



A Missed Encounter: Stuart Hall and Lesbians and Gays Support the Miners (LGSM)

GIANMARIA COLPANI

Utrecht University

In 2014, the movie *Pride* written by Stephen Beresford and directed by Matthew Warchus brought to the attention of a national and international general public the story of Lesbians and Gays Support the Miners (LGSM), which had been largely forgotten within the London LGBTQ community itself.¹ LGSM were a solidarity group active in the 1984-85 British miners' strike. They formed in London a few months into the strike and forged a coalition with the miners based on material support, solidarity, and a shared will to resist the attacks launched by Thatcherism in the 1980s on organized labor as well as black, feminist, and gay and lesbian communities and movements. By the time of the movie's release in 2014, the story of this unlikely coalition had "passed beyond memory into folk-myth" (Tate/LGSM 2017: 5) and had appeared only sporadically in literature on the miners' strike and the LGBTQ movement (Field 1995: 162-5; Massey/Wainwright 1985: 153; Robinson 2007: 154-84). The release of *Pride* coincided with a new wave of interest in this story (e.g. Goodspeed 2019; Grant/Kelliher 2019; Haslop 2018; Kelliher 2014; Smith/Leeworthy 2016; Yusoff 2015) and helped turn LGSM into a unique source of inspiration and political identification. While the 1980s are often remembered – in Britain and elsewhere – as a decade marked by the rise of neoliberalism, political retreat and disillusionment on the left, new waves of postcolonial racism, the violence of state homophobia in the context of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, and the fragmentation of communities and progressive movements, none of these processes unfolded without encountering steadfast resistance. The miners' strike and the larger solidarity movement that formed around it, including LGSM, was one such form of resistance.

Pride was released only a few months after Stuart Hall's passing in February 2014. Hall has been one of the key interpreters of the 1980s in Britain. His work at the time shed light on the conjunctural triangulation between the rise of Thatcherism, the crisis of the left, and the consolidation of 'identity' as a terrain of political struggle broken

¹ *Pride's* scriptwriter Stephen Beresford himself recalls that when he first heard about LGSM from his partner at the time, who was ten years older than him and was accusing younger gay men of no longer being political, he initially did not believe that the story was true (Tate/LGSM 2017: 278).



open by intersecting social movements such as feminism, black power, and lesbian and gay liberation (cf. Hall 1988a, 1989a). That triangulation materialized in particular ways in the context of the miners' strike. As Diarmaid Kelliher (2021: 113) argues, the solidarity movement for the miners – especially groups such as LGSM, rooted in intersecting social movements and operating autonomously from the traditional structures of the labor movement – perfectly embodied the construction of 'a new historical bloc of forces' which Hall argued was the only way for the left to offer a real alternative to Thatcherism. Indeed, Hall's thinking belongs, alongside LGSM, to the archive of the 1980s, which is an archive of crisis and defeat as much as one of resistance and potential recomposition.

Yet, despite the powerful resonances that exist between the story of LGSM and Hall's thinking on the renewal of the left in the 1980s, Hall adopted a very skeptical position on the strike and was especially critical of the ways in which the struggle was conducted by the leadership of the National Union of Mineworkers (NUM). The experience of feminist, black, and lesbian and gay support groups for the miners barely appeared in his analyses. He once observed that "the unparalleled involvement of the women in the mining communities, the feminist presence in the strike" meant that the strike was "instinctually with the politics of the new", yet he argued that this political potential remained "imprisoned in the categories and strategies of the past." (Hall 1988a: 205) In this article, I address the missed encounter between Hall and LGSM. First, I outline the hard road to renewal which Hall imagined for the left in the 1980s. Next, I discuss the experience of LGSM during the miners' strike, situating the group in relation to the political fault lines running through the British left at the time. Finally, I draw some lessons from the missed encounter between Hall and LGSM, with particular emphasis on our understanding of the political moment of the 1980s.²

Stuart Hall and the Hard Road to Renewal

In the 1980s, Hall devoted most of his intellectual energies to outlining a project of renewal for the left in the face of Thatcherism. For him, the task confronting the left – particularly the Labour Party – was not just to concoct an electoral program able to beat the Tories at the ballot box. Nor was it simply a defensive task, consisting of 'reversing' the process set in motion by Thatcherism. What he had in mind was a thoroughly forward-looking project of ideological and political reconstruction. Hall always emphasized that the Conservative Party under the leadership of Margaret Thatcher did not single-handedly transform the terrain of social relations in Britain. Rather, he saw

² I borrow the notion of 'political moment' from Massimo Prearo's (2014, 2015) genealogical works on the French and Italian LGBTQ movements.



