

**Suggest:**

1. what do you remember about the circumstances in which it was introduced – place, time, context
2. what do you understand about this concept
3. can you provide any examples or samples
4. how did you use the concept or tool

**Concepts:**

1. Class content/class stand

**G1:** working at PW; G7 was working there also. During the period when G7 and the others had left the farm and were going around initiating study groups. Were raising the question about who the coops served. Think it was around summer to fall 1974. G7 had been talking about why the PW didn't carry canned foods, food people will eat. Was raising the question. PW had weekly meetings and had to come to consensus on issues. For several weeks had been intense discussion on what foods were going to carry. There were two or three people strongly against making those kinds of changes. Got to the point they wanted to kick G7 out. Up to that point G1 had been very quiet in meetings. When got to point of voting to kick G7 out of the collective, G1 gave her talk – thought what he was saying made sense. Did not talk in front of people so was a big step. Remembers it was the first time taking a class stand. People were totally shocked that she spoke up. People backed down from kicking him out. People in control of PW were very threatened by this; their value was tied up in what they had developed.

Had no idea what she was doing was a class stand. Had no theory. Parents moved family to wealthy suburb for schools. They were on the bottom in terms of class (parents academicians). Was on the bottom in terms of class and social status. Father built their house; mother made her clothes. Thinks this factored into forming her ideology. Experienced the snobbery directly. Thinks this experience entered into how reacted to situation in PW and why she defended G7 (had no personal connection to him at all). Thought the coops should serve the people; not try to convert people to eating whole grains. Everything G7 was saying made good sense to her.

Picked up on for a study group right after. Does not recall when became aware that what she was doing was taking a class stand but thinks it came together during that period; month or two after the particular situation at PW.

**G2:** Working at health center, after Beanery paper released, [redacted] 'working on' G2. Had some reaction to BP, had burned out on the coops earlier, frustrated with how they were run, hard work but Mill City all controlled by Chuck P and [redacted], left and ended up at the health center. Felt BP was sort of an insult to the work she had done, finally after discussion with Irv, came to conclusion needed some sort of organization in the coops, and decided then there was not reason for her to be resisting this change. Hippies say want to organize and do political work, but at same time are exclusive, keep people out. She was still a little involved at MC. Hard to read it without being defensive initially because she had put in so much work, initial reaction was who are these people coming from outside and criticizing. But when thought about it, saw she had much the same criticisms.

Started working at MC in Feb 72, was there a little over a year, to May 73. Came expecting to do community organizing, but only worked a lot and was at awful meetings that went on and on. June 73. Saw level of awareness of people coming to the store was still at a low level; struggle with CP and PM. Also some awakening feminism, saw D [redacted] as macho, building organization through personality. (Anti-war movement context; Saul Alinsky community organizing; VISTA. She applied to Peace Corps.) Wanted to see more organization – picked up on Keith's idea of a committee. After Oct 73 when she was coming to realization she agreed with criticism of coops.

**G3:** G5 invited to a study group, G3 had practice in daycare coop. They were generally around the coops and the left, Powderhorn house of NAM people. Q got them into study groups, G5 asked if G3 could get into one too. Was 'blown away' by the study. About spring of 75. They were founders and co-runners of MDAC, had been there a few years. People were talking to him in addition to the study group, dhm was one that really hit him. Eddie F in his study group, brought in as 'foil to Eddie'. Q took them around to some coops. Remembers talking about distinction between class experience and class stand. Did some 'spy' work. A particular event was at Seward (?), they were asked to participate, it struck G3 that what was being discussed on who was the coop for, related very closely to their experience at MDAC – saw need for child care and child development (G5 lead on), getting into



community organizing on child care, paper called Democratization of the Family, became clear to them that the initial organizers were holding the center back, New University Conference people, conflict between Q and Paula, parents took over from organizers. G3 spoke up at the Seward meeting. Had connected to coops around healthy food, but not aware as much of ruling clique (Powderhorn a little different). The study group itself was astounding to G3, an enlightenment. Was generally attracted to what the o was putting out, no reaction. Also remembers a conversation in a bowling alley when it hit him that this was serious, adrenaline.

Macalaster; SDS; G5 and her friends; civil rights and anti-war movement at Mac. Got married, decided to join VISTA, didn't go; friends went to Selma; electoral politics.

