
* WHERE WE STAND *

- * Opposition to all ruling-class policies and *
* organisations. *
* Workers control over production and a workers' *
* state. *
* Opposition to Imperialism and support for all *
* movements of National Liberation. *
* Uncompromising opposition to all forms of *
* racialism and to all migration controls. *

CONTENTS	Page
Editorial '..... York IS	1
Comment Ulster	2
Appeal Nigeria	3
Article Womens' Liberation	4
Comment The General Election	8
..... Makoni	9
Poem Trad Anon	10
Article Youth Revolt	11
Letter From New York	14
Branch Programme	15

It would be easy to make all sorts of grandiose claims about the work of the group in York. However, the reality is that we have gone through periods of intense activity, followed by set backs and disillusionment. The major problem is that in order to begin to have any effect in putting over our politics to industrial workers, we have to be consistent, not only in our political views, but also in any activity we undertake. Against this we must always guard against the possibility of activity become merely a ritual. It is sometimes hard to admit that work which has been going on over a period of time, involving a great deal of commitment has been fruitless. But we have to be continuously prepared to face this possibility.

Despite this and other problems, we have over the past five years, slowly established close contacts in a number of different areas in the town, and now seem to be beginning to reap the rewards of that work.

Last year a factory bulletin was started for the Railway Workshops. This only ran to four editions, but as a result of the experience gained through that we hope to start a new one this year. In addition we hope to produce bulletins for Rowntrees and the National Redfern glass works by the end of the year. In all these places we have now established contacts, and the success of the bulletins, which depend upon inside information and distribution is more probable.

We have also sold Socialist Worker around the Council Estates. One result of this was that a number of people were brought together and helped form Tenants Associations. These have had their ups and downs, but seem to be slowly gathering strength. In conjunction with this we would like to help form a Claimants Union, to help protect those drawing social security. There is a Child Poverty Action Group also working in this area, and we hope that some form of joint work through the Socialist Federation will be possible.

In the university the position seems to be one of uneasy quiescence. Some of the gains won in the past have been eroded by a combination of student indifference, and a more concerted attack by the administration and a number of 'liberal' academics. Constant pressure must be kept up by students for a voice in the running and curricula of their courses, and in the administration of the university as a whole. We must also continue to demand that university facilities are made available to those outside, and particularly to those in need such as the Gypsies etc.

Finally, with the decline of the formal organs of left wing politics it becomes increasingly important that some programme of political education is provided. We hope to go some way towards this, in conjunction with the Socialist Federation and its constituent associations. But political education in isolation is as meaningless as mindless activity. For those who are serious about building the basis for a revolutionary transformation of our society we can offer plenty of work. What we can't offer are any guarantees about its success !

ds
ble
,
ins
A year after the burning, shooting and looting of last August in Belfast and Derry, the dilemma of British Rule is still no nearer solution. Pressure for intervention came from two quarters. First the Catholic minority created such a widespread challenge that Westminster was faced with either standing by, and watching a Catholic massacre by the Paisleyites, or the virtual take over of part of the United Kingdom by the people! Second, in Eire there was increasing pressure for intervention in the North on behalf of the Catholics. Such an act would not only have had the obvious serious repercussions of a military confrontation with British troops, but also would have brought into question the availability of England as a market for Irish produce. Therefore the Eire Government made strong representations to Westminster to get them off the hook by some form of intervention ostensibly on behalf of the Catholic minority.

3
However there were several obstacles in the way for any intervention short of moving in the troops. The Unionists were not willing to make even the smallest concessions because they regarded any reform as the thin edge of the wedge which would ultimately lead to the end of their domination. At the same time the Government of Eire felt that they were not able to jettison (at least publically) what remained of their unfulfilled demands, arising out of the conclusion of their struggle against British Rule between 1916 and 1923, without serious internal trouble. Most importantly, the working class Catholics in Ulster, who had been fighting for years to get the most minimal reforms, no longer had any faith in any form of Unionist control. Nor were they prepared to be pacified by the traditional Catholic leaders who had won a handful of concessions for the Catholic middle class.

5
Thus the use of troops in Ulster had two functions; first to appease Dublin by restraining the Paisleyite fanatics, and secondly to ram the 'new order' of reform Unionism down the throats of the Catholic workers if they were not prepared to accept it willingly.

