

turned to vacillation and cowardice.

Mao Zedong addresses such empty bravado in his essay "Beat Back The Attacks Of The Bourgeois Rightists". He states: "Don't we talk about tempering? Tempering means forging and refining. Forging is shaping by hammering and refining is smelting iron in a blast furnace or making steel in an open-hearth furnace. After steel is made, it needs forging, which nowadays is done with a pneumatic hammer. That hammering is terrific! We human beings need tempering too. Some comrades, when asked about being tempered, would appear very much in favour, saying, 'Oh yes, I have shortcomings. I'm eager to get some tempering.' Everybody says he wants it. To talk about it is very easy, but when it comes to the real thing, when it means being 'forged' with a pneumatic hammer, he backs away, scared stiff."

Edward Pickersgill was a political opportunist, always out to save his own neck and preserve his position. During the Mini-Cultural Revolution, some comrades were discussing the fact that revolutionaries need to keep their eyes focused on a fixed point in order to maintain their equilibrium. Comrades used the analogies of keeping balance when walking along a railroad track by looking at a fixed point in the distance, and of early navigators training their sextants on guiding stars in order to establish their direction. One leading comrade pointed out that Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought must be our guiding star. Edward Pickersgill picked up this concept and put forward the slogan, "Anti-imperialist revolution is our north star!"

This discussion took place just before the pregnancy of one of the women in Edward Pickersgill's faction was revealed to the Collective. Edward Pickersgill later admitted to another comrade that he thought the coining of this slogan had been fortunate since it had served to warn the Collective members against pinning their hopes on himself as leader of the Collective, and would focus their attention on the political work instead. Thus, the exposure of his darker side would not cause the comrades to become disillusioned with anti-imperialist revolutionary work.

Of course, this opportunist did not articulate his full meaning. He did not say that if the comrades focused their attention on the political work in the general, abstract way he wanted them to, they would be put off the trail of his promiscuity and further investigation of his corrupt leadership, which would lead to exposure of his factionalism.

In actual fact, the slogan Edward Pickersgill coined was theoretically unsound. The north star is a fixed point by which direction can be established. Anti-imperialist revolution is not a fixed goal. It is a strategy that may change if the principal contradiction in Canada changes. The more correct slogan would

be, "Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is our north star". This never occurred to Edward Pickersgill because correct leadership of the Collective was not his primary concern. He was more concerned with keeping the members of the Collective at bay and off his trail.

REVOLUTIONARY LEADERSHIP AND PROGRESSIVE POLITICS COMPLETELY ABANDONED

Edward Pickersgill was afraid of class struggle. He was absolutely unwilling to subject his negative practice to scrutiny by Collective members. Edward Pickersgill claimed that he held back in bringing things to the Collective because he thought the comrades were incapable of actually dealing with them. In fact he held back because of his monumental arrogance and personal pride, and because of his contempt for the Collective.

Contempt for the Alive Production Collective was the underlying theme in Edward Pickersgill's documents issued after August 18, 1978. For instance, in his document entitled "Factionalism, Its Roots And Effects In The APC", he wrote: "I must bring my ideas into correspondence with the laws of the objective external world. I do not think, and I say this with all due respect to the 'members of the APC', that this means bringing my ideas into correspondence with the laws of the APC". What kind of "respect" can Edward Pickersgill have for the Collective members when he slanders their ability to establish Collective norms that correspond with the objective conditions of revolution in Canada? What kind of revolutionary leadership is it that cannot in practice have trust and faith in the strength, honesty and political integrity of the ordinary members?

In the recent political struggle Edward Pickersgill did not even act like a political person, never mind the leader of a revolutionary organization. This charlatan always promoted that the driving force behind him was anti-imperialist revolution. Yet in this recent struggle he threw anti-imperialist politics completely out of the window and attempted to reduce the political struggle to the level of a dog fight over material goods and business interests, as witnessed in his document, "Letter Dated September 30th" and his subsequent bourgeois legal manoeuvres.

Edward Pickersgill was no revolutionary leader. Indeed he was no revolutionary at all. He had no faith in his comrades and no faith in the Canadian people. Mao Zedong spoke of these people who lack faith, in his essay "On The Question Of Agricultural Co-operation". He wrote: "We must have faith in the masses and we must have faith in the Party. These are two cardinal principles. If we doubt these principles, we shall accomplish nothing."

PART SIX Edward Pickersgill Was A Misleader

"LEADERSHIP" BY DESPOTISM — EDWARD PICKERSGILL'S AUTOCRATIC STYLE —

In his essay "On Contradiction" Mao Zedong wrote: "Opposition and struggle between ideas of different kinds constantly occur within the Party; this is a reflection within the Party of contradictions between classes and between the new and the old in society. If there were no contradictions in the Party and no ideological struggles to resolve them, the Party's life would come to an end."

This struggle between correct and incorrect ideas is also a constant feature of life within the Alive Production Collective. It is this struggle which gives the Collective its political life and vitality. It is this struggle which enables correct ideas to triumph over incorrect ideas and so move our political work forward.

What must be our method in such struggles against incorrect ideas? Mao Zedong gives concrete guidance on this question in his essay "On The Correct Handling Of Contradictions Among The People" when he says: "What should our policy be towards non-Marxist ideas? As far as unmistakable counter-revolutionaries and saboteurs of the socialist cause are concerned, the matter is easy, we simply deprive them of their freedom of speech. But incorrect ideas among the people are quite a different matter. Will it do to ban such ideas and deny them any opportunity for expression? Certainly not. It is not only futile but very harmful to use summary methods in dealing with ideological questions among the people, with questions concerned with man's mental world. You may ban the expression of wrong ideas, but the ideas will still be there. On the other hand, if correct ideas are pampered in hot-houses without being exposed to the elements or immunized from disease, they will

not win out against erroneous ones. Therefore, it is only by employing the method of discussion, criticism and reasoning that we can really foster correct ideas and overcome wrong ones, and that we can really settle issues."

