THE ATTACHED PAPER REPRESENTS A FACTUAL ANALYSIS OF EVENTS THAT PRECEDED AND PRECIPITATED OUR RESIGNATIONS. A MORE GENERAL POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE ON THESE EVENTS WILL BE SET FORTH IN THE NEAR FUTURE.

This paper is submitted to the membership of MCLL by the 10 people who resigned from the organization on Sunday, Sept. 3, 1972. Pursuant to telephone and written communications to Buck, this paper, with ample copies for the entire membership, is being submitted to Buck on Sept. 11. We expect a responsive paper within 3-4 days after the first membership meeting following Sept. 11. We, in turn, shall be ready to meet on the first Sunday following receipt of your written paper, so long as we are allowed approximately 3 days' time to prepare our response. That response, by us, will be set forth at the joint, Sunday meeting.

We shall try to write in chronological sequence and avoid needless repetition of uncontroverted and fully understood facts and interpretations. We speak, essentially, to what prompted our resignations.

Prior to the Convention there was no Murphy bloc. There had been a single meeting of 5 people--Sheila, Lynda, Bill, Margaret & Brian. This took place on the Friday night before the Convention.[1] This meeting had been preceded by the Frank-Brian discussion of "how to get Jack off CC," in which Brian served at Frank's request as a conduit to Sheila. The 5 did discuss the question of CC Elections, but they at no time sought to impose a "slate" upon one another and did not vote alike. Sheila, in fact, voted for Frank. The meeting was no more nor less than what might have been expected--or have taken place--amongst members of Moss House, Anderson House or other units, such as "small discussion groups," within the organization.

False charges that there was a "Murphy power bloc" come from sources that have never been as open and candid on questions of power as has Sheila. For example, at Saturday's Convention meeting during the discussion of GS representation, one person, to the best of our memory, spoke openly to the question of power. Sheila, speaking in opposition to dual representation on GS by CC members representing sections as well, candidly stated that this would not be desireable because it would cause sections to use power tactics in the selection of their GS representatives. Sheila took a position that sought to structurally avert such power plays.

At the Sunday, Sept. 3 GM meeting, Frank said he had "predicted to Valerie" after the CC election that the Murphy bloc would be elected to GS and this was"part of a self-conscious process for leadership and power." He then added a postscript, saying that was "okay." We agree. There was nothing wrong with Sections selecting their representatives to GS; and it was proper (and probably predictable) that Marge, Bill, BP and Lynda would be selected from any of their various sections. The point is that <u>at that time</u> Frank really did not think it was "okay;" he was even then obsessed with fears of a "power play" by the non-existent Murphy bloc. These same fears led him to conclude, erroneously, that an unopened wine bottle and people leaving the Campaign Office later than others on Aug. 28 meant there was a second "bloc" meeting. And indeed, he told Justin as a mater of <u>fact</u> that this "second meeting" took place Aug. 28.

On Sunday, Aug. 27, a GM meeting was held and the "bloc" question was discussed. As defined, the Murphy "bloc" understood the import of the questions being raised and readily identified themselves as a bloc. Others did not. It was then believed by the Murphy grouping, and by others as well, that another "bloc" existed and failed to identify itself. Sheila clearly expressed this belief at the GM meeting. Subsequently, the "Murphy bloc" was persuaded that this belief was erroneous and admitted that they had been wrong.

It is one thing to have an erroneous belief. It is another to translate that belief into conduct that detrimentally affects and infects practice within a democratic-centralist organization!

---

[1] Kevin, who had not been a participant in the pre-Convention, Friday night meeting, apparently gained his credentials as a "bloc member" on Saturday morning when he happened upon Red's broken down car on I-696 and helped to fix the thermostat.

On Monday, Aug. 28, there was a RAAG-Campaign Staff meeting. Frank arrived late. Whatever he missed or did not miss, his interpretation of that meeting was totally erroneous. Worse yet, his erroneous interpretation of the RAAG meeting was used as illustrative proof of his equally erroneous, and later retracted, position that the Murphy bloc was punishing the organization for the failure to elect BP or others to the CC.