But the British troops were not tough with the Catholics to satisfy the right wing of the Unionist party and the Paisleyites. These groups are now demanding the use of the Special Powers Act. This legalises the arrest of political opponents without charge; indefinite imprisonment without trial; the banning of newspapers and magazines; and the ability to search without warrants. If their demands are not met, the Unionist right wing are determined to overthrow Chichester-Clark and replace him with someone like Craig. Already they've been able to forstall local government elections, due to be held this year to 1972.

At the same time the troops have not been able to break the resistance of the anti-Unionists. The workers of areas like the Falls Road, are far more bitter in their hostility to military intervention now, than they

were a year ago. Young Catholics in particular are increasingly militant. Much of this is directed into the Provisionals (a breakaway wing of the IRA) which concentrate on brave but futile confrontations with the troops. But at the same time Republicans are becoming more sympathetic to revolutionary socialism, and are collaborating with groups such as Peoples Democracy.

Socialists in Northern Ireland see the need to fight on two fronts: The fight against Stormont for civil and political rights; and the fight for working class unity in a struggle against unemployment, the bosses, and the capitalist system.

The British Left must give every possible support to this struggle. The most effective way to do this is to strengthen the Irish Civil Rights Solidarity Campaign in this country. To this end a Conference to generate and organise support has been organised on October 10th and 11th in Birmingham. Anyone interested in going should contact Mike Lomax, Chairman of the York University Socialist Federation.

MEANWHILE.....

Meanwhile, excluded in the media by the more 'newsworthy' events in the Middle East, the fight still goes on in Ireland, South-East Asia, and Africa. One result of this lack of interest is that the attack by the military government of Nigeria on socialists, and in particular the attempt to shut down the "Nigerian Socialist" - the paper of the Nigerian Labour Party - is virtually unknown outside that country.

The paper championed strikes in the Federal Region, hard hit by inflation before, and during the war. Early last year it ran a series of articles exposing the ruling class' links with foreign big business. One of the owners named, a dock contractor, sued the paper for libel and was awarded \$2000 damages. Dockers staged a sympathy strike in support of the paper which depends entirely on the dedication of workers for funds - it carries no advertising. Since the Court case it has not been able to publish. Since it is illegal to launch an appeal in Nigeria, and all attempts to collect money from individual supporters and at factory gates are prevented by the Public Collection Ordinance, funds to prevent the editor being jailed, and to enable resumption of publication, will have to be collected outside the country.

WE APPEAL TO ALL SOCIALISTS TO GIVE WHAT THEY CAN

Money should be sent to 'The Nigerian Labour Party', c/o Tanji Osoby, 192 Stoke Newington High Street, London N 16. (Or Jim Edmundson, 28 New Walk Terrace, York or c/o Langwith College).

WOMEN'S LIBERATION AND RADICAL LEFT GROUPS

Over the past few years the West has witnessed the development of a significant Woman's Liberation Movement. It is evident that the Movement originated among women involved in radical politics. (It is as long ago as 1966 that Juliet Mitchell's article ' The Longest Revolution' appeared in New Left Review providing the British Left with an account of socialists' and marxists' approaches to the family and a comparatively new analysis of Women's oppression.) It is apparent that the changes that have taken place in radical politics over the past decade has helped to accelerate Women's Liberation as an organised movement. The difference between the Left in the late 50's and the late 60's is important when taken as a basis for understanding why there was no Women's Liberation Movement until recently.

In this context the change in the Left's attitude towards emerging groups is the significant factor. The Old Left , seemed to consider that what mattered was the number of people it could reach within these new groups and move around to its way of thinking, i.e. it was inconceivable to sink differences of opinion. In consequence further fragmentation of the Left occurred and there was hesitancy, even hostility exhibited towards groups which did not immediately adopt the 'correct line'.

The change of attitude towards the student movement in 1968 due to the success of collective action in France etc., was a crucial turning point. Although perhaps debateable in practice, I.S., amongst others, announced (I.S.33) that they;

"were prepared to merge our organisation with any others which share our sense of the urgent need for united action. If our differences inhibit what we can do, the left is likely to be permanently condemned to irrelevance."

