, it was essentially the pursuit of power in the interests of the organization. It was not for the aggrandizement of Frank Joyce. Others certainly have also exercised leadership in the period of struggle, including Ron Glotta, Buck Davis, Valerie Snook, Linda Ann Ewen, Nancy Woodside, Jim Bish, Donna Bish, Pat Korth, Camilla Davis and others. The interest of the organization and the class have, while not the only concerns, always been the overriding concerns and have been political in at least the same sense that the demand for Valerie's expulsion was political.

We reject the notion that the membership is so politically backward and underdeveloped that they can be duped, manipulated and exploited by any "inside" agitator for his or her own personal gratification. The process of struggle in which we have engaged has operated to oppose the personalization of conflict in favor of its politicization. As we attempt to explain in the section on power and leadership, personalized conflict is bourgeois and counter-revolutionary whether it involves Frank Joyce, Sheila Murphy, Valerie Snook, Jack Russell or anyone else. We are, thanks in part to this crisis and the leadership it has produced, beyond that point and will mightly resist a return to it.

Although we do not want to indulge ourselves in the luxury of bourgeois reincarnation of the past, numerous concrete issues must be resolved.

The demand for Valerie's expulsion from the C.C. was political and appropriate. So was the procedure for resolution and the position taken by the majority of the C.C. in response to the demand. It was the premature resignation in the face of a majority opinion on the C.C. which sought to prejudge the question and thus pushed the issue in the direction of personal rather than political struggle. The resignations did not afford the organization the opportunity to assess the political issues. Such action would have been appropriate at the end of a process but hardly at the beginning.

Perhaps Valerie would have been expelled from the C.C. and the resignations rendered unnecessary. Perhaps, Sheila and Jack in the process of arriving at some sanction less than expulsion would nevertheless have been persuaded of the seriousness with which the organization including the central committee members and including Valerie were dealing with the matter and hence resignations would have been rendered unnecessary. Perhaps as in fact the ensuing developments suggest, the organization through its structures would have synthesized the issues into a quite different resolution. We will never know. The resignations prejudged the outcome and objectively threw the organization into a state of crisis at a crucial point in its work and development.

The problem was exacerbated when precisely at the moment the organization was moving to a discussion of the issues around Valerie's action and possible expulsion the walkout occured. Once again the political struggle was diverted by the personal.

We inherit, whatever our growth since then, some very clear issues which must be resolved. The general staff deadlocked 9-9 on Valerie's expulsion. The matter of expulsion or some lesser sanction therefore remains before us. It is true that the case for expulsion has never been presented to the membership. Jack's resignation has been accepted by the General Staff. Sheila's is ambiguous.

We hold the Saturday night meeting to have been completely legitimate in view of what preceeded it. However we are completely prepared to discuss it, assuming that the perspective is not one purely of personality. A resumption of the process of diverting political struggle into personality struggle which led to the crisis would clearly serve no useful purpose.

The balance of our paper is an attempt to begin discussion in four areas: Power and Leadership; Leadership; Criticism and Self-Criticism; and the Nature of Political Work. It makes no claim to be definitive. Its style is uneven because numerous people contributed to it.

Power and Leadership - from Personality to Power to Politics

Conflict within MCLL and within the party to come will inevitably revolve around personality, power and politics. The first is bourgeois, the second pre-revolutionary and the third, given our politics as Marxist-Leninist, is revolutionary.

what does that mean?

Capitalist politics is personality politics. It is "adversary," competitive politics. Defense lawyers vs. prosecutor; labor leader vs. management; republican candidate vs. democratic candidate. It is one-dimensional. It is politics involving struggle between individuals or groups of individuals around an already baked pie. As we see in an election year and in our formal and informal socialization the emphasis is on "character," trust and personality. What will he do with his finger on the nuclear trigger?

As a class, politicians are presumed by the masses to be unprincipled and untrustworthy. Cynicism abounds. There is, of course, value for the bourgeoisie to the assumption that little can be expected of politicians. It reinforces the notion that "self-reliance " is the "natural order" of society and that one must ultimately"look out for number one." The task of the "responsible" citizen is to evaluate which is the more trustworthy of an inherently individualistic and opportunistic group of people.

To the extent that politicians even slightly raise the question of going beyond the already baked pie, as George McGovern is believed to have done by some, they become vulnerable to attacks on ; their "loyalty" since the opposition is assumed to be "loyal" first and foremost. The same attacks are leveled at an attorney who strays beyond the limits of the "adversary" rules in actually pursuing the interest of a

client. The attorney is likely to be accused of attempting to "destroy the courts."