Thatcherism as a key *interpreter* of the economic, political, and ideological crisis affecting British society since the late 1960s: a crisis of the ‘post-war settlement’ that had witnessed Labour and the Tories alternating each other in government on the grounds of a broadly shared consensus around Keynesianism. As he once put it, “Mrs Thatcher has given the ‘swing to the right’ a powerful impetus and a distinctive personal stamp, but the deeper movement which finds in her its personification has – when properly analysed – a much longer trajectory.” (Hall 1988a: 39) So, in Hall’s view, the task for the left was to offer its own interpretation of the same conjuncture and of the profound social transformations underlying the crisis.

But the road to renewal was particularly hard for the left, not least because it was Labour – not the Conservatives – which had been considered until then the most natural incarnation of the post-war social democratic consensus. While Thatcher could easily capitalize on the crisis of social democracy and mobilize the themes of ‘anti-statism’, ‘anti-collectivism’, and ‘anti-social democracy in power’ in order to transform first her own party and then British society at large, Labour found itself cornered (cf. e.g. Hall 1979: 15-7, 1980: 169-71, 1988b: 36-8). Thus, Hall’s critiques of Thatcherism in the 1980s were always accompanied by lucid but unforgiving analyses of what he saw as the left’s failure to keep pace with the times and transform itself. His most polemical writings appeared in *Marxism Today*, the theoretical magazine of the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB). Hall was not a member of the party, but his political vision – rooted in his experience of the ‘first’ New Left of 1956 (Hall 2010), his engagement with the new social movements and identity politics of the 1970s and 1980s (Hall 1992), and his readings of Gramsci (e.g. Hall 1986a, 1987, 1988b) – largely converged at the time with the Eurocommunist current within the CPGB. This is the current with which *Marxism Today* became strongly identified under Martin Jacques’ directorship from 1977 until 1991, when the magazine disbanded and the party itself dissolved (Andrews 2004; Pimlott 2022).

As Herbert Pimlott (2014: 194-5) recounts, it was Jacques himself who met Hall through the Communist University of London (CUL) and asked him to write his first contribution to *Marxism Today*, “The Great Moving Right Show” (Hall 1979). In this piece, which marked the start of a long collaboration (Hall/Jacques 1983, 1989), Hall began developing his distinct analysis of the emergence of Thatcherism from the ruins and contradictions of post-war social democracy.³ Drawing on Gramsci, he argued that Thatcherism had to be understood as a *conjunctural* response to an *organic* crisis, hence as an effort to construct a new hegemonic settlement that would replace the old:

³ While the origins of the very term ‘Thatcherism’ are debated, Hall was certainly the first to provide the term with a conceptual dimension. The theoretical and analytical ground for this conceptualization was largely prepared in the earlier collective work *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order* (Hall et al. 1978).



If the crisis is deep – ‘organic’ – these efforts cannot be merely defensive. They will be *formative*: a new balance of forces, the emergence of new elements, the attempt to put together a new ‘historical bloc’, new political configurations and ‘philosophies’, a profound restructuring of the state and the ideological discourses which construct the crisis and represent it as it is ‘lived’ as a practical reality; new programmes and policies, pointing to a new result, a new sort of ‘settlement’ – within ‘certain limits’. (Hall 1979: 15; emphasis in the original)

In other words, Hall insisted that the emergence of Thatcherism signaled deeper historical tendencies – first and foremost, the crumbling of the post-war social democratic settlement – and that the transformations it promised to introduce in response to the crisis were meant to have a lasting impact on British society. For both reasons, he disagreed with those on the left who saw in Thatcherism nothing more than a familiar effort to uphold ruling-class interests against organized labor and the working class. In Hall’s view, this reading failed to appreciate Thatcherism’s engagement in what Gramsci (1971) had called a ‘war of position’: a struggle to seize space and take root in civil society so as to win consent to the exercise of political power. Drawing on Gramsci, Hall came to understand Thatcherism as a form of ‘authoritarian populism’, whose main ideological intervention consisted of “dovetailing [...] the ‘cry for discipline’ from below into the call for an enforced restoration of social order and authority ‘from above’.” (Hall 1988a: 137) In other words, for Hall, the authoritarian character of Thatcherism could not be explained through a general theory of the capitalist state and its function in upholding ruling-class interests – including by force – against workers and popular sectors. This would miss what he regarded as an integral component of the project of Thatcherism: its careful construction of a new ‘common sense’ and potentially long-lasting reworking of popular ideologies.

Emphasizing the relative success of Thatcherism on this ideological front – a matter which in itself generated some debates with his critics at the time (e.g. Hall 1985; Jessop et al. 1984) – Hall also insisted, somewhat provocatively, that the left had important lessons to learn from Thatcherism. By this he never meant that the left had to become populist (cf. Colpani 2022), but that it had to learn the decisive role of ideological struggle: “I stress the centrality of the domain of the ideological – political ideas and the struggle to win hearts and minds to socialism – because I am struck again and again by the way in which socialists still assume that socialism is inevitable.” (Hall 1988a: 177) In Hall’s view, only by engaging in this ideological struggle, in a war of position with Thatcherism, could the left hope to become a truly popular-democratic alternative to the authoritarian populism of the right.