The importance of this change in the radical movement, which strongly influenced the formation of Women's Liberation, was a subsequent recognition that it was possible that a generalised movement for revolution was not viable to fight all kinds of oppression which were specific to individual groupings within society (i.e. the student movement, Black Power etc.). From the point of view of left groups this was not to deny that such groups should be correctly linked ideologically to other types of specific or general oppression. Sheila Rowbotham emphasises this in her article 'Womens Liberation and the New Politics'. After quoting Mao Tse Tung's allusion to minority groups taking power into their own hands, she goes on to

say :

" But closer related is the realisation within Marxism of the inter-locking nature of oppressions and the significance of hegemonic control."

There are many differences between the old and the new left, but perhaps what has been discussed so far can serve as a brief understanding of why there was no Women's Liberation movement until two or three years ago. After all there were always women involved in left political groups. Their position in these groups was much the same ten years ago as it was six months ago. They were active but the roles open to them within the movement were those of leaflet distributors, typists, etc.. Male chauvinism was certainly not absent ! The ideologues were male, leadership of the groups was male, but women in the left did not appear to feel that society was oppressing them any more than it had oppressed anyone else. In other words they did not believe that male chauvinism had defined their role in the movement.

Thus it was partly due to the lack of consciousness on the part of the women that a specific movement was not considered necessary until recently, and partly due, as above mentioned, to the Left ideology of the time. Up until the mid sixties it was argued that if Capitalism is the root of all oppression, and if it and its institutional structures were changed, then each oppression in its various different manifestations would also end. It did not seem to occur to women at that time that after the revolution women might not be free.

In the mid sixties, groups began once more to organise around their own sense of oppression and related concerns: tenant activists fought against rent increase; students demonstrably question 'academic rights'; workers began striking with increasing frequency - all these could be seen as being implicitly anti-capitalist. In the face of this seeming diversification of revolutionary potential, left groups began to envisage incorporating the specific grievances demonstrated by these groups into their own political framework.

In America this similar change of attitude in the left was accompanied by a recognition of the importance of creating alternative life styles. Clearly this life style, or cultural revolution, where adopted by an individual within the left can lead to a consciousness of oppression on an individual basis. Because this was more widely adopted in America than in Britain, it is not surprising that left wing women there began noticing oppression in traditional relationships between women and men, whereas here it seems that it was Women's Liberation rather than left wing women who exerted pressure for this recognition (E.g. the Easter I.S. Conference).

There has been a fair amount of discussion as to the perspectives of Women's Liberation. It was especially noticeable at the

National Oxford Conference that there were opposing attitudes, even among the radical women. It is ^{the} diverging theoretical attitudes of these women which should be considered seriously by left groups.

There are numerous variations on the theoretical theme that Women's Liberation is inherently revolutionary. The more extremist, quasi-political, feminist line sees the genesis of all oppression in society as the exploitation of women, and thereby maintains that the only way to revolution is through the liberation of women. For some women this conveniently justifies their non-participation in other revolutionary groups.

A position that a number of industrially orientated women take is that capitalism relies to such a great extent on the exploitation of women that any attempt to redefine the role of women on an equal basis with men would necessitate the collapse of capitalism. This is close to the attitude Audrey Wise and L. Lloyd take.

Others, notably those affiliated in some way with I.S. or I.M.G. see participation in Women's Liberation as a way to radicalise women who are just becoming conscious of their own oppression. In other words it can be seen as a means of approaching groups of non revolutionary women, learning from them more about their immediate grievances, and helping to bring home to them the nature of the oppression not only which they undergo as women, but that all people undergo in a repressive society. One of the activities that form part of Women's Liberation may demonstrate the potential problems the group faces.

One of its major functions, at least in Britain, has been that of a support group. In York this is the position we find ourselves in with relation to a 'Mothers Alone' group, members of which have attended Women's Liberation meetings. I think the group can play an important part in raising the consciousness these women have of their own personal problems and relating them to the problems which confront women in industry and day to day life. While the value of acting as a support group is unquestionable, the fact that personal oppression is a result of female oppression plus class oppression may easily become disguised. It is very easy for Women's Liberation to fall into the trap of agreeing that men are the enemy, when capitalism is the enemy par excellence. If one were to develop the former attitude to the extreme, it would be implied that the revolution entails struggle on the basis of sex, not class.