**G4:** Generally for him a series of situations (continues) in context of personal relationships. Always seems that when takes a class stand, is rupturing personal relationships. E.g. in high school, position around war could create ostracism. Selby coop – couldn't be easygoing and go with the flow, had to contradict people's view of him. Had to go to a lawyer, get leases changed, sitting in the car with people who were friends but 'reactionaries' was difficult. When asked to go to PW takeover, had to go against girlfriend. Time of stolen t-shirts. Series of decisions. Wasn't so conscious it was a class stand – didn't look at these as for his development. (Later when wife and child left, first time took a stand for own development.) But clear on hippie institution vs connecting to people in neighborhood. Struggle putting self in physical confrontation also.

Background – worked at Selby peripherally; worked mostly in the Tenants Union, organized in Selby neighborhood, living in commune; this late 73 thru 75. Was in VISTA to do the community organizing. At the time considered self somewhat militant, very involved in the political community. Had met with our friend thru Tenants Union; people pulled G4 into Selby more. Had good theoretical background, had studied in college and outside. Also anti-war organizing; brother in SDS.

Note discussion of people who had more advanced theory tended to be held back because value in their theory was challenged with figuring out what to do in real situations.

**G5:** Not involved in the coop struggle. (Didn't realize it at the time, but grew up in the working class neighborhood. Pioneer background in family, dad social worker. Grandparents hands in logging camp, got land to farm. Note in assessment process, parents of different generation, more material.) Biggest thing for her, was very involved socially in the sets of people connected with coops and other political sets in town. She was looking for an organization. Q working on them, invited her to join. Had trouble with some of the literature; did want Q directed. Felt she wasn't 'working class' so situation where [redacted] said 'what are you doing here, you aren't wc', [redacted] said difference is taking a class stand. Struggle for her to break social ties to do it. She saw signs of the organization, attracted. Older, had house, kid, etc. – learned has to be a context to be part of group taking a stand, has to be in your historical context. Saw it was time to do something, fit with her looking for organization. Coop thing wouldn't in itself be enough. Was looking for org because of experience in daycare coop – first had to meet the material needs of the program, people with kids – but didn't have enough to take it to next level to take people somewhere based on their material experience of having kids. Had a lot more vision than people around her, but didn't know how to move it forward. Saw the coop movement had the capacity to take it somewhere.

Also was the study group, important because her thought is 'now the rev is happening', saw it as something serious. One sign was that took security seriously, recognizing reality and were taking care of her.

**G6:** First turning point for her where she got the term class and an explanation was at Mill City, G7 was there, gave her an article related to working class women, the theory of ruling vs w class was there, struck her. Also the value and legitimacy of the wc, this was a huge turning point for her. During 73, she was a shopper there. Had moved up with [redacted]. G7 remembers the paper, it was a class perspective on feminism, dripped with venom, lively writing, funny and nasty, JP had picked up. Was the type of thing you could give a person to see how they responded. G6 talked to [redacted] about it, got pulled in. Struck her because of clarity of class anal instead of middle class, etc. – plus the value of the w class, doing the work, not getting the credit. Related because of her background of always sticking out like a sore thumb after they moved to the suburbs due to wc background. Really was the rights and legitimacy of the w class. After started to get pulled in, didn't really have to take a class stand. Started study, had some reaction to the secrecy. Read dhm, made perfect sense to her. But scary because of comm stuff, insecurity about the red squad, etc. Involved taking risk. First material class stand was invading the PW. Didn't particularly want to go, didn't see as her struggle, but related to discussion of



social property, saw the logic. Related to woman wacking the hippies in PW. G6 saw clearly now knew who these people were. Then difficult talking to angry people screaming at her, needed a break. Came back in, every day was didn't want to do it, but is the right thing to do. Always thought back to the PW and the clarity of the stand. Wasn't such an issue of losing social contacts. Interesting her understanding of potential consequences, being from Chi, knew there was a red squad, etc. vs TC. Her background told her need to work the system because objectively in oppressed situation. Note carried through to current work situations, can take a stand when needed, but still struggle doesn't want to be yelled at. [organizing principle of taking people from their realm of understanding – zone of what can do by self and what can do with good leadership, more but not infinite – is individual, particular, changes, ebbs and flows – a good organizer know for each individual what is their potential at the moment]