Hall located at the core of this war of position – alongside competing interpretations of the crisis of social democracy, of the relations between state and civil society, and so on – the key terrain of identity politics broken open by feminism, black power, and



lesbian and gay liberation. In *The Politics of Thatcherism*, he and Jacques (1983) argued that, while the left did not let its language and programs be fully transformed by these “new social forces and movements”, Thatcherism avoided committing the same mistake “with its attention to the centrality of women’s domestic role, the policing of black communities and the frontal engagement with the peace movement.” (14) In so doing, they continued, Thatcherism also “allowed many of these contradictory forces and pressures to play more freely into the political backyard of the left and the labour movement, precipitating its own fracturing and internal crisis.” (15) At the time, Hall partly shared this analysis with the Eurocommunist current within the CPGB and with other readers of Gramsci such as Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, who argued in *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* (1985) that the struggles of the new social movements had to be recomposed, together with class struggle yet without according any privileged centrality to the latter, within a new socialist project. According to Laclau and Mouffe, key to this process of recomposition was the construction of ‘chains of equivalence’ between these different subjects and struggles, whereby each would be able to stand for the chain as a whole. Thus, each subject or struggle would lose some of its specificity but gain the capacity to embody the universality of an expansive political project.

While in dialogue with these political and theoretical tendencies, Hall always emphasized that forging a new system of social and political alliances – a new ‘historical bloc’ – was a more difficult task than could be grasped either through theoretical abstraction or short-term political tactics. As he remarked in one of his interventions in *Marxism Today*, “[p]eople sometimes speak as if all we have to do to construct a new social alliance is to add up incrementally the demands of everybody who happens to be in the room at the time. The fact is that because of the variety of social experiences and the uneven consequences of a capitalist development, these different needs and demands are often genuinely contradictory.” (Hall 1988a: 201) Indeed, through the 1980s, Hall came to understand the politics of gender, race, and sexuality not just as a fundamental front in the struggle for hegemony between Thatcherism and the left, nor simply as a new kind of politics to be reconciled with the politics of the labor movement, but as a political and ideological terrain crisscrossed by its own wars of position and contradictory articulations. For example, he paid great attention to the emergence of feminist and gay critiques *within* black culture and politics (e.g. Amos et al. 1984; Mercer/Julien 1988), which sanctioned what he once called “the end of the innocent notion of the essential black subject” (Hall 1989b) and laid bare what black feminists at the time were beginning to call ‘intersectionality’ (Crenshaw 1989).⁴

⁴ Anna Marie Smith (1994) takes this analysis a step further and connects the war of position between Thatcherism and the left with the wars of position taking place within identity formations themselves. According to Smith, the intersectional stratifications of blackness and queerness were actively exploited by Thatcherism, which did not engage in a “simple total war” against racialized and sexual minorities, but



Thus, while in the mid-1980s Hall looked at the Labour Party as a site in which the intersecting politics of class, race, gender, and sexuality must have found some sort of unity (Hall 1988a: 201-2), what he had in mind was always more complex and harder to achieve than a 'rainbow alliance' or even, in Laclau and Mouffe's terms, a chain of equivalence.⁵ He once referred to this as the "inside but not beyond the fragments problem." (181)⁶ In a different context, Judith Butler has written about the fraught relationship between Marxism and identity politics and the problem of political recomposition in terms that also capture Hall's vision of renewal for the left in the 1980s:

The only possible unity will not be the synthesis of a set of conflicts, but will be *a mode of sustaining conflict in politically productive ways*, a practice of contestation that demands that these movements articulate their goals under the pressure of each other without therefore exactly becoming each other. This is not quite the chain of equivalence proposed by Laclau and Mouffe, although it does sustain important relations to it. New political formations do not stand in an analogical relation with one another, as if they were discreet and differentiated entities. They are overlapping, mutually determining, and convergent fields of politicization. In fact, most promising are those moments in which one social movement comes to find its condition of possibility in another. (Butler 1997: 269; emphasis in the original)