This method of discussion, criticism and reasoning to foster correct ideas and overcome wrong ones was not used by Edward Pickersgill. This petty despot resorted instead to name-calling, personal insults and abuse of comrades. Mao Zedong addresses this incorrect approach to criticism in his essay, "Speech At The Chinese Communist Party's National Conference On Propaganda Work". In this essay he points out: "On the one hand, we must be strict and conduct criticism and self-criticism of mistakes and shortcomings seriously, and not perfunctorily, and correct them; on the other hand, we must not be rough but must follow the principle of 'learning from past mistakes to avoid future ones and curing the sickness to save the patient', and we must oppose the method of 'finishing people off with a single blow'."

To use the method of "finishing people off with a single blow" will result time and again in failure of the erring comrade to transform. Edward Pickersgill consistently used this method and its application consistently resulted in the same errors being committed over and over again.

Even when this petty despot put forward correct ideas he did so with an incorrect style. Put forward in such an incorrect way, the correct ideas were sterile and robbed of life. The abusive style in which ideas were put forward by Edward Pickersgill became the dominant aspect of any criticism and any correct content was lost in the process.

While correct content is more important than correct form, an incorrect form can rob correct ideas of their impact and indeed of their very life. This was consistently the case when Edward Pickersgill criticized any of the comrades. The comrade being criticized would remember the shouting and abuse, the looks of hatred and contempt in this petty despot's eyes, but the content of the criticism would go by unnoticed.

Such criticism is worthless. It serves only to demoralize the comrades. Edward Pickersgill used this autocratic style of criticism for exactly this reason. He intended to demoralize the comrades and so strengthen his own position as "chief autocrat" of the Collective and undisputed "leader".

NAME-CALLING AND PERSONAL INSULTS MASQUERADED AS POLITICAL CRITICISM

During criticism Edward Pickersgill would resort to name-calling and personal denigration. These names were always yelled at high volume and with full theatrical gestures and expressions. Any bourgeois theatre critic would have been most impressed by these displays of crude, hysterical emotionalism. As part of these performances this petty despot would rock backwards and forwards on his heels with his hands on his hips and shake his finger barely an inch away from the face of the comrade under attack. This routine was accompanied by slitted eyes full of hatred and contempt. During these sessions this petty despot pinned vile epithets on comrades to humiliate and denigrate them.

Edward Pickersgill was prone to take these "epithetic fits" whenever any comrade irritated him. He would rant and rave, and yell vile epithets at high volume for long periods of time. During several of these "epithetic fits" comrades were concerned that this despot had actually lost his mental balance and become totally deranged.

This petty despot had any number of vile epithets which he used against the comrades. These included such derogatory names as "slimy worm", "bitch", "scummy pirate", and "academic arsehole". It is clear that these terms were devoid of political content and were simply personal insults.

The epithet "slimy worm" was used by Edward Pickersgill to label the comrades whenever this petty despot perceived that they were trying to avoid criticism. Edward Pickersgill would viciously accuse

the comrade of "weaseling out of criticism". This petty despot used the term "worm" to describe his own definition of the activity as low level, and the term "slimy" to describe what he characterized as the "wriggling and squirming" to avoid criticism. What a vile slander to describe any comrade as a "slimy worm"!

In some cases when Edward Pickersgill yelled the epithet "slimy worm", the comrade in question was indeed trying to evade a justified criticism. On other occasions the comrades were simply trying to defend themselves against an unjustified attack. On no occasion was the use of the term "slimy worm" correct.

Comrades who make mistakes are still comrades. The mistakes do not miraculously transform them into vile creatures, beneath contempt. Yet this was Edward Pickersgill's view of comrades who made honest mistakes. This was a reflection of his desire to humiliate and denigrate comrades during criticism and "finish them off with a single blow".

Other vile epithets were used to label comrades who fell into disfavour with this petty despot. "Scummy pirate" was a term used to denigrate one comrade on the basis of this comrade's untidy appearance. When the criticism of this comrade's appearance was first made it was justified. The comrade was in the habit of dressing untidily.

However this criticism should have been a minor point made in passing, not a matter of principle. The comrade was given no mild warning and then encouraged to change his practice. No, the vicious attacks began immediately. The vile epithet used was absolutely incorrect and had no place in comradely criticism.

The petty despot continued to use this vile epithet for years although the comrade in question had quickly rectified the mistake. The comrade was derided as a "scummy pirate" although he dressed tidily and cleanly, and washed regularly, which was more than could ever be said for Edward Pickersgill.

The epithets "academic arsehole" and "veg" also had no place inside the Alive Production Collective. The term "veg", as a short form of "vegetable", and the other epithet mentioned were designed to insult comrades in the Collective with a university education. These comrades were criticized for being vague and disconnected from reality. At times the content of this criticism was correct but at no time were these two derogatory terms anything other than absolutely wrong. Edward Pickersgill's aim in using these epithets was simply to insult the comrades concerned. When he made these criticisms this petty despot had no intention of actually trying to assist these comrades in combatting the real problems they faced.

CRITICISM BY DISCUSSION AND REASONING WAS DENOUNCED AS LIBERALISM

On one occasion Edward Pickersgill went so far as to actually call Michelle Landriault, his "virgin maiden", by one of these vile epithets. During one particularly vicious session of criticism the petty despot yelled at his virgin maiden that she was a "bitch". One of the other comrades leapt to the maiden's defence pointing out that none of the comrades should be referred to as a "bitch".

Edward Pickersgill immediately turned on this comrade and denounced him for "liberalism". The virgin maiden abandoned this honest comrade and leapt to the defence of her husband. She whined that the use of the term "bitch" was correct since it reflected real class hatred for an incorrect political line.

With his virgin maiden as an ally, the petty despot turned the criticism back onto the other comrades present, claiming that unless they jumped in and helped him deal with problems they had no right to criticize his methods. He denounced the comrades for laying the burden of dealing with these problems on his shoulders. What sophistry!

For one thing these autocratic methods used by Edward Pickersgill never actually dealt with any of the problems on hand. This petty despot yelled a lot about the problems on hand but by no stretch of the imagination did he ever actually deal with any of

them. Other comrades did actually deal with problems. They dealt with problems by discussion and reasoning not by yelling and screaming. Edward Pickersgill labelled discussion and reasoning as "liberalism" and so did not recognize the work of the other comrades in actually solving problems.