**G7:** Came up first at farm study group, questions asked 'who owns the coops', answer was 'class clique', then 'what should be done?'. Around 72. G7 had been brought into coops by KR, was at farm on his invitation. At that point had to consider that K and S were part of the clique and he was going to have to break from them and go back in and do something about the clique, wasn't sure he could do that. Was writing, thinking, was explicitly a class stand in ownership was a class clique, necessary to oppose coming from wc perspective. He came into coops because looking for pol program with econ base, had experience with orgs dependent on donations from the rich or theft etc. Attracted to serious economic base, joined to try to develop jobs. Then became clear that there were all these swirling interests involved, some people wanted only nice little club. Objected to the exclusivity, not the food etc. Became clear wasn't going where he thought, needed to go to farm to think. Class stand came when discussion of who owns, what gives them the character they have, etc. – if finally crystallized for him it was a class thing, saw the individuals involved, saw S saw as a place she could start a business. Eric had vision of PW becoming Whole Foods. Saw could go in a lot of different directions, saw not going in direction of political program unless strong organizing effort to do it. Not sure he could do this (him and JP), no history of leadership position, scary to try, but clear someone had to do this. Lack of confidence overcome by the necessity, help from T in terms of org principles. Clear T had deep experience, highly principled, took a long time to figure out if was someone he wanted to follow. Also used class stand as a concept when organized people; looked for people doing the actual work. Saw this as a way for the assholes not to win (for a change). Next point was during PW takeover, he failed, had too many friends, went along but didn't provide leadership. Was being shaped by ex wife, etc, has general problem with forceable action. Then got sick, etc. (knew was ideal). Then question was can he come back, or will drop out. Had been clear for years was a comm, wanted a rev, lots of different paths (some blind alleys), but question was will continue to work this direction or fall by wayside in some way. Sees as series of big ups and downs in terms of stand, tends to personalize.

#### Summary:

Taking class stand involved breaking with something from the past practice. Sometimes social relations, sometimes own practice. People come into a condition where it is not possible to sit on the fence. You had to be in the context of the issue or struggle – you have to have both the unity and struggle of opposites – overcoming something in a concrete contradiction you are involved in. Can't be just an abstract idea. A class stand is not theoretical, it is ideo.

Taking class stand is a series of struggles, continues to this day for us.

G7 and others had no trouble identifying with the correct stand, difficult to take action in some conditions.

Thoughts of background of racism in how one reacts to having to take a class stand. Note the b concept of classes (middle class etc.) and pitting classes against each other – and people's fluid and varied class backgrounds –

Reference the diagram of wc vs cap, mc vs sexism, wc vs rac – each of us a more complex set of ideo being that affects our struggles in taking a stand.

## 2. Mode of thought

**G6:** Working at the daycare center. Introduced in relation to developing the children. 'Realist' was the open term for metaphysician used in the daycare center. Concept was actually introduced as part of the original assessment process but remembers it more in context of the daycare center.



**G3:** Remembers that the identity between himself and M was picked up on early on. Both were assessed as metaphysical. Later on got changed but doesn't remember when. Practice with money indicated couldn't be metaphysician. Were in process of buying property at the time.

**G4:** Remembers very clearly because had read all this stuff but had absolutely no idea what any of it meant in practice. When concept was introduced was first real theoretical thing could grasp materially. Could see the concept in personal practice; idealist. In particular was around events at PW – when it had been infiltrated and lost in large part due to G4 idealism. Concept had been introduced sometime in 1975.

**G5:** Had some difficulty with this one. When in heaviest practice assessed as metaphysical based on Father who was sense as DI. Because he had left farm. View that if one's MOT changed, then needed to look at the other. View that only opposites would be in a relationship. Was reassessed in mid-80's as idealist. Gave paper to the two of them; working in parallel; big wheel, little wheel. Decided both idealists; very difficult case. When got into daycare was sense that G5 was a metaphysical going to town. Able to put theory into practice in getting daycare up and running. But was more related to historical experience in daycare vs mot. Biggest practice re mot was intense stuff did with the kids at daycare. When reassessment came was much clearer. Had hard time understanding how could be metaphysical. Just didn't fit. Made total sense. Did not step forward and take clear leadership role in every situation. In arena where knew things (e.g. daycare) could step in and get things going. Otherwise more conforming; and in terror of next thing that would come down. Thought was a metaphysician; dominating everyone; not supposed to do that, so held back. Practice re daycare was identified as metaphysical but was more due to vast historical experience with daycare vs MOT. One effect of having assessment changed, is that is more critical. Conscious of stereotypes. May see someone as metaphysical but holds back in mind that may be misleading. Will be tentative in assessment of someone but will use it. Did not see thing as a big mistake; did not make that conclusion.