One might object that these moments are far too rare to inform a sustainable political project. However, precisely one such moment materialized in the British miners' strike of 1984-85. The strike was accompanied by the emergence of a large solidarity movement across the country, which produced some unexpected coalitions and included support groups rooted in feminist, black, and gay and lesbian movements (Kelliher 2021; Massey/Wainwright 1985). Diarmaid Kelliher (2021: 113) points out that "[t]here was nothing automatic about such relationships. As Stuart Hall suggested, the question to be asked was: 'under what circumstances can a connection be forged or made?' The miners' strike provided such an opportunity." The formation of such an expansive solidarity movement could not prevent the miners' ultimate defeat, which in turn precipitated a profound crisis of the British labor movement as a whole. Yet looking at

instead "deployed a tremendously sophisticated complex of frontiers and differentiations." (42) For example, Smith argues that the Thatcher government's campaign for Section 28, which was introduced in 1988 to prohibit the so-called 'promotion of homosexuality' by local government, heavily relied on an ideological partition between the 'good homosexual' and the 'dangerous queer'. This partition was classed and racialized, for the 'good homosexual' promoted by Thatcherism was not only closeted and respectable but also male, white, and middle-class (215). According to Smith, these strategies were not secondary in Thatcherism's struggle for hegemony because they allowed it to position itself at the 'center', with the white straight 'majority' and the 'good minorities' against the militant left (18-20).

⁵ Hall's main critique of Laclau and Mouffe did not concern the specific notion of 'chain of equivalence' but more generally their theoretical practice, especially the place of theoretical abstraction in their work (cf. Hall 1986b).

⁶ Hall's formulation makes reference to Sheila Rowbotham, Lynne Segal, and Hilary Wainwright's *Beyond the Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism* (1979).



this political moment, particularly at the experience of Lesbians and Gays Support the Miners (LGSM), shows us how coalitions can be established, autonomy be negotiated, and intersecting conflicts be productively sustained in the heat of political struggle and at a moment of crisis and renewal for the left.

The Political Moment of Lesbians and Gays Support the Miners (LGSM)

In 1984-85, a strike led by the National Union of Mineworkers (NUM) under president Arthur Scargill took place in Britain in response to a massive program of pit closures designed by the Thatcher government and announced by the National Coal Board (NCB) on March 6, 1984. The government plan was to do away with what were deemed 'uneconomic' pits and shift energy policy towards imported coal as well as oil, gas, and nuclear energy. Politically, the confrontation with the NUM offered the government a chance to undermine once and for all the power of organized labor at large. The strike witnessed an unprecedented deployment of police forces – both against the pickets and in the policing of entire mining communities – and was the target of an aggressive media campaign framing the miners as the 'enemy within', as Thatcher herself referred to them (cf. Beynon 1985; Callinicos/Simons 1985; Francis 2015; Kelliher 2021; Samuel et al. 1986). Thus, this strike was different from the ones that had taken place in the recent past: it was experienced on both sides as a point of no return in the confrontation between the labor movement and the state. Huw Beynon (1985: 13-4) conveys this feeling in his introduction to *Digging Deeper: Issues in the Miners' Strike*: "In 1974 a Tory Government [the Heath government] had gone to the country in the middle of a coal strike; in 1981 the Thatcher Government had back-pedalled rapidly. [...] In 1984, there was no possibility of either course being followed. It was going to be a long strike or nothing." Indeed, the strike lasted one entire year and ended with the defeat of the miners.

Not surprisingly, such a historic struggle helped unite the labor movement and the left at the grassroots while also laying bare some of the weaknesses and internal divisions of their organizations. Beynon (1985: 5; emphasis in the original) went as far as observing: "As a major struggle for jobs and employment undertaken by a union in the teeth of an offensive from the most right-wing Tory administration in living memory it would seem, in the face of it, to have all the makings of a *unifying* force within the British labour movement. Yet, almost the opposite has happened." Not only did miners in some areas – notably Nottinghamshire – refuse to join the strike, but predictably, opposition both to the strike and to the NUM leadership was voiced especially by those sections of the Trades Union Congress (TUC) involved in other energy industries, such as the electricians and the power station engineers (5). Additionally, the strength of the labor movement had already been undermined throughout the 1970s by rising



unemployment and increasing precarization, which for example helped undermine the solidarity that the miners had expected from the steelworkers (17-9). In this sense, for Beynon, “the strike represented not so much the front line as the last ditch” (20) in the confrontation between the British labor movement and the state.

On the political front, the NUM’s decision not to hold a national ballot among its members sparked some debate on the left. At best, critics read this decision as a mistake of the leadership, which would jeopardize the miners’ capacity to win support for the strike both within and outside the labor movement. At worst, what took shape was the image of a leadership coercing miners into taking action, even against their own interests (Beynon 1985: 6). A parallel but not unrelated debate concerned the privileging of flying and mass picketing over other forms of mobilization, such as demonstrations, conferences, and a more sustained and strategic engagement with the hostile media. For some, including Hall (1988a: 203-5), this signaled a short-sighted lack of interest in the battle for popular opinion, that is, in the arena of ideological struggle. The target of such discontent often became Scargill himself, and while the critiques were rarely voiced in public – at least not until the fall of 1984, when the possibility of a miners’ victory began to recede and the prospect of a winter on strike loomed large on the horizon – most Eurocommunists shared some version of them (Acker 2014). On the other hand, the widespread support for Scargill and his ‘syndicalist’ approach to the strike included, among others, both the so-called ‘traditionalists’ in the CPGB and the Trotskyist left (cf. Callinicos/Simons 1985).