Fully aware of the unwholesome 'more revolutionary than thou' attitude of many left groups, it is important to stress that Women's Liberation does hold definite possibilities of developing a revolutionary consciousness and of threatening institutions within capitalist society. It can only serve as a means for this end, however, if

it develops beyond the consciousness of individual oppression and individual ways of coping with it. But, although general demands such as the right of entry by women into industry are of prime importance this does not mean to say that left groups should reduce Women's Liberation merely to an economic function. Juliet Mitchell, I believe rightly, suggests in her article 'The Longest Revolution' :

Economic demands are still primary, but must be accompanied by coherent policies for the other elements (i.e. reproduction, sexuality, socialisation, and familial patterns), policies which at particular junctures may take over the primary role in immediate action."

It is radically important for Women's Liberation to move out beyond our own group, to communicating and organising where possible the needs of women who are not yet even conscious of what is the basis of their oppression or that anything can be done to alleviate or change their lives, bearing in mind all the time that the argument for women's liberation must be closely connected to the liberation of others,

The various different aspects of female oppression in capitalist society have been taken as a basic assumption. The importance of the Women's Liberation movement in a revolutionary context will only be finally impressed upon left groups when women within the movement prove that it is one of the most dehumanising forms of oppression. When the demands of Women's Liberation become directly related to those of other oppressed groups then and only then, will it make a real impact.

Juliet Ash

*For details about the IS Book Service enquire at the	*
*Socialist Federation Bookstall.	*
*I.S. Publications include	*
*T.Cliff The Employers Offensive	6/- *
*C.Barker The Pilkington Strike	2/- *
*T.Cliff Rosa Luxemburg	5/- *
*I.Birchall France	2/6 *
*C.Harman et.al Education, Capitalism	*
* and the Student Revolt	4/- *
* Back copies of the journal can be obtained	3/- *
*	*

Peter Sedgwick

The sweeping Tory victory has sent a wave of guilt, as well as of sheer shock, among the ranks of the independent Left. "This is our doing?" people have said remorsefully: should we perhaps have supported Labour after all? As an unrepentant abstentionist I want to consider the lessons of the election and its result.

The return of a Tory government is a defeat for the working class, or at any rate a serious reverse: this is undoubtedly the case. But the return of a Labour government under Wilson would also have been a working class defeat. It is impossible to estimate relatively the size of either blow: wage freeze versus anti-union laws. There was no way at this election for Britain's workers to win. Even if we admit that "the Tories are worse", their victory has the same implication as the victory of Nixon over Humphrey: The Republicans are worse, and their triumph was the triumph of the party of business and right-wing reaction - but that does not mean that workers and Socialists could or should support the other capitalist and imperialist party.

If there is little discrimination to be made between Tory and Labour at the level of government, at the level of consciousness implied in the electoral outcome, there is most certainly is. Heath's sudden victory reflects the impact of Powell and the shift towards the Tories in this sense proceeds from a wave of popular racism. Wilson's debacle can partly be attributed to the failure of his campaign to challenge Powellism and racialism directly.

Is the mass abstentionist characteristic of this election also an index of defeat? I think not. If Labour could not pull out its supporters, then it deserved to lose. Refusal to vote for a party and a leader who only had a series of election gimmicks and some patter about the trade surplus reflects political maturity rather than political apathy. Labour did not try to mobilise because it had no issues and no politics around which to mobilise. To blame the electorate for their failure to turn out is the politician's lamest excuse.

Two main conclusions need to be drawn from the verdict of June 18:

1) The Tories must be fought. They have a programme for restricting strikes and union rights. The answer to this must be LET THEM DARE! They will unleash the biggest struggles that British history has ever seen.

Equally they have a programme for attacking students, banning the sit-in and strengthening their own brand of "law and order". Again: LET THEM DARE TO TRY IT! Particularly here. Students must more than ever strengthen their links with the trade union movement to face the common attack.

2) No illusions in Labour: build the alternative. There is only one possible conclusion for those who blame the left and the abstentionists: they themselves should have been canvassing. The revolutionary Left did not canvass or offer any systematic support for Wilson. If comrades are going to question the "Plague on both your houses" stand of the rest of us, they should at least have the guts to tell us what arguments they would use in favour of Wilson. The fact is of course that it was impossible to produce any rational argument in favour of Wilson that was not a straightforward liberal, marginal-reformist sweetener (like comprehensive education) for the bitter pill of wage-freeze and capitulation to racism.