Edward Pickersgill developed his attack on the other comrades still further by claiming that if they participated more in these criticism sessions it would not be necessary for him to resort to such extremes as yelling and name-calling. This was a lie.

From their own direct experience several of the comrades were well aware of the fact that if this petty despot received any support in these sessions he would indulge in yelling and name-calling to an even greater extent. With support he felt firmer in his position and so attacked the comrades even more viciously.

Edward Pickersgill's recurrent "epithetic fits" had their root in his incorrect approach towards criticism and towards relations between comrades. He viewed criticism as a process of condemnation and personal denigration. He viewed comrades who had made honest mistakes as beneath contempt.

Edward Pickersgill did not understand that honest mistakes are made as a result of incorrect ideas implanted by the bourgeoisie. They can be overcome and practice can be transformed through the revolutionary process of criticism and self-criticism.

Criticism is a positive process which is essential if our work is to move forward. We use the method of criticism in order to advance our political work. Edward Pickersgill used criticism as a means of insulting comrades and demoralizing them in order to retard the overall political work.

EDWARD PICKERSGILL'S BAD LINE ON CRITICISM UNDERMINED COLLECTIVE SUPPORT FOR A NEW MOTHER

Edward Pickersgill's "epithetic fits" were often part of an extended campaign of protracted "political criticism". One such campaign was waged against a woman comrade shortly after the birth of her first child. At this time, this comrade needed the support and encouragement of the Collective in adjusting to her responsibilities. Instead Edward Pickersgill waged a criticism of her on the basis of her class background. This vile campaign, which reflected his mistaken view of criticism, merely served to isolate this comrade from the majority of the Collective members in general, and from her husband, also a Collective member, in particular.

Using the incorrect premise that being a mother would freak this comrade out, Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault interpreted every little incident following the birth as indicating that the comrade was "becoming a petty bourgeois bitch."

When it was reported that the comrade had complained to one nurse about the abandonment of a child care program initiated by a nurse on another hospital shift, the two scandal-mongers began popularizing the slander that the comrade was bitching at the hospital workers all the time.

Petty incident after petty incident were similarly blown into points of principle by the hard core of the faction over the next two months. For example, when the comrade first came home from the hospital she wore a full length dressing gown around her house. She explained that she felt more comfortable in the dressing gown than in tight fitting pants. This dressing gown routine only lasted for two days, but in that time the slanders launched by Edward Pickersgill and Michelle Landriault were enormous. The comrade was labelled as the "dying swan", "a typical petty bourgeois neurotic," etc.

This being the comrade's first child, she was slandered repeatedly on some of the minor mistakes she made in child care. On many occasions Michelle Landriault arrogantly marched into this comrade's house, grabbed the child out of the mother's arms and proceeded to condescendingly give her a lecture on "proper" child care. In fact, there was not anything improper about this new

mother's care of her baby.

The effect of this campaign in the overall was to make this comrade appear to have "flipped out" in the eyes of many Collective members. Those who did not have access to the actual facts and who were aware only of the slanders thought that this comrade was slipping quite badly from the good level of her previous political participation.

CRITICISM BY VICIOUS INTIMIDATION

The tactics used by Edward Pickersgill when criticizing comrades were often designed simply to intimidate the comrade in question. So this petty despot would yell and scream, his eyes filled with hatred and contempt. He would refuse to listen to the comrade being criticized, would constantly interrupt the comrade, purposely misinterpret the comrade's position and denounce them for upholding a position which they had in fact never upheld. Comrades would be threatened with dire consequences unless they toed the line. This petty despot would subject rebellious comrades to isolation from their comrades and from the political work.

When these intimidatory methods of dealing with erring comrades were questioned, this petty despot would attempt to justify his actions by saying, "Although these people have taken up anti-imperialist revolutionary work, they have a lot of bad ideas which need to be rooted out. They need to unlearn all that they know and relearn it with an anti-imperialist perspective. Their spirit must be broken so that they don't know which way is up and which way is down, and from that point begin to learn again!"

What a bare-faced exposure of his reactionary line! To set out consciously to try and break the spirit of a revolutionary in this way is clearly counter-revolutionary.

Time and again Edward Pickersgill defended his claim that this intimidatory style of criticism was essential to our work. Yet he hated it with a vengeance if any comrade dared to raise their voice at him. He would accuse the comrade of all kinds of vile things. This petty despot hated even the mildest criticism. He would react with arrogant outrage that his "perfect practice" and "advanced political level" were being challenged by a mere plebeian. Immediately this petty despot would launch a rabid defence of his own personal integrity and prepare to launch a vicious attack against the comrade who had dared to speak out against his tyranny. Edward Pickersgill's refusal to accept criticism because the comrades making the criticisms were "impure" and had made errors themselves goes directly against Mao Zedong's teachings on this question.

In his essay "Serve The People", Mao Zedong says: "If we have shortcomings, we are not afraid to have them pointed out and criticized, because we serve the people. Anyone, no matter who, may point out our shortcomings. If he is right, we will correct them. If what he proposes will benefit the people, we will act upon it."

On a number of occasions this petty despot took his intimidatory tactics during criticism to the extent of threatening physical violence. One classic example of this occurred when one of the men comrades made an unacceptable lewd comment about one of the female comrades. This was wrong, but Edward Pickersgill's response was way out of proportion to the error made.

This petty despot became quite hysterical, yelling and screaming denunciations and waving his finger less than an inch away from the comrade's face. His eyes slitted with hatred and contempt, this tyrant spat, "I feel like throwing you out of the Collective so that I can kill you!"

Edward Pickersgill appeared to have completely lost his mind. He repeated this threat at high volume several times and also threatened to punch the comrade out.

This whole hysterical display was outrageous by itself. It is particularly outrageous when this petty despot's "moral outrage" in this event is compared with his overall degenerate social practice and his own bourgeois view of women as sexual commodities. What hypocrisy! Edward Pickersgill had no shame!