I will return in a moment to some of these political fault lines, but what matters for now is that despite these debates and divisions, a broad solidarity movement did form around the strike. As already mentioned, the solidarity movement was rooted in the trade unions and organizations of the left but also in the so-called new social movements. Links were forged – sometimes precariously – between women active in the coalfields, organized in the national Women Against Pit Closures (WAPC), and feminist activists, such as the women of the Greenham Peace Camp (Kelliher 2021: 95-121; Rowbotham/McCrimdell 1986; Seddon 1986; Shaw/Mundy 2005; Sutcliffe-Braithwaite/Thomlinson 2018). In London, a variety of black and black feminist organizations, among which Southall Black Sisters, Black Women for Wages for Housework, and the Asian Socialist Collective, formed a Black Delegation to the Mining Communities (BDMC) (Hajee 1984; Kelliher 2021: 103-13; Morris 1986).

Lesbians and Gays Support the Miners (LGSM) were part of this heterogeneous solidarity movement. The group formed in July 1984, after Mark Ashton and Mike Jackson decided to collect money for the miners at the Pride march in London. For the entire duration of the strike, LGSM met weekly in places such as Gay’s the Word bookshop and the Fallen Angel bar, participated in conferences and demonstrations,



collected money outside gay and lesbian venues, and organized fundraising events such as the very successful 'Pits and Perverts', which staged Bronski Beat and managed to raise over £5,000. Throughout their one-year existence, LGSM collected a total of approximately £20,000 for the miners (Kelliher 2021: 124). Many support groups in the cities operated by twinning with specific mining communities in the coalfields, often located at a significant geographical distance. LGSM were no exception and twinned with the Dulais Valley in South Wales, thus working closely with the Neath, Dulais, and Swansea Valleys Miners Support Group.

The encounter between the lesbian and gay activists and the miners was transformative for both sides. By building support for the miners – which they always insisted was going to be unconditional (Tate/LGSM 2017: 131) – LGSM also brought the politics of lesbian and gay liberation into the labor movement and the mining communities.⁷ On the one hand, Kelliher (2021: 128) argues that when LGSM first travelled to Dulais, the visit “certainly was not uncontroversial and there is a risk of taking sanitised accounts at face value.” For example, Hywel Francis’s (2015: 111) claim that “[a]t no time, then or subsequently, were any openly homophobic attitudes expressed in our locality” must be somewhat balanced with the accounts offered by some of the women, who recall different degrees of homophobic attitude in the mining community (Tate/LGSM 2017: 131-2, 170-1). After all, Francis (2015: 114-5) himself argues that it was mostly the women in the local support group, not the men, who took the lead in forging the coalition with LGSM. Yet, on the other hand, it is true that no real opposition to the coalition was ever raised in South Wales. On the contrary, the lesbian and gay solidarity was embraced with such enthusiasm as to take LGSM themselves by surprise (Tate/LGSM 2017: 175-95). Thus, as Kelliher (2021: 128) puts it, “rather than two entirely pre-formed communities coming together, the understanding of a coalfield or a London lesbian and gay community was shaped through this relationship.” Additionally, once the strike was over, not only did the NUM support and secure the passing of a motion on lesbian and gay rights at the 1985 Labour Party conference by making explicit reference to the solidarity received by the miners during the strike, but the 1985 Pride in London witnessed a contingent of miners from South Wales marching together with LGSM.

⁷ In their attempt to bring lesbian and gay politics into the labor movement, LGSM were building on existing efforts and campaigns both within and outside the Labour Party. Two noteworthy examples are the engagement initiated in the mid-1970s between the CPGB and the new social movements, including lesbian and gay liberation, especially through the Young Communist League (YCL), and groups formed within the Labour Party such as the Labour Campaign for Lesbian and Gay Rights or, in the youth section, Lesbian and Gay Young Socialists (LGYS). Many of the founding members of LGSM had been already active in these and other established organizations of the labor movement and the left (Goodspeed 2019: 65-6).