Doubtless we shall see once again the rush of the "entrism" Marxists into the hollow shell of Social Democracy. (Why not try the Liberal party, it's ripe for the take-over surely?) Those who try this tactic will adapt to the attempt to pick up a few disillusioned Social Democrats, donning the Labourite protective clothing as typical of "entrism" a la Fourth International. The only trouble, as ever, will be to tell just who is entering who.

The only way of combating Toryism in a way that will not immediately lend support to the Labour traitors is to construct an open socialist alternative outside and in opposition to the Labour party, viable and frank and militant, which is more than can be said of Harold Wilson and his following, "Left" or Right.

This was the lowest turnout since 1918, we are told. Why should this fact be deplored? 1918 was the most revolutionary year in British labour history.

THE MAKONI CAMPAIGN

The Makoni election campaign has received much the same reaction from the left as from the right - a laziaristic apathy occasionally sparking into outright hostility. Makoni and his supporters freely admit to making mistakes of both a tactical and ideological nature, but nevertheless the response from left-wingers to a genuine alternative at last to the three Parliamentary parties has certainly been disappointing.

It was stated at the outset of the campaign that if Makoni thought he could win the seat for Howden he probably would not have stood. There was no question of running a campaign in the usual vote-catching sense; the election was merely being used as a platform for Makoni in particular and his supporters in general to put their views across to a potentially nationwide audience of presumably disillusioned voters. It was probably a mistake to stand in Howden - York would no doubt have provided a sharper focus for publicity as well as a particularly easy Tory target - but Makoni's main platform, anti-racialism, is just as relevant to the Howden farmers who return Paul Bryan each election as to Powell's Wolverhampton constituents. Once the nomination papers were accepted, however, there was nothing to prevent Makoni "campaigning" in other parts of the country, which he was able to do, thanks to his status as a parliamentary candidate. For once, he had to be taken seriously by the professional politicians, and even had Askew admitting that one of his best friends was a black.

An improvised yet effective street theatre performed in Driffield, Pocklington, York, London and Bradford and helped to break down the barriers between Makoni and the voters. The press coverage was not so helpful - purely factual statements of Makoni's stand and fruitless interviews with the Sunday Times and the Guardian. A publicity stunt involving a dog produced better results - notably in Leeds and Sheffield.

The most promising aspect of the campaign, however, was in the field where Makoni hoped to make his biggest impression - in personal confrontations with the British voter. Time and again, ~~XXX~~ at Makoni's meetings and at those of Tories which he attended, useful discussion groups would take place between the audience and students once the speechifying was over. This was where the campaign was undoubtedly a success - in pointing out the faults of the existing structure, in presenting a socialist alternative to the people in words they could comprehend, without making them feel they were listening to so much Marxian jargon. Once the heckling had finished the people - the old folk in particular - were very ready to listen to what we had to say and usually went a great way in agreeing with our demands: Makoni's 154 votes as a result of three constituency meetings surely prove this.

As well as support from the older generation, the newly enfranchised youth of Britain would appear to be eager to align themselves to a radical alternative, given the opportunity. They proved willing to assist with leafletting and with the street theatre but, more importantly, they wanted to talk. This in itself is probably the biggest of those left groups who preferred to have nothing to do with Makoni because of ideological aberrations.

The Makoni campaign's experience has shown that there is the potential to not only a Tory government but to its Labour alternative as well. It is now up to his supporters to find the means of tapping this source. One obvious solution is increased activity and inter-action with the disillusioned electorate on each issue the Tory government cares to raise (or ignore). One thing is certain: the answer is not to be found merely by discussions in college coffee-bars. With the Tories in power, increased activity is the only solution.

Dave Carter

NOTE for 1st Year students. Tonderai Makoni is a graduate student at York from Zimbabwe who was imprisoned by the Smith regime for distributing leaflets.

EVERY SHIP NEEDS A HELMSMAN

.....