Edward Pickersgill's intimidating style of criticism revealed how similar his attitude towards Collective members was to that of the capitalists' foremen towards workers. He expected Collective members to unquestioningly follow his orders. The only "acceptable" response that a comrade could give to Edward Pickersgill's order to "jump" was "how high?"

Another relatively minor incident is a good example of this foreman at work. A comrade came into a Collective work area. He was met by Edward Pickersgill and casually told that the two of them should get together. Edward Pickersgill left the room. The comrade decided to attend to the task which had brought him to the work place while it was on his mind, before chasing after Edward Pickersgill and finding out what he wanted to talk about.

In the course of the comrade doing this small job, this self-styled foreman stormed into the room and launched an hysterical attack against the comrade for not immediately following after him. The tirade was continued a couple of hours later in a Collective meeting. Edward Pickersgill labelled this comrade an "individualist" because he pursued his own individual program and not the Collective's (read: Edward Pickersgill's) program. The comrade was also labelled a "putschist" for disobeying the direct order (read: casual statement) of Edward Pickersgill.

The attack on this comrade was hateful and denigrating, obviously designed to stamp out the spirit of rebellion in the Collective against the petty-authoritarian style of leadership. In this Edward Pickersgill was as successful as any capitalist foreman: his attack only gave rise to increased rebellion from Collective members.

EDWARD PICKERSGILL ORGANIZED ON THE BASIS OF COERCION OF COMRADES

When Edward Pickersgill's petty-authoritarianism was resisted by comrades he would resort to pure intimidation to get what he wanted. This was the case in one instance where Edward Pickersgill was attempting to organize a room to be used for regular meetings.

A number of Collective members and supporters allow their homes to be used for political purposes. Agreements on the use of homes for political purposes are formally agreed upon between the occupants of the homes and the Alive Production Collective. In this way the Collective seeks to avoid potential misunderstandings which may get in the way of the anti-imperialist political work.

Edward Pickersgill directly went against this longstanding policy of the Collective in arranging for the use of a room in a home for these regular meetings. An agreement had been reached with one comrade that her home would not be required for meeting purposes. This was because the house was laid out such that it was impossible for a meeting to take place in the home without disrupting domestic activity.

Edward Pickersgill went to this comrade's house and told her that the Collective required a room on the main floor of her home for study group meetings; these meetings ran 4 nights a week. He conducted himself without Collective authorization.

The comrade replied that this arrangement would be unacceptable and brought up the formal agreement she had reached with the Collective that her house would not be required for meeting purposes. Edward Pickersgill became quite irritated with the resistance she put up to his spontaneous idea. He suggested that she could move her living room furniture into a boarder's tiny bedroom upstairs and allow her present living room to be used as a combination of the meeting room and bedroom. Of the boarder, Edward Pickersgill said, "This comrade will do what we tell him to do."

Thus, if there was a study group going on, this boarder was expected to stay out of his bedroom until the meeting was over.

The woman comrade who owned the house opposed the idea, saying she liked the location of the present living room just fine. Edward Pickersgill, true to form, attacked her unmercifully, attempting to draw upon any half-baked idea which would get

under her skin. He pointed out that the present living room was wood panelled and that he had heard that she didn't like wood panelling. So, why didn't she agree to move her living room?

The comrade continued to oppose the idea at this point, refusing to be drawn into side issues and referring back to the already-in-place agreement on the use of her home.

As Edward Pickersgill escalated this argument with the aim of breaking the spirit of the woman comrade, she adopted the position that she'd like to talk to her husband before making a decision. He sneered, "There's no point in doing that, your husband will do what I tell him to do."

When pressed for an immediate decision on the matter, the woman comrade eventually gave in to the cruel persecution. Edward Pickersgill made no accurate report on this incident to the other members of the Collective.

A SPECIAL CAMPAIGN OF HARASSMENT LEADING TO A "SPECIAL DISCIPLINE"

Edward Pickersgill's criticism of one comrade was particularly vicious. He launched a fierce personal attack against this comrade which sharpened in intensity and broadened in scope over six months.

On the first day of the attack Edward Pickersgill orchestrated a document writing session. The comrade was ordered to respond to titles dreamed up by this petty despot and scribbled across the tops of blank sheets of paper. Two of the "glorious" document titles were "Further Plans In My Head For Unity With Reactionaries" and "Why I Am Now Promoting The Petty-Bourgeois Line That There Is No Hope And I Should Be Suspended From The Alive Production Collective — Or — A Tearjerkers (*sic*) Lament." The titles reflect the cruel and denigrating character of this attack. Edward Pickersgill was out to smash the spirit of this comrade and subjugate him under a "special disciplinary program". This comrade was slated to be the petty tyrant's favourite whipping boy and servant.

Edward Pickersgill conducted this document writing struggle on a one-on-one basis. On the day it occurred other Collective members, including other leaders, were purposely kept uninformed about its development.

At a Collective meeting held in the middle of the document writing process, Edward Pickersgill made a contemptuous reference to something the comrade had written in one of his documents. This was the first concrete information other Collective members had about the documents.

The comrade disagreed with Edward Pickersgill's point. The petty despot lashed back, "Are you calling me a liar?"

"No," the comrade replied.

"What are you calling me then?" sneered Edward Pickersgill.

After a short pause the comrade said, "I guess I'm calling you a liar."

Of course, at that point other Collective members had none of the facts on which they could make sound judgements on this exchange. Knowing this, Edward Pickersgill immediately went into a full attack against the comrade. He ridiculed him unmercifully and forced him to completely abandon his "liar" charge before the harassment pressure was eased.

Following this exchange Edward Pickersgill assigned another title to the comrade: "Ed Is A Liar." The title was intended to mock the comrade's rebellion. The document itself was self-critical. Its purpose was to drive home the point that the comrade had been completely wrong in disagreeing with Edward Pickersgill.