The objective facts of the RAAG-Campaign Staff meeting are simple:

1. RAAG was responsible for preparing the copy and the training manual for the campaign workers' meeting of Aug. 28;
2. RAAG failed to fulfill this responsibility by
   a. Failing to provide timely and publishable copy to Productions;
   b. Failing to provide even minimal help in editing the wholly inadequate copy furnished, thereby compelling Bill and BP to edit and rewrite the entire thing;
   c. Failing to consider, at all, the needs of Productions--the form and appearance of the manual, the putting together of the manual, the reproduction processes, etc.

Secondly, Michael B. left at the Campaign Office, without conversation with anyone, what can best be described as a stack of shit with a "directive" to the campaign staff to type up his RAAG work. He then left town without even notifying Lynda Ann who was trying to reach him and complete their joint task.

The Campaign Staff on Aug. 28, to be sure, took RAAG to task. And, one after another, Lynda Ann, Pat & Jim accepted full responsibility and criticism. It was well understood that BP and Bill, to the exclusion of other vital work, were forced to work nearly around the clock for 96 hours because of RAAG failures. This was not the first time that BP, in particular, was compelled to respond to the poor practice of others by busting his ass to meet a deadline.[2]

Some of us who were present at the RAAG-Campaign meeting agree with Frank that Bill did say "BP works harder than anyone in this organization" or words to that effect. Our position on the substance of the statement is that it is not literally true--but damn near! We would be happy to survey the organization to see how many believe that they have worked as hard for us as BP.

Our position on the Thursday, Aug. 31, CC meeting was detailed in the Murphy Bloc Report at the Sunday, Sept. 3, meeting of GM. Sheila informed CC at the commencement of the meeting that she had to leave early. She was not asked why. She left. If Frank, or others, as Frank said Sunday, felt that "she was daring anyone to challenge her" reported early departure, it was, indeed, his responsibility to do just that. He didn't.

The CC meeting continued on well past the agenda points initially raised. This occurred because in a discussion of the merits of Lynda Ann "introducing" the GM discussion of the "Gold Papers", a number of members had made reference to perceived divisions and/or tensions in MCLL. Jack suggested that the CC, as leadership, have a discussion of one another's perceptions of this matter.

After an initial presentation by Jack which centered on the historical questions which had previously divided MCLL leadership and the primitive stage of political contention in the organization, there was brief interchange on these matters. When others, particularly Frank, began to speak on the "divisions and/or tensions," it began to be clear that the real subject in their view was the character and leadership of Sheila: her leading her bloc to punish the organization for BP's non-election, her

---

[2]The above facts did influence Sheila's response to Ron at the Sunday, Aug. 27, GM meeting when she cut-off his criticism of BP at a time when BP was not present but was upstairs grinding out the Manual. Also of influence was Ron's abject failure to even begin to meet his responsibilities as "treasurer of the campaign."

being a poor winner and a poor loser, etc. It should be clear that it was not Jack who focused organizational problems on the one absent CC member.

During this phase of the meeting, Sheila called and Valerie answered the phone. As was subsequently learned, Sheila asked Valerie two questions: (1) Is the CC meeting still going on? (2) Who's there? Valerie made two answers, both of which can only be characterized as conscious and deliberate lies to a comrade's direct questions about organizational matters. She lied saying that the meeting was over and by only saying that Jack was still present. Everyone was still present and the meeting was, indeed, still taking place.

Sheila asked to speak to Jack because she had to schedule a meeting with him on CCC matters. Jack and Sheila held a brief and hurried conversation, scheduling an evening meeting to, in Sheila's words, "discuss some of this shit." Jack, who had not assumed that Valerie had lied, indicated that such a conversation would be most welcome, the phone call was terminated and he returned to the meeting. Upon his return, Valerie asked something like, "Is this a CC meeting? I may have unintentionally misinformed Red?" The impression given did not begin to suggest the full nature of Valerie's lies to Sheila. Jack and Frank both criticized Valerie's needless and "timid" confusion on the question of a "meeting," and the meeting continued. It was only that night, when meeting with Sheila, that Jack learned the true nature of the phone conversation and Valierie's conscious lies.

Two additional points on the CC meeting should be made. First, Jack said on a number of occasions that if people had criticisms of Sheila they ought to make them to her, that this was both correct practice and was "possible." Some, including Frank, indicated some skepticism on this. Secondly, Valerie at one point asked of the group of 5, "Well, what are we going to do about this?" Jack made it immediately clear that he was not the part of any group which was going to collectively deal with Sheila.