**G6:** Remember understanding it in very mechanical way at first. Wasn't until working with children that became clearer. In time, with practice, became obvious. What did it was seeing personal practice reflected back in children. When all started understanding it better tried to use the concept in working with children. Remembers seeing some results in the children. Was at the same time being pushed by G3. Learned concept of interpenetration by watching G3.

**G7:** Remembers being assessed as idealist from very early stage. Involved in assessments of other people early on. Being wrong a lot of the time; getting confused by the phenomenon. Impressed on G7 early on was strengths and weaknesses of different MOT's. Difficult understanding metaphysical and difficult understanding how word applied to assessment. Realist made more sense. In terms of weaknesses, one of difficulties was being systematic. As ITP became more systematized started to lose track of it more. Has trouble following things in procedural and systematic way. Has been developmental for G7 when forced to do it, but resists it. Preference is to immerse self in topic and have it snap to a conclusion. Assessment itself was condition for looking at self in different way. Difficulties in mixing up forms; not sure what was appropriate in different situations (organizational forms). Tendency was to be more open with people and to bring them in closer than there was a material basis. Couldn't understand putting boundaries on relationships with people. MOT was anti-organizational in some respects. Idealism new mode of thought invented by capitalism, in the particular form that we find it. This idea introduced to him by TS. Capitalism needs that MOT and FOM much more. New forms of organization; new scams; new ploys; new ways to manipulate people's minds. Although there are weaknesses in MOT, is a historical necessity. Connection between MOT and difference between Protestant and Catholic church – idea of free will.

**G2:** Remember introduced early on as part of the assessment process. Assessment may have changed but, if so, did not make much of an impression. As far back as remembers was assessed metaphysician. Remember it being applied crudely at first, but got more sophisticated as went along. Worked in EB for many years, an open form, so used assessment process in dealing with people. Used process to assess people; helped understand their motivation and how they would react in different situations. Used assessment process more in assessing other people; vs assessing self. Long discussion about effect of understanding ITP in how we do/do not do things that are outside our comfort zone. Understand things aren't qualitatively easier, but probably easier to force ourselves to do it. Probably would not push ourselves to do things outside MOT if had not been introduced to ITP.



**G1:** Introduced very early. Remembers very little about when it was introduced. Vaguely remembers being aware of it when working at PW. Remember there was some value attached to being an 'idealist'. Somehow it was better to be an idealist. Doesn't think there was ever any question that she was a metaphysician. Remember really struggling theoretically with the concept. Had to be believable for her to adopt the concept. Doesn't remember a lot about it. Was working at PW when introduced. We analyzed our mistakes as idealist or metaphysical. Were reading 20 Enemies at the time. Presented in the context of developing organization. Very first tool introduced. Thinks introduced along with c/sc. At that time was the only tool we had to deliver principled criticism to someone – criticism based on their MOT. Principle struggle at that time was just pushing self to express opinions. Remembers the organizational context, in conjunction with 20 Enemies and c/sc. First time remembers being serious about organization.

Need to develop chapter about moralism in relationship to development. Lot of moralism in the beginning because of ignorance. People used it as capital. Part of the natural struggle people go through

[useful to summarize characteristics of both modes of thought. should be around somewhere]

### 3. DI/non-DI

[The concept of DI was easy to absorb because there is acceptance in general society that one parent usually has a stronger influence on the child than the other e.g. 'acorn doesn't fall far from the tree'. Trying to think if know any metaphysical men that stuck it out. Don't think so. They want to control the organization they're in.]

[add identity and identity content to list]

**G4:** Initially had hard time with concept that mother had that much control and influence over him. Thought he was beyond her reach. Was conscious when left home that wanted to be far enough away that they couldn't make a surprise visit. Thought he was free from her influence. Was disappointing to think that he was replicating her code. Resisted it for awhile. Always had seen father as much more working class so wanted to be more like him because he was 'cooler'. Hers was more a petit bourgeoisie background (father owned furniture store). She grew up more affluent than G4 did. Mother married down. Motion with mother is form of contrariness. Tried to justify it – she can't influence me because I don't listen to her. Struggle to distinguish between conscious/unconscious motion. Realizes now that the influence didn't end when she died; it's embedded deeply.