Capitalist politics is of course zero-sum politics; it is the politics of competition. Since the pie is already basically baked except for whatever technology and foreign conquest can add, competition must be between the few for the most and between the many for the least. With the material base of power in control of the means of production, power is the scarcest resource of all. Competition, then, is intense and personal at every strata of the society.

Electoral politics, as the most "open" and superficially accessible form of power, is particularly "dirty" and likely to concentrate on character assassination, impugning the integrity of ones opponent, etc. Like every other aspect of capitalist social relations it is, as long as people stay within its basic bourgeois assumptions and proceedures, a self-fulfilling prophecy. The capacity for human viciousness and duplicity is fertilized daily. Conflicts, as we know, are exacerbated and institutionalized.

The desire for power is a necessary but not sufficient condition of revolutionary struggle. The willingness to fight is a necessary but not sufficient condition of revolutionary struggle. Bourgeoisie power is the power to force people to do what they do not wish to do--to submit their labor power to social parasites who turn it to their own privilege. Socialist power, of course, is the ability to prevent the bourgeoisie from ripping off the efforts of the overwhelming majority of people and the ability to organize the resources and labor of the society for the benefit of the overwhelming majority of the people.

There is a measure of "upward mobility" in at least U.S. capitalist society such that the natural desire for power to insure one's own, family's and/or social group's physical security frequently is individualized rather than suppressed

completely. The result is that many individuals and groups do strive for a measure of power in the society usually at the expense of other members of the working class.

It is equally clear that the capacity for armed conflict exists within the masses as the homicide rate demonstrates. Such conflict is an essential component of the defeatism of the working class which sees no alternative but that of implosive, internalized hostility and fighting. Many come to glory in it as an end in itself as evidenced by the fights between gangs for turf which neither actually posses and for "honor." Many, of course, are rendered completely passive, seeking to avoid all conflict and merely get by as members of the "silent majority."

What is necessary for revolutionary struggle is the combination of the willingness to fight together with the desire for power, conditioned by the politics of class consciousness which understands that power is that of the class not that of any individual or small group.

Disputes within the organization or party then become not fights between personalities but rather struggles around which methods of organizing the masses and building the party are best.

It is inevitable that we must and would evolve through phases of bourgeoisie, "personality" power struggles on the zig-zag path to revolution. There is no where else from whence we could have come. In the organizing of the class and the building of the party the process will be repeated many times. Issues of character, trust, loyalty, principle and honor are hollow and bourgeois when divorced from politics.

It is unfortunate but necessary, at this time, that a leap in revolutionary trust--based on unity-criticism-unity and the belief that we are all indeed political people--be

taken so that we all assume that the real political differences were not merely manufactured, ex post facto, to justify a personality or apolitical power struggle.

The organization, let alone the class, cannot tolerate the destructive and corrosive effect of bourgeois conflict. It must demand respect for itself, its capacity to select leaders and procedures and structures it creates to distribute power within the organization and resolve the healthy disputes which inevitably arise within its ranks.

On Leadership

Revolutionary leadership inevitably must develop itself--pull itself up by the bootstraps. True revolutionary struggle does not develop through defection from the ruling class--they come rarely and usually much later, e.g. the Weathermen were NOT revolutionary. Almost by definition, existing models of leadership are either counter-revolutionary or non-revolutionary. The U.S.military clearly employs a method of leadership which is counter-revolutionary. This is most clear when counter-posed to the People's Army described in Vietnam Will Win. Tiger coach Billy Martin or Lion coach Joe Schmidt, leaving aside the sexual contradiction for the moment, perhaps could be said to employ non-revolutionary methods of leadership. They are certainly concerned with motivating human beings and improving their capacity to fight deploying them strategically, etc., but the motive is a combination of money and the fight itself. The corporate methods, taught at Harvard Business School--or for that matter self-taught by Horatio Alger entreprenaurs--are not easily accessible to us and irrelevant anyway. Models of women's leadership and black leadership are limited. We must therefore teach and develop within ourselves the substance and the style of leadership most approriate to unifying the class and defeating the enemy. Since we are all leaders to a degree, these preliminary criteria apply to everyone.