A recent examination by Collective members of the document in question, which along with many others had been hidden away by Edward Pickersgill, revealed that Edward Pickersgill was indeed a liar. He had yanked what the comrade had written out of context, twisted its meaning and made a completely false accusation. At the time the comrade's orchestrated self-criticism was effective in diffusing the drive by Collective members to investigate the facts.

Now, however, Edward Pickersgill's conscious anti-Collective scheming stands exposed!

Other documents assigned by Edward Pickersgill expressed equal contempt for the comrade. The title on one document was so obscure and contorted that the comrade never replied to it. That incredible title was: "My Explanation For Promoting The Line That My Reactionary Theory Comes Out Of My Reactionary Practice And Will Serve My Reactionary Theory At The Expense Of My Closest Comrade."

Following the document writing struggle Edward Pickersgill sat down with a leading member of the Collective and described the entire process. As this comrade read through the documents, the reactionary dog persistently made comments like: "This really fucked him around", "This really got him going", etc. What a disgusting attitude for a person who supposedly just conducted a principled political struggle! Only a huge amount of revolutionary contempt is equal to the task of scorning the rotten politics of Edward Pickersgill!

FANATICAL DISTORTION OF A COMRADE'S PAST HISTORY

Opportunism and maliciousness were the driving forces behind Edward Pickersgill's vicious criticism. Often he deliberately distorted certain Collective members' class backgrounds to suit his own subjective perceptions of these people and to wrongly colour other Collective members' attitudes towards them.

One comrade who was treated in such a way came from a petty bourgeois family. In her grandparents' generation, on both sides of the family, the family was bourgeois. Her immediate family, although being rather ordinary petty bourgeoisie in terms of occupation and income, have strong bourgeois aspirations. These bourgeois aspirations played a large part in shaping this comrade's thinking before she got involved in revolutionary work.

Throughout the beginning stages of the Mini-Cultural Revolution, Edward Pickersgill carried out a vile campaign of slander against this particular comrade. He spread the lie, far and wide, that this comrade came from the bourgeoisie. He attacked every aspect of her past, always without investigating the actual facts and always behind the comrade's back.

Those who listened to these slanders were presented with the illusion that much investigation of this case had taken place. This was because Edward Pickersgill was fanatically firm in his judgements, often being close to foaming at the mouth at the "rotteness of this comrade's past".

In a fit of despotism one day, Edward Pickersgill got into this comrade's photo album and began giving "proof" that this comrade was a "slut". Any male in these pictures who was unknown to other Collective members was described as being a former lover of this comrade. In a fit of rage, this petty despot had some of the pictures ripped up.

Meanwhile, an actual process of investigation was initiated by other members of the Collective. It established the facts on this comrade's class background. The myth that this comrade was a "bourgeois slut" was firmly overthrown. Still the slanders issued by Edward Pickersgill lingered in the minds of some Collective members. It was not for more than six months, until the overthrow of the counter-revolutionary enemy Edward Pickersgill, that the record on this comrade was once and for all set straight.

What was the purpose of this underhanded attack? First and foremost, Edward Pickersgill was working to split up the sexual social relationship between this comrade and her husband. By discrediting her, he hoped to either force her to leave the Collective without her husband or force a separation between them while both remained as members of the Collective. A second reason for this attack is that Edward Pickersgill was a sexual pervert. He expressed this in the sense that he himself engaged in all kinds of sexual promiscuity and liberally let this experience pass without analysis. However, he was an outspoken moral prude when it came

to examining other people's "promiscuous" histories.

DISTORTION OF MICHELLE LANDRIault's CLASS BACKGROUND LED TO LIBERALISM AND COMPROMISE

Michelle Landriault also had her class background deliberately distorted by Edward Pickersgill. The purpose of this distortion was to shelter his wife from decisively coming to terms with her past history.

Michelle Landriault's family is upper petty bourgeois. Her father is a project director of a large U.S. imperialist construction company. He holds the title of corporate vice-president but is, what the company calls, a "working vice-president". Both of her parents originally came from the working class and have consciously chosen to betray their class backgrounds. Her family has many of the rotten attitudes of the bourgeoisie since her father is a direct servant of the U.S. imperialists.

Edward Pickersgill did give Michelle Landriault some criticism for her unwillingness to split with her family. However, criticism was always superceded by his approval of her on-going friendly contact. Amongst Collective members, Michelle Landriault used to maintain one of the closest relationships with her family despite their untrustworthy and reactionary character.

The fact that Michelle Landriault's mother and father betrayed her working class background in a most decisive way was always sloughed off by Edward Pickersgill. Instead, he used to stress the good working class roots that other parts of her family had maintained. Never did Edward Pickersgill recognize that in order for Michelle Landriault to uphold that aspect of her family history which is working class, she'd have to decisively split with the rotten class betrayal of her mother and father. This is why, year after year, Michelle Landriault made trips to her parents' vacation home for little "holidays".

When she came back from her holidays, Michelle Landriault was steeped in petty bourgeois and bourgeois illusions. Her consciousness was filled with bourgeois romance, dreams of "middle class" material comfort and twisted perspectives on Alive's anti-imperialist political work. She never really rooted out these illusions after her holidays, only setting them to one side until the next holiday came along. Of course, a big aspect of these holidays was the fact that she dragged her children along and allowed their minds to be filled with the same illusions.

The other members of Edward Pickersgill's faction also had their histories distorted. As in Michelle Landriault's case, the purpose of the distortion was to shield these comrades from the struggle to actually come to terms with their class backgrounds.

One factional comrade's family has its origins in the lower petty bourgeoisie. Over the course of his early adult life, the comrade's father moved between the working class and lower petty bourgeoisie. Later he built a capitalist firm and became a straightforward bourgeois. Today he is a very rich man. In the course of his meteoric bourgeois rise, he concretely turned on his former working class friends with such tactics as strike breaking, and firing union organizers who had previously been his closest friends.

Amongst Collective members, this comrade's immediate family were the only ones from the bourgeoisie. This is a significant fact which shouldn't have been overlooked. Edward Pickersgill, however, put forward that this comrade came from a straightforward petty bourgeois background. He stressed that her family was hardworking and had working class ties.