[Think it would be useful to examine how the influence is transmitted between DI and child. Possibly part of it genetic. Don't understand how this works. Would be useful to study this in depth to understand how is passed on. DI is the parent that shows the child the most useful things. Think maybe the child is born with a predisposition to one or the other and the parent picks up on it and moves to influence the child. By age two this is all formed. Marie Montessori's studies.]

**G1:** Had no reaction to mother being DI because liked her. Remembers thinking it was interesting. First time looked at background and class background as something other than middle class. Wasn't threatening. Part of first assessments in 1974 or 1975. Intense period of development. Had accepted the concept behind the process but was more passive. With first study groups remember needing to have theory explained to her in concrete forms so could understand and apply it. Once made that breakthrough, the other concepts were easier to accept. Some people fell out at this point because couldn't understand how the assessment process worked to making revolution. Wanted to go out and make revolution. Didn't have that problem. Understood that this was all about making revolution. Was committed and had thought it through. Not sure ready to risk life. Issue wasn't whether or not this was right; struggle was more about whether she could follow through.

**G6:** Has really come to understand DI/non DI in the past few years when has become so involve conceber whd in their care. Had rejected her when she was about 12. Decided didn't like her because was stone cold male chauvinist. Didn't like the way she treated people, especially father. Have ht was intorad to become dominant aspect in relationship with parents because of their illnesses. But realizes now that when stepped in did it in very male chauvinistic way. Doesn't think DI meant anything really



until started working with children and met their parents. Applied it at daycare e.g. if child idealist would work with them in developing something with their hands. This would have been 1978, 1979. Think assessed child's DI and non/DI. Would try to get non-DI involved. PIC for her was lack of confidence. Made a lot of sense to her. Hasn't been until taking care of mother that feels contradiction changing.

**G2:** Doesn't remember when concept was introduced but didn't have any disagreement with it. Seemed pretty clear. Has always clashed with mother who was controlling, she rebelled. But accepted assessment, made sense. Saw the implicit outlook that was being passed by DI. Don't remember strongly the time the concept was introduced, saw it made sense. Does see she can get beyond it now in being able to deal with her DI's tendencies, like harassing father.

**G7:** Concept interconnected with MOT in his memory of assessment process. Have seen lot of people go thru changing assessments – his has always been same. It was not surprising to him to be assessed as idealist but was surprised mom was di. Father left to run farm at early age, mother daughter of village blacksmith. Father was attracted to mother as an educated person; his background was self-educated himself thought was intelligent. Father's mother thought G7's mother worthless. G7's dad quit farm, got job on railroad. Eventually mother got office job. Mother encouraged art and literature, his dad encouraged engineering. Also got message from both parents was to get out of where at, no future there. Mother religious, father not really. G7 had battles with father from early on, mother mediated. His assessment surprised him but made sense, put some things together for him. Has seen throughout that has difficulty with systematicness etc., has seen clearly the MOT. Sees changes happen in head when consciously goes against MOT, becomes more calm.

**G3:** Father was DI. Think it might have changed at one point, but can't recall. Discussion of DI was connected to Nancy. Interpermeation is FOM. Father didn't teach him a lot of things, particularly around economics. Was said that his father's form was racism in transition to wc, but he didn't make it; resisted it. Had been a farmer. Joined the army. His father died during his basic training. Was sent overseas during WWI and while was gone, remaining family members sold the farm. He never got over that. Wanted to be a farmer; did not want to live and work in the city. In his mind, owning land was wealth. Was always bitter about it. Was not wounded during WWI but gassed. Demobilized at Fort Sheridan. Met mother, married and settled in Chicago.

G3 not sure if his form is racism. Should be theoretically.

Going to college was not standard for G3's era; changed shortly after that. Mother pushed him to go to Loyola Academy. Although father strong on education saw no reason that Loyola Academy was any better than the public high school. Thinks mother pushed it more as a status thing.

Father very proud that G3 was educated. Always talked about his son, the professor.

Mother's family had achieved some status – her father was a general manager at a soap company that was later bought by Proctor and Gamble.

Mother not active in making choices for him but accepted what path he chose. Only insisted on two things: that he go to Loyola Academy and that Nancy be baptized.