Some qualities of revolutionary leadership are clear:

--Leadership is not perfect, nor is it an example or some end quality or goal. All should strive forward. Leadership in the broadest sense is the highest level of struggle, both personally and politically. Leadership is a function, not simply a person(s). Leadership is a process by which cadre through their interaction with the highest level of struggle come to a clearer understanding of internal and external contradictions and a sharper ability to move towards revolutionary objectives.

--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 as a part of the process which is necessary to growth and expansion.

--Leadership's ultimate responsibility is to the masses not to other leaders insofar as a distinction is necessary. It is out of concern for the development of class that leaders create, sustain and when necessary destroy organizational forms. Within the party or organization, leaders are primarily responsible to the members, without whom the leaders would have no one to lead. There are, of course, leaders among leaders, but that is a secondary formation. Leaders are to

undialectical - because the class also leads

members as members (including leaders) are to the class.

--Leaders must lead in the struggle to eliminate bourgeois forms of personality and subjective strife from the organization or party.

--Leaders must be exemplary in building the self-esteem and confidence of members and workers which the ruling class seeks relentlessly to destroy.

--Leaders must be exemplary in not confusing contradictions among the people, including those with in the party with contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

--Leadership must reflect within each leader and within particularly the mass, public leadership bodies the continuing process of synthesizing the racial, sexual, economic and geographical divisions within the class. (The diversity of MCLL together with its proletarian authenticity is therefore a potentially far greater strength than we have heretofore recognized.) This process will become progressively more important and more difficult as we come to represent even more fully the spectrum of the class than is presently the case. Leaders must exercise great care not to mistake differences in cultural style for political differences.

--As growing numbers of the class overcome their passivity, fear and aversion to fighting for power, leadership must constantly struggle to politicize the struggle against the class enemy and resist the reversion to intra-class fighting.

--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, 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 <u>political</u> comradeship. The characterization of all forms of human warmth as "touchy-feely" would be counter-revolutionary. The people of Viet Nam <u>love and respect</u> themselves and one another; that along with the complete clarity of their political objectives and political line is the basis of their unity and hence their strength. Human warmth as an end in itself, absent political objectives, strategy and mutual respect is, of course, counter-revolutionary as well.

--Leaders must exemplify comradely struggle. The presumption of comradeship must obtain unless decisively proven otherwise. Comradeship is assessed not only through personal trust and relation but through relationship to the masses and to struggle against the enemy.

--The method of work of leaders must strive to inspire emulation of hard, high quality work not despair and demoralization at the difficulty of ever achieving such lofty practice.

--Leadership must be more not less accessible to criticism and self-criticism.

Criticism and Self-Criticism

The relationship between criticism and self-criticism is clearly dialectical. The bourgeois tendency to level only criticism is static and punitive, whereas criticism and self-criticism is a PROCESS which leads to higher levels of struggle, unity, and education for those who participate.

The need for criticism to point out mistakes and correct errors is more clearly understood than the need for self-criticism. There are perhaps three major reasons why revolutionary comrades engage in self-criticism.

1. Acknowledgement of responsibility toward the object of criticism: "If you made a mistake, I had a responsibility, as a comrade, to in some way have acted more productively than I did."

2. Acknowledgement of the vulnerability of criticizor: "My assessment is human, I too make mistakes, I am telling you that I am like you and our strength lies in our ability to struggle together over mistakes."

3. Examination by the criticizor of his/her own motives and behavior; that is, the criticizor should not try to contrive self-criticsm but must honestly seek sources and understanding of own behavior vis a vis the criticism.

Whether self-criticism or criticism occurs first depends on the point in process when the mistake is made and understanding of the mistake is achieved. Because criticism and self-criticism is a dialectical process in its own right, one part will always lead to the other (the "chicken or egg" question). It must be clearly understood that the levels of criticism may vary - that is, self-criticism may be far less "serious" than the criticism levied or it may be more serious.

Formulations of Criticisms

I. At Self:

A. Must be made within political terms; must be carefully separated from psychological needs to remove guilt, engage in self-flagellation, impress others with own humbleness, etc.; this is not to say such motives will be present, bit IF present, must be dealt with in political terms - e.g. what are the class, sex, racial and family origins of "guilt," etc.

B. Must be framed in realistic terms of what self is capable of responding to; no point is served in saying, "I criticize myself for not providing leadership in X situation" if objective political facts point to such under-development that leadership was not possible - this does NOT mean that criticism

could not be framed "I should have acted, given my capacities, in a different way than I did in X situation." For instance: Donna should not be overly critical of herself for the uneven development of the Food Co-op - but examine the direction and assistance provided by the Alliance section and the total organization, as well as particular praxis on her part.