Thursday night Jack reported the meeting's substance to Sheila, who was justifiably indignant. There were two responses: (1) She called Valerie and told her the matter had to be discussed soon in a special CC meeting, thereby initiating the proper organizational process; and (2) she invited the much-discussed (already convicted) "Murphy bloc," now including, as charged, Kevin, to hear Jack's report. This was the second meeting of the "bloc." No plans nor decisions were made. No effort was undertaken to organize within the organization or to seek support from general members. The matter was left where it belonged, in the CC.

We all have imperfect practice and qualities that warrant and require principled criticism. Sheila, on her part, has on a few occasions that can be enumerated, exploded and left meetings. When she has done this in the past, proper practice would have been to (1) evaluate the reasons for her anger and determine if it may or may not have been justified; and (2) criticize her for her lack of patience. How many of you have ever, even once, done this in the past?

Detecting a generalized flaw in a very advanced member of what was MCLL leadership, Frank proceeded to play-off of your (meaning whomsoever the shoe might fit) discomfort at not having struggled with Sheila in the past. He proceeded to mount an argument without any proper analysis or self-criticism of its "substance."

He writes, at page 4 of his paper submitted at the Sunday, Sept. 3, GS meeting:

> "It is typical to characterize most criticism as baseless and, or unprincipled and, or as having been improperly raised and, or as having impugned the integrity of the person being criticized or disagreed with. We believe that to resign rather than take the issue properly before the appropriated body is characteristic of a 'taking the marbles and going home attitude' which discourages the very struggle and criticism to which leadership in particular must be open."

By Frank's own admission a major premise of the discussion that he initiated at the CC meeting was "baseless" and in our considered judgment "paranoid, bizzare and flimsy" [words he properly attributes to Sheila at page 3 of the same paper] and did, improperly, impugn the integrity of Sheila and 5 other comrades. This is a proper characterization of his belatedly abandoned notion that the Murphy bloc was seeking to punish the organization. Yes, it was "paranoid, bizzare and flimsy" to conclude that an unopened wine bottle and belated departure meant another, "second meeting of the Murphy bloc." Yes, his interpretation of the Aug. 28 RAAG-Campaign Staff meeting was, by any objective measure, equally "baseless," etc.

It was not improper for Sheila, the victim of Valerie's outright lies, to lose confidence in a leadership which had so clearly abdicated and temporized on the question, a leadership which had not even characterized such lies as uncomradely and unprincipled. Nor was it improper for Jack to reach the same conclusions. The position of Sheila and Jack was that it would no longer be possible for them to serve on a CC with someone who had acted as Valerie did. The question of Sheila and Jack's resignation or Valerie's expulsion was a principled position brought to the GS, which was the body to next pass upon the question. GS could have accepted Sheila and Jack's position or the position of other CC members or could have taken any other position that leadership body deemed politically appropriate. Those who see some violation of democratic centralism or a "childish" "take your marbles and leave" stance in Sheila and Jack's political position had best make their positions clear or give them up.

What did the Joyce-Snook and whoever else bloc do?

Frank met with Justin, who has offered self-criticism for letting the meeting go on and for not telling Frank immediately that he thought it was incorrect. Justin did seek thereafter to communicate this to Frank, but his calls were never returned.

In the meeting with Justin, Frank ran out his "punish the organization" theme and the view that he was being forced to organize and campaign after the CC election. He stated that the Murphy bloc defeat (and he wasn't sure it was a defeat) was due, in part, to a "revolt of the dipshits" and secondly some more political considerations on the part of some apparently not characterized as dipshits. He said he had three choices: (1) to meet with Sheila; (2) to raise the matter in CC; or (3) to organize within the organization.

The <u>proof</u> that Frank had already commenced the third "choice" by meeting with Justin is found in the fact that he never once even raised Valerie's obvious misconduct!

Frank followed all three courses, simultaneously. He met with Red, he attended the CC meeting which Sheila initiated by her call to Valerie Thursday night, and he moved to continue organizing internally.