Father very opinionated (racism). Strong political opinions. Wrote several essays on world government (when on the farm).

**G5:** Had trouble accepting mother as DI. Reacted to it. Very close to her father. He took very active role in child care. He had been raised on a farm. His older brother was more in charge of the outside work; G5's father was more in charge of the inside work including minding the children. So, very used to taking care of children. Took G5 everywhere and did everything with her.

Both parents had been teachers and married late in life. G5 was indulged and over-protected. Even though spent a lot of time with father, mother was clearly in charge of her development.



Had her involved in everything: piano, violin, dance, Girl Scouts, horseback riding. Left her mentally exhausted and wanting to just do nothing. Father always told mother to give G5 some rest, but didn't happen. Subliminal message picked up from father was 'don't be like your mother'.

FOM with mother – similarity.

Came to understand that father's politics were very left. Gave her a lecture once when she said something negative about the 'communists'. Politics developed from SC.

Mother was very involved in the neighborhood. Although had almost no idea what was happening in the outside world (father told her who to vote for even) knew everything about the neighborhood. Organized the neighborhood around a number of activities. One thing sees pickup up from DI – hesitancy I making a decision.

Both parents emphasized teaching – that's how they survived the depression. Teachers will always be needed – regardless of what's going on.

Mother never gossiped. Very democratic.

Although got the sense from mother that had lost some status over the years, was overall very satisfied with her life. Parents had changed economic status but didn't change class.

MOT coming out of DHM. 4SM when? A little later, This more connected to DI/non-DI.

Clear that learning to operate in one's non-MOT makes huge difference in productivity and ability to deal in the world.

4. IF

MC		Cap		Wh Ch (culture)	
MC – Phys	MC – Intell	?	?	WC ?	WC ?
Sx – Conform	Sx – Resist	L – Conform	L – Resist	R – Conform	R – Resist
Sexism		Lab		Rac (culture)	
recognition, personal		responsibility		obligation	

Plus distinction between personal and social IF.

Note also study of transitional forms.

**G7:** His first intro was this diagram. He got more conceptual presentation because his job to bring it to other people (to some extent). IF initially social recognition, conformity to sexism, sc transitional from resistance to racism. From mother, message be an artist. Response to introduction – followed MOT assessment, a progression in understanding.

**G1:** What I remember was being more objective about whole class background. Prior to that had felt guilt about background. Became materially clear what experience had been. Understanding various sets of relatives. Remembers relating the discussion to reading were doing – class movements. First introduction to her seeing her background in its true class state. IF = MC based on both parents coming out of racism; emphasis on education. People however don't see the MC. Gets value out of doing stuff, doing it well, etc. Remember a slight reaction to MC=personal superiority, but saw that was there.

**G2:** MC. No recollection of that period. Father more from chauvinism, mother from racism. Focus on education.

**G3:** Still unclarity on form. Father DI, father assessed as racism in transition to wc, resisting it. Doesn't remember first assessment. Remembers the period as having big impact on him, but not the first



assessment. His generation somewhat different. Remembers some reaction to assessment of non-di as white chauv.

G4: Assessed as PB, remembers reacting to that. Remembers coming to understanding that IF doesn't necessarily correlate to economic status/condition. Was revelation because had rigid understanding of class, e.g. work in factory is wc, small store is pb, etc. This was good because had always thought mx was simplistic in some ways. Took a while to struggle thru this. Remembers in general the moralism around the concept that was rampant in org. (Discussion: remember struggle for all to understand every form has positive and negative, from cap ideo.) Came to understand more the particularity of how class is communicated, the materialism of the strivings of pb, e.g. education as striving for societal status from mother.

G5: Assessed as different things over the period – thinks first was sexism with strong element of pb. Same response of this being negative thing to be. Mother di, also close to father; earliest assessments had a lot to do with class consciousness – mother encouraged to associate with higher class but always really just practical. Father unlike mother had strong political opinions. Both parents in heavy transition. First her father put out as di. Personal recognition. .... Sees still in process of understanding her if etc. Did not want to see mother as di, didn't want to be like her mother. Conform vs react to sexism. Took sexism as female is mother, she took that and converted that to a social program. Appealed to her in o also that took daycare, turned into process of human development, reordering who takes care of the kids. Reaction to concept of daycare as means not an end.

POV/FOM –

Generally condition of intense work in production, using this to assess people, observe practice. Understanding how the POV works for results in production/work.