C. Must be carefully formulated in terms of other comrades' responsibility to self - it is incorrect to carry out self-criticism for mistakes which could have been prevented if another comrade had acted more correctly; this does not absolve self of certain responsibilities toward that comrade - i.e. why did that comrade fail? For instance, John Taylor's self-criticism in regards to Mike Berger's job loss would need to be carefully evaluated. Did John make it clear to Mike not to engage in political organizing? If so, it would be inappropriate for John to criticize himself for failing to do so. John should examine his self-criticism for the lack of POW organizer training and possibly be critical of the general staff for its lack of initiative in this area.

II. At comrades:

A. Must be made within political terms; must be carefully removed from psychological needs to assert authority, to "prove" oneself, etc.; IF such motives are present, they must be dealt with in political terms - e.g., how does this society's emphasis on competitive individualism create the need to put others "down"?

B. Must be offered in context of vulnerability and accessibility; (this is related to self-criticism which precedes or follows) the comrade being criticized must believe that criticizor is willing and able to listen to an explanation, defense, or admission of error in a fair way (i.e. sense that the criticizor has not made a hard and fast pre-judgement); the comrade being criticized must not feel intimidated out of a sense of fear projected by implicit threats of criticzor; the criticism must be hard in the sense of being firm, well thought out and clearly presented with no "hedging" but must not be harsh; the comrade being criticized does not feel insecure out of sense that his/her own respect, worth, or political integrity is being questioned, unless such is explicitly the case, in which case both parties should openly acknowledge hostility or conflict rather than pretense of comradely relationship.

C. Must be framed, as far as possible, in historical understanding of a comrade's struggle rather than on a single error in a single incident, i.e., the nature of an individual's struggle to grow and develop is always ultimately at the base of a criticism; the

intensity and seriousness of error and of the criticism levelled at that error cannot be ahistorical (although it may be limited by virtue of limited contact - but comrades with little struggle experience with each other should be hesitant to level serious criticisms without such historical understanding). For instance, new members of the organization with little prior political pratice , who violate some aspect of organizational discipline should be criticized fully for such a violation with an explicit understanding of the historical context and lack of experience.

The Substance of Criticism

I. Mistakes in practise among working comrades:
The points following below are analytically separated but are clearly interrelated in reality.

A. Tactical Errors - Mistakes made in the process of carrying out objectives.

1. External

a. mis-estimation of others' abilities and capacities and the failure to trust in the revolutionary abilities and capacities of the ~~people~~ class or the development of such.

b. failure to be correctly conscious of objective conditions among the ~~people~~ class and the material base available that facilitates political organization and work.

c. failure to listen and learn from the people.

d. inability or failure to correctly communicate with and educate the ~~people.~~ class

e. failure to have sufficient theoretical, strategic, and factual understanding of objectives/too great a hesitation to act awaiting more data or understanding.

2. Internal

a. mis-estimation of comrades' abilities and failure to trust comrades to understand and correctly assess the bases of disagreement over tactics.

b. failure to apply, or delay application of criticism and self-criticism.

c. misassessing comrades' need to know - either too much or too little.

d. failure to communicate information, report and evaluate activity/failure to insist on information, reports or evaluation of activity of comrades..

e. failure to support, appreciate, and/or understand other comrades' work/failure to challenge other comrades to higher work levels.

f. failure to participate in formulation of, and demand of leadership, clear tactical objectives and explanations of theory and strategy underlying

such objectives.

g. failure to view activity as part of a total process and a lack of integrated view of all ones' activity:
   1. individualistic work behavior
   2. orientation only to the immediate
   3. possessiveness of work
   4. failure to understand place of others', as well as self's activity in terms of total process

B. Strategic Errors - Mistakes made in perceptions, assessments, and setting forth of basic positions that define objectives.
   1. Failure to participate in formulation of, and demand of leadership, clear strategic objectives and explanation of theory underlying such objectives.
   2. Mis-estimation of comrades' abilities and failure to trust comrades to understand and correctly assess the bases of disagreements over strategy..
   3. Failure to apply, or delay application of criticism and self-criticism and failure to evaluate and re-evaluate on-going strategy.
   4. Failure to have expanding factual understanding and knowledge of objective conditions within a correct theorectical perspective that leads to correct strategy and to constant refinement of strategy/failure to incorporate experience and practise into strategy formulation.
   5. Failure to seek political frame of reference and basis of strategic disagreements.