Every manic needs a depressive

and

Every depressive needs a manic

and

Every dominant needs a recessive

and

we

agree

People think we're so aggressive

but

Underneath our front there's panic

but

Let's not get depressed or obsessive

or let

pec-

ple see

Every conman needs a sucker

Every sucker needs to be conned

You don't have to be a stupid mucker

If you don't count your change don't squeal if it's wrong.

We have got a special pedigree

From Karl Marx's holy family tree

With an Engels-pure heredity

- then we cross:

Four Voices:

1, 2 & 3: Lenin fucked my grandma.

2: Trotsky fucked my mam.

1: Uncle Ho,

3: And Uncle Jo

1: Not to speak of Chairman Mo,

4: And that sexy old Malchno,

1, 2, 3, & 4 All of the great bods had a go,

(crescendo:) SO SEE WHAT A BIG STRONG LAD

I AM!!!

Every junkie needs a mania

Every politico needs Tanzania

Moscow, Castro or Albania:

Make your vow.

Every setback needs a victory

Every doubt must have a mystery

We're hooked on history now.

ANON TRAD.

.....

After the second world war, western capitalism began to experience an unprecedented boom. The contrast in the living conditions between the fifties and the pre-war days was so marked that issues such as poverty dropped from the news, though not out of existence. The Welfare State, it was assumed, was providing a decent standard of living for everyone. This cosy view of predominantly middle class folk was shattered by the explosive advent of the Teddy Boys along with their all embracing cultural expressions of revolt. These 'ungrateful' recipients of the welfare state were the forerunners of what has since developed into a comparatively large scale involvement of youth in conflict.

The 'Ted' was a working class phenomenon, whose employment tended to consist of a dreary cycle of unskilled work. Getting his name from his Edwardian style jacket and 'drainpipe' trousers, the teddy boy movement developed all the major characteristics of successive youth cults by centring his revolt around dress and music, personified by Elvis Presley.

"Technically, of course, Bill Haley was singing rock and roll, and causing riots before Elvis, but since Haley was nearly 30 and his music was souped-up country and western, he hardly qualified as a teen age idol. Elvis was different - he was young and arrogant and outrageously sexy, and he was the first teenage symbol that most grown-ups could never possibly share in. He was a full-blooded spit in the eye of adult authority..." *

Not for long of course, for his money and image conscious manager Colonel Parker soon persuaded Elvis of the need to be respectable, and Elvis became the first in a long line of rebel-made-good stars. In both music and dress youth was moving beyond the pale of bourgeois standards, and despite the ability of shrewd capitalists to cash in on these trends, they nevertheless represent at least a culturally expressed rejection of capitalist society.

The origins of this revolt lies in the fact that under such a system a small capitalist class exploits the labour, and hence the lives, of the majority of the population, but it needed the specific conditions of the fifties to trigger off the revolt in this form. For the first time, working class youth were earning sufficient money to give them some economic independence from the home. If he had been employed at all in the thirties, his wage would have gone to supplement the family income. This economic power gave the impetus to the youth music and dress industries. It also enabled working class youth to seek entertainment, and generally the only entertainment available which could be specifically youth was the coffee bar. Thus the usual pattern for working class youth, which was very closely bound within a short geographical radius from the home, was broken, and the basis

for a rapid spread of cultural identity, laid. The economic power that made this possible should not, however, be overemphasised. These unskilled workers were badly paid and as today there was an underlying problem of youth unemployment. 'Money to burn' is a liberal deception but nevertheless a modicum of economic independence was established.

The traditional authoritarian repression of youth depends upon the education system as one of its main weapons. With the introduction of the 11 plus after the war and the rigid categorisation of pupils into passed and failed, grammar and secondary modern, the majority of working class children became destined for overtly second class education. Thus along with some economic independence there grew the self conscious isolation and separation of youth, starkly reflecting the class divisions of society. From every perspective the working class pupil was deprived as was clearly born out by a study done by Jackson and Marsden *. No wonder then at the bitterness and tenacity of the revolt. It has sustained itself through a plethora of cults.

The same forces that lead to these also precipitated increasing numbers of middle class youth into rebellion, though these tended to be expressed in less violent and more 'political' forms. For a time the media turned its attention to their own sons and daughters. Then suddenly, with the same sense of shock, horror and indignation that they had displayed towards the Teds, the media were forced by the Skinheads - the most class-conscious youth cult yet - to admit the existence of a large section of the population conveniently forgotten for over a decade.