Period of physical confrontation some coincidence with this. Generally intense personal confrontation over identities, etc.

G1: Assessed as Realize and Interdependence. Worked in print shops and computer operations at NB (production). The intensity was important condition to see these, through C/SC. Difficulty remembering the past. Can now

G5: Satisfy (at time), similarity – quantity/quality. Her understanding came out in struggling to understand who DI was. Related to sexism. Understands in her DI, mother, she had a plan for what traits she wanted in her daughter. Lessons, education, etc. Not so much skill building, but quality building. She reacts to quantity. Clearly sees satisfy in her whole history, e.g. MDAC. Remembers in car shop, how her POV got in the way – keeping lots of inventory to make sure could satisfy.

G4: Succeed, unity. Instance of moving and assembling the cutter. Frustration with JP in lp of process, G4 frustration with process and no plan, was very negative and contrary, finally he just had to do it rather than struggle with JP to develop it. Principles break down if can help succeed.

G6: Boxing match with Ann, remembers that started to break down her subord relat with her (as person with development, leadership, etc.) Period of learning not to hide behind Secure, to be able to struggle with people in leadership when she saw something. Remembers CSC forms, structured method for being principled rather than personal. Remembers times in bakery where process had gotten to point meetings were efficient, principled, etc. – seeing the results of the development. Understands Secure in her history, keeps her from putting herself out, make sure people taken care of, very careful. Insecure of herself. Remembers going over and over Gratify with Wal.

G3: Progression/regression, similarity. S sees Gain. Secure there a lot, could be social.



G2: Rotate, never understood. Doesn't remember the interdependence. Sees discharge; discussion: this on social side. Remembers a lot of struggle with MF on Take, doesn't remember the particularities.

#### Associative Identity

Based on relationship with parent

Form relationship with people that are similar to relationship have with DI

Try to replicate the identity you have with your DI with other people

Working with people with whom have associative identity can sometimes be barrier to getting things done; has limitations

#### Productive FOM

Subset of the associative identity

These are the forms of motion establish with people; types of relationship form with people.

Connect with other people dominantly in a certain way

Semi permanent

How you do your work; social relations of production

Relates to use value and exchange value

#### Rotation:

Negative side is hanging on to outdated methods; positive side is being the teacher.

Look to disseminate information to others once having something concrete

#### Encode/decode:

Creating forms

Take idea; make program

Ideas grow out of material needs e.g. democratization of the family – need for daycare

#### Generate

Create concept; big fat idea

Converting bakery → coop

Look at the outline – all this is under 'Particularity'.

Productive FOM/identity content not parallel

#### Identity content

dominant identity establish with other people

More temporal, ephemeral

5. PIC/IC

6. POV: personal character, social character



7. User value/exchange value
8. FOM, PFOM
9. Domination/subordination
10. FOO
11. Cycle of knowledge
12. Worksheet
13. Sets, subsets: intersect, union, disconnect
14. AI
15. Open/closed forms
16. Classifications (100, 300, etc.) and subclassifications (101, 301, etc.)
17. Criticism/self-criticism
18. Negation of negation

(B) Adding the amount of any unpaid subscription price and accrued interest thereon.

(ii) The portion of the Keywell Net Enterprise Value allocated to L.L.C. ("Allocation") shall equal the Keywell Net Enterprise Value.

(A) Reduced by (i) the net book value of all real property owned by Keywell and (ii) the net book value of other assets of Keywell other than the L.L.C. Shares and

(B) Increased by (i) amounts owed to L.L.C. by Keywell and (ii) amounts owed by L.L.C. to Keywell and (iii) the net book value of other assets of Keywell other than the L.L.C. Shares and (iv) any other liabilities of Keywell not otherwise stated.

(iii) The L.L.C. Shares shall be allocated among the holders of L.L.C. Shares as follows:

(A) First to the Class A Shares in an amount equal to the liquidation preference of the Class A Shares.

(B) Next to the Class B - 1997 Series Shares in an aggregate amount equal to \$4.00 per Class B - 1997 Series Share multiplied by the number of Class B - 1997 Series Shares outstanding;

(C) Next to the Class B - 1998 Series Shares in an aggregate amount equal to \$1.00 per Class B - 1998 Series Share multiplied by the number of Class B - 1998 Series Shares outstanding;

(D) Next to the Class C Shares in an aggregate amount equal to \$0.04 per Class C Share multiplied by the number of Class C Shares outstanding;



CS

In the context of the TC, coops as an economic program, people also working in other programs, a lot of connections in the left.....