This was a wrong analysis. He never mentioned the bourgeois background of this comrade's family, or the class betrayal that her parents engaged in as they built up ownership in the capitalist firm. He never mentioned the fact that her father sold his business to a U.S. imperialist company. He never mentioned the fact that her father made hundreds of thousands of dollars in selling the old family property to real estate developers. Edward Pickersgill consciously worked to build up this factionalist in the eyes of

Collective members. It was only after detailed investigation by the Collective that this matter was set straight.

PETTY INTRIGUE WAS A TRADEMARK OF EDWARD PICKERSGILL'S PRACTICE

Intrigue and deception were consistent aspects of Edward Pickersgill's participation in Collective life. These deep-rooted counter-revolutionary traits became most apparent to the Collective following the exposure of his degenerate factional activities. Prior to August, 1978, however, there was strong indication of this factional approach from his participation in inner-Collective political struggle. The Alive Production Collective's main mistake was to not sum up this evidence earlier and do a thorough review of Edward Pickersgill's participation in Collective life.

In early 1978 Edward Pickersgill prepared a document giving his views on the difficulties a certain comrade was facing. This was a unique document in that no other similar documents had been written during the Mini-Cultural Revolution. After writing the document, Edward Pickersgill immediately read it to a large group of comrades. This group did not include the person to whom the document was addressed.

The document was titled, "Internal Report, Leadership Unit, Document #4, Prepared by Ed for Consideration of the Leadership Unit". This title is an outright lie. It was not an internal report of the Leadership Unit for two very good reasons. First, the leadership unit of which Edward Pickersgill wrote had been rendered non-functional by him a number of months earlier. Thus there was no such thing as an internal report of this non-functioning unit. Second, the other members of this leadership unit heard about the report at the same meeting as many ordinary members of the Collective. What's "internal" about that?

The term "Document #4" was also an outright lie. The first sentence of this "internal report" reads, "As in the cases of (*initials of 3 comrades*) it is necessary that we take a formal and far ranging look at the situation in which (*the specific comrade*) finds herself." No formal report of this type had been done on any of the 3 comrades mentioned, nor was such a report ever done.

What is the meaning of these lies? Specifically, Edward Pickersgill prepared this report with the intention of showing it to the comrade concerned. Although he wrote the document all by himself, and the views in it represented only his own views, he wanted to give the comrade the illusion that her case was being carefully handled in the best democratic centralist revolutionary form. Further, he wanted her to have the illusion that other people's cases had been handled the same way. These are the illusions that were eventually passed on when the comrade was presented with the report.

Why did so many other comrades allow this deceptive process to take place? First, there was not a broad consciousness amongst Collective members that 3 other "internal reports" hadn't been written. For those who knew that there were no such reports at present, there was the mistaken impression that 4 reports were in preparation, and in order to keep the specific comrade's mind at ease it was necessary to let her know her case wasn't unique in the Collective. It was this type of thinking which made excuses for Edward Pickersgill's deception. Basically, Collective members had the wrong attitude that Edward Pickersgill was just twisting the facts a bit in order to smooth the process. Our liberalism caused us to miss the truth that Edward Pickersgill was consciously lying to a Collective member in order to give her a wrong impression about how the leadership of the Collective was handling her case.

The actual content of this "internal report" is quite wrong. This only became evident after an investigation of the case was conducted following the exposure of Edward Pickersgill's faction. Thus, although other members of the leadership of the Collective had disagreements with the "internal report", in the main they thought the report was good. As in so many other cases, they over-

looked Edward Pickersgill's spontaneity in issuing the report, and his deception at calling it a report of the "leadership unit" on the basis that, in the main, Edward Pickersgill was putting forward correct ideas. This is the same type of liberalism exhibited by ordinary Collective members. Many mistakes and many incorrect ideas were allowed to slip by in this way.

EAVESDROPPING AND SNOOPING WERE USED TO GATHER "FACTS"

Edward Pickersgill's contorted idea of leadership was that he should know all about everything that happened in the Alive Production Collective. He was a classic snooper, going through other people's mail and personal possessions in search of tidbits of information he could twist around and use to attack comrades. He was also a classic eavesdropper.

One example of Edward Pickersgill "the eavesdropper" in action occurred the day after he launched a baseless personal attack on a leading member of the Collective. A number of comrades had not been at the meeting where the attack was launched, including the leading member under attack and another leading member.

The next day, when it became apparent that Edward Pickersgill was not developing his attack or even reporting on the content of the attack to the missing comrades, an ordinary member took the initiative to give a report to the two leading comrades in question. The comrade who had been the subject of the attack was informed late in the day by way of a Collective wall poster. Earlier that same day the other leading comrade had been given a verbal report on the attack in one of the work rooms. Edward Pickersgill consciously put himself in an adjoining room so that he could eavesdrop on this "private" report.

The day after these two reports were made, Edward Pickersgill launched an attack on the leading comrade who had been given the verbal report. Much to this comrade's surprise, he gave her a point by point summary of the verbal report she had received the previous day. He then asserted that she was having a problem because she was upset at the content of the report. The leading comrade was outraged at Edward Pickersgill's unashamed eavesdropping. She told him that she wasn't having any problem with the content of the report and in fact wasn't having any problem at all! (She knew that her "problem" was the fact that Edward Pickersgill was launching yet another baseless personal attack against her.) With her militant response, though, she ended this reactionary dog's attempt to make some sort of unprincipled alliance with her.

UNNECESSARY PETTY ARGUMENTS UNDERMINED COLLECTIVE UNITY

On a regular basis Edward Pickersgill would launch verbal attacks against individuals in the Collective. These attacks would all basically have the same purpose, namely, to keep Collective members in line with Edward Pickersgill's narrow perceptions of the world. The form of the attacks, too, would follow the same course. No matter what Edward Pickersgill used as a starting point for his attack, he would hone in on the same theme: the comrade's differing perceptions of an incident and the defence of these perceptions indicated rebellion against the Collective and its leadership. No disagreement at all was tolerated by this petty demagogue.