While all accounts of this story agree on LGSM's firm and unconditional support for the miners and the NUM,⁸ the group's political composition is somewhat less clear. Many argue that one of the group's successes was precisely to have transcended divisions within the left, bringing together lesbian and gay activists from across a broad spectrum of political and ideological orientations (e.g. Flynn et al. 1985: 41; Kelliher 2021: 124; Tate/LGSM 2017: 152-3). Others instead privilege LGSM's links to the CPGB – especially through the charismatic figure of Mark Ashton, who was active in the Young Communist League (YCL) and would become its general secretary in 1985. Evan Smith and Daryl Leeworthy (2016) take this as their starting point to argue that the 'pre-history' of LGSM must be identified in the struggle for lesbian and gay liberation within the CPGB since the early 1970s, particularly the role played by the YCL in promoting the politics of the new social movements within the party. So, they go as far as to conclude that "[a]lthough the membership of LGSM included Labour Party activists, unaligned gay liberationists, and communists, there can be little doubt that it represents one of the most important achievements of British communism in its final years." (642) Moreover, while it has sometimes been suggested that LGSM's twinning with the Dulais Valley might have been accidental, others emphasize that the link was forged through communist connections (e.g. Francis 2015: 110-1; Tate/LGSM 2017: 129).

What is certain is that a Eurocommunist analysis of the relations between class and identity politics had an impact on LGSM, yet this in no way exhausts the range of political and ideological orientations that converged within the group and that provoked, in fact, a certain amount of internal debate. As Nicola Field recalls, "LGSM had different left-wing groups who were represented. They found it very difficult to work together because of their differing political frameworks. And it was quite bullying, so that I saw men tearing into each other remorselessly on points of political theory at meetings." (Tate/LGSM 2017: 223) While different members might have diverging memories of these debates and their intensity, the issue was certainly present as it was explicitly addressed by a resolution proposed by Mark Ashton in September 1984. The resolution stated that LGSM "is a single-issue, solidarity group and owes no allegiance to any political party. The only requirements of members are that they are either lesbian or gay – and that they support the NUM in their struggle against pit closures, job losses and privatisation." (154) Nonetheless, according to some of the lesbians in LGSM, the

⁸ A partial exception is Lucy Robinson (2007), who argues that LGSM's choice to twin with the mining community in South Wales was a deliberate attempt to by-pass the union in order to avoid "bureaucratic restrictions and the possibility of co-option." (166) However, while the relationship with the NUM might have generated some debate within LGSM at the beginning, and while twinning was not completely uncontroversial within the NUM itself (Kelliher 2021: 81), it was in fact a widespread practice during the strike and it became particularly crucial once the Thatcher government sequestered the NUM's funds. Thus, as LGSM member Rosie Leach put it in an interview at the time, "that situation has changed [...] because of the fact that you can't send money now directly to the NUM even if you wanted to. [...] In a sense that argument is being by-passed." (Flynn et al. 1985: 44)



sectarian debates among gay men were both intimidating and boring to the extent that they became one of the reasons for the formation of the separate group Lesbians Against Pit Closures (LAPC) (223). More broadly, LAPC questioned the predominant maleness and whiteness of LGSM.⁹

For some, the lesbian group was divisive. Women of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) took an explicit position against it, partly informed by long-standing debates on separatism. They argued that “women instead of tackling sexism when it occurs have effectively cut themselves off from those arguments”.¹⁰ But many others understood the reasons for the split. As Mike Jackson points out, the lesbian group was acting according to the same principle informing LGSM themselves: “To my mind, if we wanted to have a group of lesbians and gay men supporting the miners autonomously of other political organisations, I didn’t see how we could complain that lesbians wanted to form their own autonomous group to do the same.” (Tate/LGSM 2017: 227-8) Additionally, LAPC explicitly situated themselves within the larger women’s support movement, were able to campaign and raise money in lesbian-only spaces, and twinned with a different mining community in Rhodesia, Nottinghamshire, thus expanding, not shrinking, the reach of lesbian and gay solidarity in the strike (Vittorini et al. 1986; Winson 2015). In fact, as a support group *for the miners*, LAPC is best understood not through the lens of separatism, but through the dialectics of autonomy and solidarity, identity and coalition politics – a dialectic partly precipitated and informed, in this context, by political fault lines running through the left and reproduced within LGSM.

LGSM’s political heterogeneity was also reflected, if less explicitly, in different interpretations of the group’s relation with the miners. Kelliher (2014) observes that to forge that relation, LGSM emphasized key analogies and shared matters of concern between gays and lesbians and the miners: the defense of community space, police violence, and the hostility of the media. As mining communities came under the attack of an increasingly authoritarian state, lesbian and gay activists could draw parallels with their own experiences at the time: from the Thatcher government’s attack on local government, which specifically targeted the funding of initiatives such as the London