Note the people are relatively educated in the conventional sense, people who already had decided at some level to work for progressive change, people looking for some leadership.....

Taking a class stand was for many people the first significant step in the road to serious commitment to change the world, and to change themselves in order to be able to contribute. For most people taking a class stand was difficult, because it is not just a theoretical statement, and there are many inhibitions built into us all that keep us from really taking a stand. It was just as difficult for people with a strong political and theoretical background as it was for people with no theoretical understanding of class. It is difficult for people of very different class backgrounds. Taking a working class stand is not the same thing as having a working class background. [discussion – what about people with less to lose than others..... all of us somewhat similar class background in the biggest picture – bunch of white young counter-culture people even tho different IFs.....] [first class stand vs continuing class stands in different stages]

Class stand was also the organizing principle in the first stage of the coop struggle. The initial question asked was “Who owns the coops?” The answer was a clique, a small group of people who made many of the decisions, set general tone and direction, and in some cases actually held the capital investment of the coops. Another question asked a little later was “Who do the coops serve?” The answer was that it certainly was not everybody, rather it was counter-culture people who had the time and background or inclination to prepare whole foods and to participate in the stores. These are questions of class content of the coops, but that understanding was not necessary to take a class stand in the coop struggle.

A few people in the coops took an explicit class stand of ownership, saying the coops were a good place to start an alternative business, either a small one for themselves, or that the coops could grow into a large health food business (like Whole Foods is today). But most of the people working in the coops understood the goal of the coops to be organizations that could serve people through providing cheaper and more healthy food and alternative jobs. Some people who understood this goal on the surface really liked the coops as an exclusive counter-culture club for themselves and their friends. Many others were involved as ‘worker-bees’, contributing their work because of the principles of the coops, and hoping it would help, but not being allowed into the informal inner circle of people who ‘ruled’ the coops. These turned out to be the people who were the most ready for change in the coops – again the principle of class stand, organizing the people who were quietly doing the work of the coops.

For everyone, there was some understanding that precipitated taking a class stand, although this understanding was at very different levels for different people. For G7,



when he was asked “Who owns the coops?”, through much discussion understood that it was a class clique. G7 had come to the coops with several years of political experience and personal searching for worthwhile causes, and was at that point explicitly seeking an economic program. He had also already become disillusioned working in the coops because he saw the coops as exclusive. When he understood theoretically the class nature of the exclusivity, that gave him the strength to take a class stand and start organizing in the coops. He remembers his lack of confidence in himself being up to the task or being a leader in this stage being overcome by the realization that changing the coops was a necessity, that someone had to do it. He came to see this as a way “for the assholes not to win for a change.” [also break away from KR...]

G1 was a person with almost no political theory who knew she wanted to work for change in some capacity and fell into the coops. For G1, as discussion heated up in the PW where she worked, answering the question “Who do the coops serve?” made it clear that they didn’t serve most of the people. For her, this answer became clear weeks before she actually felt required to take a class stand. G1 had never spoken in groups larger than two people unless forced to, and listened for weeks in silence as discussion in the PW became more heated. G7 at that point was organizing in the PW, raising questions and proposing changes, and there was a meeting to decide if to remove him from the PW collective. As G7 was about to be kicked out, G1 (with heart pounding and voice shaking!) spoke up strongly in his favor, and the shock of hearing the usually silent G1 take a stand shocked the collective into keeping G7. For G1, it was easy to see the issues, and she immediately understood the exclusivity issue from her own background; but speaking up was difficult – this was the class stand. During that initial period, G1’s struggle continued to be to be able to speak out among people to actually make a difference, to be in the foreground, not in the ivory tower of observation in the background.

G4 on the other hand, had extensive theory, and had done several years of political work based consciously on his understanding of the necessity of organizing working class people. For him, the true class stand came when he had to rupture his comfortable relationships with people. He remembers a series of incidents where he had to make a decision to go against friends, knowing he was disrupting the unity he had enjoyed in the relationships. He was working at S coop, and when the tactics required such decisive action as getting the lease changed, ??? stolen t-shirts, it was difficult for him to step outside his theoretical strength and to take a class stand in practice.