

RED YOUTH - LIARS - SPLITTERS AND WRECKERS

This motley crew, opportunistically trying to lead the fight against racism and self-righteously lecturing to those who have been successfully combatting racism and fascism in this city for years has printed a number of direct lies about the AYM in a duplicated sheet they call a newsletter. Who are they? They are a sect that has emerged after a split with Militant, after a split with WSL and after a split with WIL. No doubt they now have the correct 'line' and a monopoly on it. However if there are any imperfections with the 'line' then no doubt there will be a further split, pursuing the philosophy that the smaller you are the more chance you have of 'the class' following you. Normally the AYM would not bother replying to the immature petulance and lies displayed in their newsletter but because of our involvement in the Anti-Fascist Defence Committee we feel that people should see a response from us. In order to deal with every lie a pamphlet would be necessary - it is intended here only to deal with some of them.

They say that: the AYM was blinded by Phil Beeley's rhetoric about a ban; this resulted in misleadership and a poor turnout; the Defence Committee is apolitical and the unity is false; they complain that paper sales have been banned at Defence Committee functions; they ridicule the newsletter.

For the record: AYM never called for a ban. All leaflets were titled "Stop the Fascists" and appealed to the community to mobilise to ensure this. The AYM opposed the ban at a public meeting attended by over 100 people one week before the demonstration. The mobilisation leaflet went out 2 days before the BNP meeting after the date had been confirmed. In these circumstances the turn out was excellent. They talk about 1,000 people being mobilised a year before, another lie. Where? They fail to take into account the defeats the working class have suffered, the demise of the ANL, the success in keeping fascists off the streets in their simplistic analysis of the turnout. They say they got one member into the meeting: they fail to mention the large contingent AYM got in, the ejection of AYM members and the arrest of AYM members. They were 'fortuitously' exempt from these arrests.

They fail to recognise that the task of a Defence Committee is to defend those arrested and not to be a debating forum for the 'correct line'. They do not recognise (or choose to recognise) that any material that the Defence Committee produces could be used as evidence by the state, jeopardising defendants. The opposite is true, they rush headlong to do just that. They call the unity false. With their history of splits what do they know about unity? They fail to acknowledge the organisation by the AYM of the aftermath, the establishment of a Defence Committee, supporting the injured, trying to get those arrested released. At that time they were nowhere to be seen. Their comrade who got into the meeting hasn't even seen fit to give a statement. They say the AYM refuses to get involved in joint work with other groups because of a fear of a challenge to our politics. What a lie. The AYM has been involved in a whole series of campaigns involving joint work, this Defence Committee being just another one of those campaigns. They talk about misleadership. A classic complaint from those unable to exercise any form of leadership or who lack any ability of analysis. Their so-called analysis is conveniently bent to their own prejudices and so-called line. The facts appear not to matter. They believe that functions organised by campaigns exist for the purpose of providing a 'paper sellers paradise'. Unable to organise anything on their own they descend like parasites on the events of others. Their only interest, not that of the campaign, but the next paper sale. Then they talk about opportunism and political bankruptcy. Campaigns don't need these parasites. They complain about the Newsletter yet proudly hold it with a collection bucket with their 'paper' prominently displayed. What an attempt

to gain credibility at the expense of others. Another opportunity to say self-righteously - "We have been actively involved in the fight against racism and fascism".

They state that the AYM sabotaged the coach to Newham in support of the Newham Seven. The AYM attended two meetings of the Support Committee. Red Youth said the RCP was organising a coach. The AYM stated clearly it would be going down in a minibus, a commitment they had already made to the Newham Seven Defence Committee. The AYM was not contacted about another support group meeting. Red Youth went and booked a coach and said AYM supported it (another attempt at credibility by association). The AYM had nothing to do with the booking of that coach. AYM said they would go in a minibus and went in a minibus. Red Youth booked the coach - they should take the responsibility for misleadership. Instead of this they slander other organisations. They complain about the turnout at the BNP meeting, but yet with their "leadership" and "line" they could not fill the coach and had to cancel it. Do we conclude a level of political bankruptcy and opportunism on their part. A principled approach allows one to admit one's mistakes.

Why are they launching these attacks against AYM? Why do they wish to spread these lies?

1. Quite clearly they wish to gain some credibility. They think this is one way of doing this. They say they do not show deference to the AYM like other groups. It needs to be said that the AYM does not ask for, nor gets deference from anyone. What the AYM does get is respect for the work it has done against fascism and racism in Bradford. They are seeking credit. For example they claim that they got Free expelled from the Labour Group. They do not mention the occupation of his Lord Mayor's office organised by the AYM. Where were they?
2. They have a history of splitting and quite clearly they wish the Defence Committee to split and degenerate into political harangues.
3. As a white organisation they pay lip service to the fight against racism. They do not understand it. But what they cannot stand to see is an independently organised black organisation taking the lead on any issue. In this they expose their own inherent racism.
4. They are opportunistically looking for issues around racism to intervene in, but see the AYM already involved.

Red Youth were asked on three occasions by another independent organisation not to sell papers outside the Saathi Centre. There are plenty of places to sell papers in Bradford but we object to them being sold outside there. The AYM over the years has been the first organisation to protect left wing paper sellers from fascists, the first to defend the Fourth Idea Bookshop. We have fought to protect their rights. The AYM does not sell its own paper and had no self interest on those occasions. AYM members have been beaten up in the process. The Saathi Centre is used by a number of people who object.

They do not wish the Saathi Centre to become a paper-sellers spot. They regard the Centre as their home. On this basis Red Youth were asked to desist. But they are incapable of accepting another organisations point of view. They then talk about unity.

For all the above reasons they have been barred from the Saathi Centre. We ask other groups to understand this decision.

ASIAN YOUTH MOVEMENT