⁹ Cf. Discussion of involvement of black and lesbian people in Lesbians and Gays Support the Miners, LHASC/LGSM/1/2. Even as they were brought together in these debates, there is no perfect equivalence between race and gender in this context, first and foremost because there was not a contingent of lesbians and gays of color within LGSM comparable to the group of (white) lesbians who ultimately formed LAPC. The trajectory of race in the politics of LGSM could be traced, instead, through the relations that the group managed or failed to establish with the Black Delegation to the Mining Communities (BDMC), which included black feminist and lesbian activists such as Pragna Patel of Southall Black Sisters and Wilmette Brown of Black Women for Wages for Housework (BDMC flyer, BCA/RF/10/06/A; Kelliher 2021: 103-10), and with the Gay Black Group (Mercer 1994: 10-1). The Gay Black Group had formed in 1981 and was not directly involved in the solidarity movement for the miners, yet on several occasions LGSM expressed the intention of contacting them (LGSM minutes, 29 July 1984, LHASC/LGSM/1/1; LGSM minutes, 11 November 1984, LHASC/CP/ORG/MISC/2/4). Whether any contact was ultimately established is unclear.

¹⁰ Statement by Socialist Workers Party on Lesbians Against Pit Closures, LHASC/CP/ORG/MISC/2/4.



Lesbian and Gay Center (LLGC) and would culminate in the abolition of the Greater London Council (GLC) and other local councils in 1986, to the routine raiding of gay and lesbian pubs and clubs, to the policing of cruising spaces for gay public sex. These attacks on lesbian and gay spaces were carried out with the significant support of stigmatizing media campaigns, especially during the HIV/AIDS crisis (cf. Robinson 2007: 154-84; Smith 1994: 183-239). In the context of the strike, it was not difficult for LGSM to establish powerful analogies with the experience of the mining communities, who were confronted with an unprecedented deployment of police forces (McIlroy 1985) and a hostile media targeting them as the 'enemy within' (Schwarz/Fountain 1985). And the miners recognized themselves in those analogies. As Siân James from the community in South Wales puts it in *All Out! Dancing in Dulais* (1985), a short documentary produced by LGSM at the time, "for years lesbians and gay men have been telling us, you know, look at us, we're under attack, we're being threatened by the police. [...] And then we were there, [...] we were next in line after lesbians and gays, black men, black women." In the same documentary, Mark Ashton states: "It's quite illogical to say, 'Well, I'm gay and I'm into defending the gay community but I don't care about anything else'. It's important that if you're defending communities, you also defend all communities."

In Laclau and Mouffe's (1985) terms, LGSM managed to establish a powerful chain of equivalence between the miners' strike and lesbian and gay struggles. Kelliher (2014: 249-50) argues that the language of 'community' so prominent in the strike facilitated this effort. On the one hand, this language reflected the fact that at stake in 1984-85 was not just the preservation of jobs, but the survival of entire mining communities dependent on their material and symbolic bonds with the pits. On the other hand, the use of analogies between different 'communities' also signaled the more specific influence of Eurocommunist ideas on LGSM (Kelliher 2021: 131-2). But this is not the only way in which LGSM positioned themselves in the strike, nor an understanding of solidarity shared by everyone in the group. Ray Goodspeed, who was a member of Militant at the time, retrospectively observes: "For us on the Trot side, we talked much more about class. [...] The YCL and Mark [Ashton] were going through their Eurocommunist phase, it was all about communities. A rainbow alliance – getting women, gay people, black people *along with* the working class. I always balked at that slightly. For me it was about two parts of the same class." (Wilson/Goodspeed 2014; emphasis in the original) Elsewhere, he adds that the idea of uniting different communities implied "that you had the working class over on one side and gay people somewhere else. That didn't really work for me because the way I saw it was that loads of working-class people – and loads of miners – were gay." (Tate/LGSM 2017: 153)¹¹

¹¹ Kelliher and others also remind us that the notion of 'community' is a two-edged sword and its deployment by LGSM and women's support groups during the miners' strike could be contradictory, for that notion potentially reifies a homogeneous understanding of communities often stabilized by



In practice, LGSM oscillated between these two understandings of the relation between class and identity. While the analogies between two distinct ‘communities’ took center stage in the relationship with the miners, in their work within the lesbian and gay community in London, LGSM often supplemented that analysis by positioning *themselves* as part of the working class. In so doing, they challenged the homogeneity of the lesbian and gay community and even pointed at some of its links with Thatcherism along class lines. For example, during a speech at an LGSM conference, Jackson polemically pointed out that some lesbians and gays “are quite happy with Thatcherism, these are the lesbians and gays who benefit from Tory rule. They have the economic power to carve out a lifestyle which protects them from the harassment, persecution and fear that many lesbians and gay men encounter daily.” (quoted in Kelliher 2014: 252) And Ashton himself expressed in an interview his desire “to organise with my own kind of people. That’s not necessarily lesbians and gay men – that’s working class people.” (quoted in Kelliher 2014: 252)