Most of these verbal attacks started with minor points which in the normal course of events would rate only passing attention. For example, one day Edward Pickersgill wanted to get into a Collective storage room which he believed was locked. Unknown to him, the comrade who carried the key to this room had opened it only minutes earlier, in anticipation of Edward Pickersgill wanting entry. Edward Pickersgill went to this storage room, assumed it was locked without checking the door, and went to another Collective work area to search out the comrade.

When Edward Pickersgill found the comrade he gave the order, "Give me the key to the storage room."

"Didn't you check the door? You shouldn't need the key, I just opened the door a few minutes ago," replied the comrade.

At this point Edward Pickersgill launched a most fanatical attack. He repeated his order to turn over the key and before the comrade could ask him whether he understood that the room was already open, repeated the order a third time. A look of great impatience and contempt had come over his face. The comrade shrugged his shoulders and handed over the key. At that point, the attack intensified.

Edward Pickersgill stated that the comrade was treating this storage room like his own domain, rather than a Collective area. He said that as the leader of the Alive Production Collective it was more appropriate for him to carry the key. He made these two faulty points in reference to an actual mistake the comrade had made. The comrade had failed to inform Edward Pickersgill, even though he had met Edward Pickersgill just after taking the initiative to open the door. The comrade was assuming that this bourgeois careerist would either expect him to take the initiative or, at the very least, would try the door to see if it was open. This assumption was a mistake.

However, Edward Pickersgill blew the actual mistake out of all proportion, and treated the incident as an opportunity to establish his false, oppressive authority over the comrade. The first argument lasted for 2 or 3 minutes and ended when Edward Pickersgill left the room.

A few minutes later Edward Pickersgill and the comrade passed one another on the street. At the time it was only 7:15 in the morning and most of the neighbourhood was asleep. Edward Pickersgill asked the comrade how he was doing. The comrade replied that he wasn't too happy about the argument that had just taken place but felt confident that he could carry his day's program. Edward Pickersgill soon raised the discussion to the level of a heated argument, despite the location and time of day. He did so by making a number of provocative comments.

The comrade's line was that since this was a minor point, the best thing would be to set the contradiction aside and move on to the day's program. Edward Pickersgill responded that he wanted to clear up the contradiction and if the comrade was just going to proceed with the day's program, he would go home. Edward Pickersgill asked the comrade, "Do you want to go home or do you want me to go home?" The comrade's reply was that both should continue the work.

At another point Edward Pickersgill told the comrade that if he persisted in giving "the leadership" a hard time the only alternative would be for Edward Pickersgill to order him to not carry out his program and send him home to mope around. After a while Edward Pickersgill's line was that the comrade was saying all sorts of things, but the one thing he wasn't saying was, "I was wrong".

The comrade picked up on this cue and did a brief self-criticism for being wrong. Edward Pickersgill accepted it and both joined some other comrades in the morning's program. However, the intense bad feelings from these two brief arguments were not forgotten. While on the one hand, the comrade had accepted that he had made a mistake, on the other hand he deeply resented the insulting criticisms and threats Edward Pickersgill made in the course of the arguments. Other similar petty arguments were commonplace right up until Edward Pickersgill's exposure on August 18, 1978.

CONSCIOUS OPPOSITION TO THE "ANTI-PUTSCHIST" ATTACKS

The general line of Edward Pickersgill's "anti-putschist" campaign was, "I am always right, the putschists are always wrong." In order to win arguments with any one of the putschists, he would do anything he had to do. Lying, threats and overt intimidation were standard parts of his repertoire. In this context,

it was a significant achievement for a putschist to take an argument against Edward Pickersgill to a stalemate. This reactionary would never concede defeat, but he would give up an argument if the spirit of the putschist remained unbroken.

The "nine week putschist" achieved this kind of success on a number of occasions. In the course of being continually attacked by Edward Pickersgill, she adopted the posture that no matter what he said, or how fanatical he acted, she wouldn't lose her composure and start to cry. Once this was achieved, she began to have much greater success in the arguments.

On one particular issue the "nine week putschist" knew she was correct and was able to argue Edward Pickersgill to a stalemate despite his continual lies. This comrade was in charge of booking a film for a meeting sponsored by the Collective. The film distributor was located in Montreal. Because of another booking, the film could not be sent from the Montreal office until 24 hours before it was scheduled to be viewed in Guelph. This made for a very tight schedule, and if there were any complications it wouldn't arrive in Guelph in time for the meeting.

The comrade had a planning session with Edward Pickersgill to discuss the situation. Her thinking on the subject going into the session was that if the Collective could afford the money, a comrade should personally go up to Montreal, pick up the film and bring it back to Guelph to ensure that it arrived in time for the meeting. Edward Pickersgill gave no indication of support for this idea and the decision coming out of the planning session was to rely on courier services to transport the film. As it turned out, the film did not arrive in time for the meeting.

At this turn of events, Edward Pickersgill launched a ferocious personal attack against the "nine week putschist". He accused her of going against Collective discipline in refusing to arrange for a trip to Montreal to pick up the film. The comrade's reply was that she had never received any direction that the film should have been personally picked up. Edward Pickersgill responded by telling her that although she hadn't received any direct order on this question, she knew very well that this was the position of "the leadership". Her action amounted to conscious rebellion against "the leadership", he argued. In actual fact he had told her not to go in person.

The "nine week putschist" knew Edward Pickersgill was lying through his teeth on this one. He wanted to put the blame for the disrupted meeting on her shoulders along with fabricating yet more evidence of her "open rebellion" against the Collective's "leadership".

The comrade refused to give in to these false charges. She pointed out that because the possibility of going to Montreal had been on her own mind, if Edward Pickersgill had made this suggestion she would surely have agreed and taken that course. However, Edward Pickersgill never so much as hinted that this was the course of action favoured by "the leadership".

In the end Edward Pickersgill gave up the argument rather than attempt to pursue the matter in broader Collective circles.

This was a victory of sorts for the "nine week putschist". She was successful in arguing Edward Pickersgill to a stalemate. To follow it up, she should have then taken the issue to the Collective as a whole and united with a majority of Collective members to oppose Edward Pickersgill's deliberate lies. Her personal satisfaction at taking the argument to a stalemate did nothing to change the situation in the Collective.