After the Saturday "CC resignation" meeting Joyce et al organized general members. Sheila and Jack met only with the "Murphy bloc," which in defense of false charges had previously met Thursday night, and also sought to inform GS members by telephone of their proffered resignations. This was a proper move toward the appropriate jurisdictional body (GS) and as many people can attest the phone calls were in <u>no way</u> a pre-GS-organizing effort.

The only additional, non-GS member contacted was Justin who had called Sheila, unaware of all that was transpiring, to mention his concerns about his meeting with Frank. At this point, it was necessary that a more full, contextual discussion be had, and Justin was updated by the Murphy bloc and reported his meeting to them. He was not a member of the bloc and he attended Sunday's GM meeting looking for serious answers to serious questions.

The Joyce et al led Saturday meeting with three-fourths of the organization was qualitatively different than the Thursday and Saturday Murphy bloc meetings. It fit the pattern of rejecting proper organizational channels: from CC to GS to GM. Major questions were necessarily going to GM on Sunday, but this process was subverted by the Saturday night meeting. All ten of us who resigned at the GM meeting attended that meeting hoping that people would be forthright and principled. This did not happen.

1. The Agenda agreed upon by the GS (the bloc reports, what is criticism/self-criticism and what is leadership) and agreed on by the general membership was altered by Frank's initiative after his late arrival.

2. The illegitimate emphasis of the attack on Sheila--she doesn't make you all feel good, she intimidates you, etc.--was continued.

3. Sheila was charged with not yet having accepted criticism (not asked for) while at the same time, we witnessed the facts (never self-criticized) of:

a. The patent disregard and contempt of the GS (and GM as well) by Buck, Frank & Valerie. At the GS meeting Buck reported that as the result of a finance meeting and election on Saturday, Hugh had been permanently replaced as finance GS representative by Ron. At the GM meeting Sunday night Hugh reported that Frank and Valerie had come to his home early Sunday morning and asked him to let Ron take his place for that one GS meeting because he could better represent "our view."

b. The obvious meaning of the Joyce Paper, at page 8: "Should a split occur we will not only survive, we will prosper. In merely contemplating the possibility with the membership, we have grown more in one day than in any preceding period."

c. The repeated effort by Justin to have an opportunity to report Friday's meeting with Frank, and the effort by Valerie and Ron to silence nearly all the rest of you in the effort to move the agenda, to "get down" by talking about "sets"--not details, which are hard to remember, but accumulated instances in which we can presume Sheila made certain general members feel badly. We presume that such offended parties, out of liberalism, weakness, lack of self respect or fear failed to raise these matters with Sheila or thru proper organizational channels, but rather, gathered together, unwittingly, on Saturday night and in a manipulated manner heard "one side" and joined under the banner of "Sheila's offended me." You all may not like Red. We still suspect the "organizer's" statements and inferences at page 6 of the Joyce Paper do not fairly characterize memberships' attitudes:

> "There is no member of the organization with whom we have talked who does not feel that they have been disrespected and consequently indeed, intimidated by the very people whom until recently they--and indeed we--respected most."

d. The total refusal by a single participant in the Saturday Joyce-Snook et al meeting to have the political decency and minimal courage to discuss that great "political" meeting that controverted the entire organizational flow (CC-GS-GM) and made, in fact, Sunday night's GM meeting the sick, but real, disaster that it was.

As we understand, from really minimal information, people were called in a sequence to meet and discuss the crisis. Some were called early, some late. Some met for hours, others only briefly. Others, in no bloc--Justin, Sara & Randy, to name 3 we know of--were never called.

Those who called this meeting, still acting on the later confessed error that the "organization was being punished" held our organization, which they claimed to be trying so desperately to preserve, in utter contempt.

If y'all grew so much in that "one day" (page 8) you sure were afraid to show it Sunday night! You struck criticism/self-criticism from the agenda. You laid silent while Justin said he had some facts to report. You laid silent while Justin futilely kept insisting that the Saturday meeting be reported. And, you satisfied the 10 of us that you were either acting in an unprincipled and uncomradely fashion by having already determined your position before Sunday's GM meeting, which destroyed our trust in you, or, by being misled entirely by the Joyce et al bloc.

We do not doubt that some of you were waiting for the leadership of the Saturday meeting to speak. Before 11:30 p.m. or thereabouts you should have bloody-well realized why it was that they chose to avoid speaking about their own misconduct, rather than the generalized, chicken-shit attack on Red.

#