C. Theoretical Errors - Mistakes made in properly applying Marxism-Leninism and dialectical thinking to theoretical base for development of strategy and tactics.
   1. Failure to participate in formulation of, and to demand of leadership, clear theory and explanation of such theory that underlies organizational objectives.
   2. Mis-estimation of comrades' abilities and failure to trust comrades to understand and correctly assess the bases of disagreement over theory.
   3. Failure to have an expanding understanding of objective conditions and experiences based on practice that leads to correct theory and constant refinement of that theory.
   4. Failure to incorporate and practice basic theoretical perspectives of dialectics and Marxism-Leninism as a tool of analysis.

II. Mistakes in practice among leadership:

Leadership is liable to any of the criticisms for comrades in general. Additionally, leadership cadre are liable to criticisms flowing out of errors in the process of the leadership function.

II. Mistakes in practise among leadership: cont.

A. Failure to exhibit highest level of struggle with both internal and external contradictions.

B. Failure to practise highest level of criticism and self-criticism.

C. Failure to exhibit highest level of practice - that is, highest standards of both external and internal work.

D. Mis-estimation of cadre capacities and potential for growth and struggle.

E. Failure to provide highest level of analysis of external and internal contradictions.

F. Failure to initiate and guide correct process for organizational work:

1. Development and political growth of cadre.
2. Practice and refinement of criticism and self-criticism.
3. Development of most productive and efficient decision-making processes
4. Responsibility for development and/or protection of defined organizational structure and process.

III. Mistakes in practice by the Organization.

A. Failure to engage, organizationaly, in constant evaluation of tactics, strategy, and theory based on experience gained, organizationally, from practice.

B. Failure to integrate all levels of work and practice in the organization into a total process:

1. Communication.
2. Co-ordination.
3. Feed-back.

C. Failure to commit or allocate resources on the basis of socialist criterion - i.e., allocation of resources to make maximum revolutionary gains.

D. Failure to develop on-going priorities, both long-range and short-range, that guide and determine allocation of organizational resources.

E. Failure to initiate, develop, and refine, process of criticism and self-criticism.

F. failure to initiate, develop and refine process of internal education of cadre.

G. Tendency to protect and/or expand organization at the expense of the Revolution.

H. Failure to set standards or organizational discipline (promptness, security, lines of responsibility, comradeship, education) and failure to enforce such standards.

I. Failure to respond collectively to the external responsibilities of its cadre - the existence of which limit the potential capacity of such cadre.

IV. Mistakes in inter-personal relationships among cadre

A. Uncomradely behavior, both internally and externally.

Unfair criticism, criticism levelled in an unprincipled manner, violation of trust, deviousness, lies, and manipulation or mis-use of comradely relationship.

B. Sexual behavior. Sexism; mis-use of emotional feelings out of sexual relationships; separation of criteria of comradely behavior from sexual relationships - i.e., failing to apply principled relationships and struggle attitudes to one particular aspect of one's life.

C. Failure to engage in struggle with oneself or one's comrades over tension or dispute in interpersonal relationships; failure to place such struggle in the context of revolutionary love of a comrade.

D. Failure to take seriously the life situations or emotional and personal problems and tensions facing a comrade and failure to assume comradely responsibility for supporting comrades in such struggles.

The negation of criticism is praise. All comrades must seek as diligently to provide praise, support, encouragement and positive challenge as they do to engage in criticism. Our strength and our unity will increase only inasmuch as we are able to struggle, as revolutionary people, with one another.

Discipline

Criticism and self-criticism are the primary methods of changing behavior of comrades within the organization. They are not however the only ones. In the event that a history of criticism of a comrade on one or more points has failed to produce a change in practice then other sanctions may be considered.

Some actions are so clearly in violation of revolutionary principles or of such serious consequence to the organization (particularly external relations and external work matters) that the method of criticism and self-criticism is not sufficient. As the organization grows and experience is accumlated and procedures clarified, errors become more serious and the standard of discipline will and should become more stringent.

The organization should move immediately to clarify the nature of sanctions, e.g. censure, suspension, expulsion and the procedures for establishing them and the circumstances under which they apply.

Orientation to "work" as that article goes on within the org.