TREATING COMRADES LIKE ENEMIES

Edward Pickersgill's intimidatory tactics were sometimes a little more "subtle" than his yelling, screaming "epithetic fits". At meetings where he had in mind to launch an attack against one comrade in particular he would make specific criticisms of all the comrades present except for his "victim". The "victim" then began to feel very nervous wondering when the axe would fall. The apprehension on the "victim's" part grew as Edward Pickersgill

deliberately refused to address any comments towards his target, often proceeding as if the person was simply not present. This growing apprehension led to fear and silence.

The petty tyrant would then jump on the "victim's" silence and non-participation as the starting point for his attack.

These attacks were carefully orchestrated to break the unity among the comrades present. The other comrades were usually willing to simply keep quiet in order to evade the maniac's wrath. They were simply glad to be off the hook. When initial criticisms were given, each of the comrades was made to feel that they were to be the "victim" of the petty tyrant's wrath that day. When they realized another comrade was in fact the day's "victim" a sense of personal relief would divert the comrades' attention from the plight of the actual "victim".

In this way the petty tyrant stifled unity and comradeship in the Collective and removed the possibility of learning from other comrades' mistakes.

Edward Pickersgill's whole vicious program of insulting and intimidating comrades during criticism led many comrades to seriously consider leaving the organization. In face of vile attacks, the comrades would become disorientated and lose all sense of self-worth. Feeling worthless and a hindrance to the organization, they would consider leaving in order to serve the political work of the

organization. What a crime that comrades should be made to feel that they are beneath contempt and worthless in this way!

Each of the comrades in the Collective is precious and should be treated as such. Errors are made, to be sure, but these do not reduce a comrade's contributions to nothing. On the contrary, if they are used to learn new lessons, these mistakes can be used to increase a comrade's contributions greatly.

Whenever his style of criticism was challenged the petty tyrant's ultimate defence was to plead that, "the end justifies the means". This is nonsense. There is no justification for treating comrades like enemies.

The fact is that the "means" used by Edward Pickersgill were unjustified regardless of the end they did or did not achieve. To treat comrades like enemies is wrong. Mao Zedong addresses this point in his essay "Talks At The Yen'an Forum On Literature And Art".

Mao Zedong points out: "To criticize the people's shortcomings is necessary, as we have already said, but in doing so we must truly take the stand of the people and speak out of whole-hearted eagerness to protect and educate them. To treat comrades like enemies is to go over to the stand of the enemy."

This is exactly what Edward Pickersgill has done. He has indeed gone over to the stand of the enemy.

PART SEVEN

Edward Pickersgill Created an Atmosphere of "No Light Criticism"

The purpose of criticism within a political organization is to point out political and organizational mistakes. This process is essential if the organization is to develop and move forward.

We must however take a dialectical and all-sided view of criticism and not dogmatically apply a set formula. When major errors are made, major criticism and examination of the errors is necessary. When minor errors are made, light criticism will often suffice to rectify the error. A minor error which is consistently repeated despite persistent criticism may become a point which requires major criticism in order to root it out.

Edward Pickersgill did not distinguish between criticisms of a minor and a major nature. This petty despot treated all mistakes as if they were of a most serious nature and raised small points to a matter of principle. Any minor error was seen as an excellent excuse to yell and scream at the comrades by this tyrant.

The petty despot also used minor criticisms as an excuse to drag out a comrade's entire life experience. Criticism was never simply restricted to the issue at hand. The erring comrade's whole life was called into question.

Edward Pickersgill's line was that before they joined the Collective all of the comrades had totally negative experiences. He viewed life before joining the Collective as a deep mire of filth and corruption for each of the comrades. He, of course, was an exception to this rule.

This dogmatic line is anti-materialist. If a comrade's experience before joining the Collective was completely negative, where did the spark of rebellion, the desire for change come from? These positive sentiments are necessary before any real political consciousness can be developed.

Comrades who enter the Collective already have a relatively high political consciousness. This consciousness was developed outside the Collective.

It is therefore ridiculous for this anti-materialist to claim that each comrade's life before joining the Collective was a totally negative experience. It was out of these experiences that a desire for change and a spark of revolutionary spirit developed.

The line of "totally negative" is wrong. It is a reflection of a dogmatic and non-dialectical approach to political questions. This

was the line of Edward Pickersgill.

A specific example of this line is the attitude towards collectivizing new members' financial resources. When one new comrade joined the Collective, the first official function he participated in was a discussion with some members of the Collective leadership unit. He was asked if he had any specific questions to ask and he responded with the questions which were on his mind.

Edward Pickersgill had previously requested a report on all this new comrade's financial holdings. When the comrade made this report, Edward Pickersgill asked the comrade which of his financial holdings he was willing to turn over to the Collective. Before the comrade could answer, this petty despot said, with eyes slitted and contempt ringing in his voice, that he would know that the comrade wasn't serious about joining the Collective if he wasn't willing to turn over all his finances for Collective use.

Just before Edward Pickersgill spoke, the comrade had been about to propose a gradual time schedule for turning over his finances which would coincide with the process of him coming to know the Collective work at a more in-depth level. Not wanting to make finances a point of principle which would hold up his integration into the Collective work, the comrade told Edward Pickersgill that he was willing to immediately turn over all his financial holdings to the Collective.

This is a prime example of Edward Pickersgill putting forward an undialectical and opportunistic position towards the process a new comrade must embark on in taking up revolutionary life. Certainly radical rupture is required with what was negative in a new comrade's past life. This radical rupture requires the full and conscious participation of the new comrade; it cannot be coerced into existence under the hegemony of Edward Pickersgill or anybody else. A person subjected to such coercion quite often merely goes through the motions of radical rupture and remains politically unconsolidated. This is why the process of radical rupture cannot be an overnight affair. It must be conducted over a protracted period of time, involving a healthy spirit of criticism/self-criticism/transformation throughout.

However, Edward Pickersgill's motivation was to get the