In the latter half of the sixties with the open attacks of a Labour Government on the working class (wage restraints, cut backs in the social services, threatened legal actions against strikes etc.) a new industrial militancy emerged among the working class. This was reflected in the growth of the Skinheads, goaded by the same economic conditions which prompted the attack on workers generally.

Skinheads have aroused some controversy in the radical press. For instance in the Black Dwarf last year, John Hoyland wrote,

"The skinheads are the real drop-outs... The skinhead is rejected by society. He is dropped out because he is 'thick', because he can't cope with the responsibility, because he's disorganised. He lands up in the lowest paid job where he has to work long hours before going back to a home that has blatantly missed out on the glitter of the affluent society".

He goes on to stress their class-consciousness, expressed in their dress, and their attacks on the middle class drop-out world. This does not mean that there is not confusion in their expressions of class-consciousness. Sections of the skinheads have reacted to their problems

*(Education and the Working Class Penguin)

by racist attacks, particularly ⁻¹³⁻ on Pakistanis. On the other hand they have proved themselves industrially militant and along with other working-class youth were active in the struggle in Derry against the 'B' Specials and the RUC last year.

Again, the forces that pressure the skinheads in this direction, are also affecting increasing numbers of middle class youth. For the first time in many years there seems to be some possibility of linking these two movements. Without trying to exaggerate an isolated incident into a political trend, an example of this merging can be seen in the recent trouble at Folkstone.

Like most other Southern sea-side resorts, Folkstone is a reactionary small town, with a Tory Council dominated by small local businessmen. The main youth centres are two coffee bars in the High Street, and being a small town these attract a broad cross-section of young people. Both the Vietnamese Solidarity Campaign, and the Schools Action Union have had a comparatively strong local base. Last May, the council called on the police to clean up the town's 'youth problem', as a response to traders fears of potential holiday-makers being put off by media scares about skinheads and general hooliganism.

Police harassment has been a regular feature in Folkstone, but this particular week-end, as part of their clean up drive, they started making arbitrary arrests. As a response, an organised group of about 150 led by young seamen smashed up the Tory party HQ, and the next week held a demonstration outside the Magistrates' Court. This demonstration was dominated by working class youth, and supported by students from Kent university. Large street meetings, of a high political content followed up, but as with any movement of this nature - specific in its limited aims, and isolated from any general movement - it died down after a couple of weeks; though sporadic information indicates a simmering of discontent that is likely to surface. But the experience of Folkstone indicates the revolutionary potential of working class youth.

The difference between the 50's and 60's is the increasing presence of politics, and it is this that makes the possibility of linking the 'radicalism' of students with the 'riotous behaviour' of young workers. The apparent barriers between rocker and skinhead, working class and student, are not as great as we are lead to believe. The main barrier is our lack of conviction that they can be overcome; yet if a revolution is ever to be achieved the groundwork has to be laid **now** in working to unite these groups into a single cohesive force. The prospects may be uncertain, but they are better than they have ever been before, and the returns may well be crucial in tipping the revolutionary balance.

-14-

LETTER FROM NEW YORK

(From Peter Sedgwick - lecturer in Politics at York University in New York for one year on an exchange visit)

... New York rents are colossal. I am renting this 3 bedroom apartment, furnished, in a very unfashionable part of town for 360 dollars a month plus agent's fee of a months rent; and thats the asking price around here, the equivalent of £1700 p.a. in English money ...

I've been in a constant state of toing and froing and fixing up things. Myths to explode; you don't get mugged, women can walk alone at night. Last night I travelled all the way from Manhattan out here on the subway at 3 a.m. and was perfectly all right. Lots of people are around at all times.

The Womens' Lib. thing is HUGE, mostly liberal. There is even a womens lib. calendar checking off important dates of female emancipation. Panthers and Young Lords (Puerto Rican equivalent, but less gun fixated) are rather weak, but just held a convention of 6000 along with womens lib., Gay lib etc. to draft a new Constitution for the U.S.. 'Black Panther' is sold very largely in white liberal quarters by grown youngsters getting 5 cents commission a copy. A film on Eldridge Cleaver is playing in a smart cinema; peace liberalism is immensely rich. You get expensive ornaments on sale in boutiques with the good old CMD symbol as the main design...