On Work

The strategic and tactical goals of MCLL are both challenging and demanding. The work of the organization consists of all the energy directed toward the attainment of these goals. A great deal of work has and is going on. However, organizationally we have not fully developed the necessary theory and practice around the question of socialist work. For this reason tensions exist and at some points misdirection of energies have occurred. We must develop more fully in praxis the socialist work ethic of cooperation, struggle, service, perseverance and responsibility. This must be achieved by continuing self-criticism-criticism in and around our work. This is necessary to maximize our resources in a way that our goals can be reached in the most efficient, correct and humane manner.

"Intellectual vs. Physical" Work

One source of tension within MCLL has been the attempt to categorize various forms of work as "intellectual" or "physical." This is an incorrect distinction for revolutionary, socialist work. While some forms of ongoing work are weighted more heavily one way or the other, none are completely devoid of either characteristic.

It may be that the actual work of sections has been mystified by unexamined class assumptions. For instance, although Productions puts out materials involving much physical labor, such as typesetting and layout, there has also been much energy expended on developing and sharing general political theory and specific theory aroung propaganda and mass mobilization. Conversely, although RAG has developed analysis for the Ravitz Campaign, much energy has gone into the physical labor in the

operation of computers and compilation of data, etc. Such a mix of tasks can be found in every section.

This is not to say that some sections or cadre have not suffered from an uneven or unexamined allocation of work. Excessive demands have been placed on and accepted by Productions personnel. There is a general lack of understanding and appreciation of the various work loads of all sections.

Finally, many comrades expend great energy but, due to lack of skill or experience, make mistakes. Such mistakes need to be criticized and rectified but effort should be acknowledged and supported.

"Political vs. Occupational" Work

The activities of persons engaged in various occupations, to some degree, has been viewed as work "external" to MCLL. We are all full time revolutionaries. Our primary political commitment is to MCLL. Any work we engage in must be viewed as an extension of this. Categorizing to some degree job related work as external has brought about feeling s of isolation, resentment and lack of appreciation. At the same time the organization has suffered by not using fully an important resource--the day-to-day experiences of folks in jobs. We must struggle not to make this distinction and view a person's work as a totality. More visible programmatic support must be given to persons in jobs.

Tensions do exist between persons who are engaged in remunative work and those who depend primarily on the organization for survival needs. On the one hand, those who do hold jobs view those who are allowed to engage in organizational work on a "full-time" basis as being privileged to do such work. On the other hand, the organization has not been fully responsible to the needs of members who do not have a"regular" income. These tensions must be faced. Above all, a rationalization of meeting adequately the needs of all members in a collective

manner is necessary. Resentments around this latter issue are real and justified.

Bourgeois Tendencies in Work

1. Departmentalism can result from close, on-going work relationships within an organization, shared skills and talents and shared concepts about the "product." A strong, well-integrated section within the organization can be a healthy dynamic but when it becomes departmentalized it is not in the best interest of the organization. Departmentalism reinforces itself. Isolated units grow up. The ability to maintain an organizational perspective decreases. The development of theory and practice around work both on a sectional and on an organization level suffers. Self-criticism-criticism at the sectional and organizational levels is severely impaired.

Departmentalism also results in possessiveness of work and the tendency to view the work of others as competitive. Several areas within MCLL have not been free of these tendencies.

2. We must guard against alienated labor within the organization . In work relationships, leadership must be sensitive to the continual development of skills and understanding to allow persons to relate to the work process in a growing and expanding manner. Closed leadership circles and commandism create alienated labor.

3. Style of work: all persons engaged in MCLL activities recognize that self-denial is involved in revolutionary struggle. Persons who work long and hard provide exemplary leadership. Those who are lazy and slothful, out of guilt, might respond with resentment. However, when the yardstick to measure revolutionary zeal is the level of self-denial, the organization and the individuals involved suffer. A degree of competitiveness is the result. People do get overextended and

cannot properly participate at all levels of the organization. Work, too, might become a question of quantity rather than quality.

4. Self-reliance is an objective of socialist work. However, there is a thin line between self-reliance and individualism. The feeling that "when the shit comes down, you're alone" can produce hostility, defensiveness and isolation and possessiveness of organizational work.

5. We have not always assessed how much and what kinds of work will be involved in obtaining specific political objectives. We went into the Ravitz campaign and the mass projection of MCLL without having a concrete analysis of the work involved. Such lack of clarity and realistic assessments leads to organization confusion and tension around work.