With the Congressional elections coming up, support for Mayor Lindsay for re-election, on the grounds that the black community self-help programme would be chopped if the other side got in, is growing amongst old 'new lefties'. Nearly all US radicals I guess will go this way...

Met New York I.S. last night; about as big as the York branch at its most flourishing. Mature intimate circle oriented towards working in the coming (???) United Automobile Workers' strike next week. Lots of well thought out position papers circulate...

My neighbourhood: lots of pizza luncheonettes and bagel shops. Puerto Rican block up the street, very lively: lots of small scale racist sentiment among white lower class against the 'welfare people' (Home from home?) but nothing very bitter (Yet). College bookstalls sell piles of literature but no Marx or even Freud...

As for myself: American bureaucracy is insane; refusing me the Health fringe benefits which I was promised in writing; ... Whatever one does here, one must not get ILL. Its just too expensive (100 dollars a day for board alone, in hospital, for instance)...

Last night a tall skinny agonised 20yr. old with burning eyes stopped me and asked for 'just a nickel or a dime': when I hesitated he said 'Fuck you' so well that I gave him all my change. His desperation no whit diminished, he at once begged with the same heartrending fervour from other passers-by "Just a nickel or a dime..."

Fraternally Pete Sedgwick

YORK INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST GROUP

Branch Programme October 1970 - June 1971

Meetings are held on Wednesdays at 7.30 at the Lowther Hotel, Kings Staith off Clifford Street, York unless otherwise stated. Socialist Worker is sold every Thursday in the University Colleges and every W/E around the estates.

OCTOBER 1st. Business
7th. "
Fri. 9th. Society's Mart at the University
W/E 10/11. Irish Solidarity Campaign. Founding Conference, Birmin'm.
Sun. 11. Regional Committee meeting
14th. Business
Thurs. 15th. Nigel Fountain on the threat from the Right. Editor of Idiot International.
21st. Business
W/E 24/25. Institute for Workers' Control Conference. Birmingham.
28th. R. Locker - lecturer in Politics at York, and ex National Committee member of IS - on Marxist Philosophy.
W/E 30/1st. 3rd. World Conference. Birmingham.
NOVEMBER 4th. Business
11th. Bill Kaye - Sec York IS - Wage demands and political consciousness.
W/E 14th/15. Regional School. Leeds. Western Capitalism and State Capitalism/Youth and Education/GMWU and Dual Unionism. Speakers to be confirmed.
18th. Business
25th. Laurie Taylor - Lecturer in Social Psychology at York - on Crime and Ideology
DECEMBER 1st (Tues) Paul Foot - Author, Political journalist, and member of National Committee - The need for Revolutionary Unity.
2nd. Business
9th. Ian Collins and Dave Gibson - Marxist criticism of literature.
16th. Business
23rd. "
30th. "

1971

- JANUARY 7th. Business
14th. "
21st. Tony Cliff - Founder member IS, Executive Committee member -
The Employers' and Government Offensive
28th. Business
- FEBRUARY 4th. Tony Needham - Sec. Cambridge IS - The Permanent Arms
Economy
14th. Business
18th. Dick Williams - Regional Organiser - Productivity Deals
25th. Business
- MARCH 4th. Ireland
11th. Business
Thurs 12th. Nigel Harris - Ex editor International Socialism -
Third World and China
18th. Bob Looker - Gramsci and Italy
25th. Business
- APRIL 1st. "
8th. "
15th. "
22nd. "
29th. The Condition of the Working Class in England
1840 - 1900
- MAY (Sun) 2nd. May Day parade and Gala
5th. Business
12th. Joan Smith - NC member - The Russian Revolution
and Clydeside
19th. Business
26th. The 30's - Slump and the rise of Fascism
- JUNE 2nd. Business
9th. The 50's - The Cold War and anti-Colonial struggle
16th. Business
23rd. The 60's and into the 70's - the Monolith breaks;
prospects for revolution.

The Branch has also got a football team. For Information
contact Stew Hamblin, Flat 4, 16 St. Saviourgate, York
For further detail of branch activity contact
Bill Kaye, 20 Newton Terrace, York.