Thus, somewhat paradoxically given the Eurocommunist emphasis at the time on forging links across an increasing diversity of political identities and movements, it is by adopting a stronger working-class standpoint – or even, as Goodspeed does, by emphasizing class unity – that LGSM came closer to what we now call intersectionality, articulating the possibility of crossovers, not just analogies or equivalences, between lesbian and gay identity and working-class belonging.¹² In fact, the logics of equivalence and intersectionality might be said to encounter in each other their respective limits.¹³ For example, when a gay miner contacted LGSM asking for financial help and lamenting the homophobia experienced in his own community during the strike, the group decided not to support him individually but to send money to the soup kitchen in his village, according to the principle of supporting *all miners* and confident that doing so *as lesbians and gays* might have helped undermine homophobia in that particular community (Flynn et al. 1985: 41). The anecdote suggests that the logic of equivalence, which can be very effective in forging links between different ‘communities’ or movements, might sometimes have to sacrifice – or at least avoid prioritizing – their intersections. Nonetheless, the two logics coexisted in the trajectory of LGSM, within the

heteropatriarchal social relations (Kelliher 2014: 250-1; Spence/Stephenson 2009). For a larger queer Marxist critique of ‘community’, see Miranda Joseph’s *Against the Romance of Community* (2002).

¹² This emphasis on class unity and on the primacy of class struggle made room for the intersection between class and sexuality while potentially obscuring others. For example, during the debate on black and lesbian involvement in LGSM, Goodspeed argued: “We should make links... but let’s not go overboard. Women and blacks are not our main allies... the working class and the labour movement is”. Ironically, Polly Vittorini, one of the women who would go on to form LAPC, replied to him with the same argument that Goodspeed himself used against the Eurocommunist emphasis on linking different ‘communities’: “Ray implies blacks and women aren’t part of the working class” (Discussion of involvement of black and lesbian people in Lesbians and Gays Support the Miners, LHASC/LGSM/1/2).

¹³ A critique of analogy as a means of coalition building is one of the foundational moves of US black feminism and intersectionality, insofar as analogies between ‘women’ and ‘blacks’ obscure or even foreclose the position of black women (e.g. hooks 1981).



broader strategic perspective of supporting the miners against the Thatcher government while bringing lesbian and gay liberation into the labor movement.

The story of LGSM is certainly one in which different movements found their conditions of possibility in one another. Although particularly successful, the process was not free of tensions and conflicts. As Kelliher (2021: 122-3) notes, “[t]he experience of LGSM emphasises the space opened up by the miners’ strike for forging new solidarities, but also the potential tensions in the creation of what Stuart Hall described as ‘a new historical bloc of forces.’” Some of these tensions were partly overdetermined by different understandings of class, identity, community, and solidarity and by political fault lines running through the British left. Conflicting interpretations of the relation between class and sexual politics were reflected in the different ways in which LGSM positioned themselves in the strike. The debates that led to the formation of LAPC, which in turn located themselves within the national women’s movement against pit closures and twinned with a different mining community, illustrate how the building of expansive coalitions largely depends, indeed, on the capacity to sustain conflict in politically productive ways. As such, the experience of LGSM, within the larger context of the solidarity movement for the miners, appears to be a powerful embodiment of the hard road to renewal that Hall imagined for the left in the 1980s.

Lessons from a Missed Encounter

However, Hall had a different reading of the strike. On the few occasions he referred to it, he did so in order to criticize how the struggle was being conducted by the NUM leadership and misunderstood, in his view, by the left at large (Hall 1985b: 19, 1985c: 14, 1988a: 203-5). For example, he wrote:

The miners’ strike certainly contained a powerful ‘class’ dimension. But politically it was not, as Arthur Scargill represented it, a class-versus-class showdown because, far from ‘the class’ being united, it was deeply divided. The political task was not to fight a united heroic battle but to unify the miners, in order to unify the class, in order to unify a wider social bloc around the issues. The internal divisions within the miners’ union had real, material and ideological conditions of existence, and were not simply attributable to the lack of some pre-existing and unproblematic class unity or solidarity. Seen in the light of the failure to address this critical and difficult political task, the absence of a ballot and the contempt which many showed for the very idea of the ‘bourgeois’ deviation of a vote when a 1917 ‘Winter Palace’ scenario was unfolding before their eyes, was a gigantic tactical error, as well as a major error of principle. [...] There followed the police protecting the ‘right’ of one section of ‘the class’ to go to work against the interests of another section of ‘the class’, the media construction of the strike as ‘about’ law



and order and violence, and the failure of one of the most strategic encounters of Mrs Thatcher's three terms. (Hall 1988a: 204)

As already mentioned, Hall's position can partly be explained by his proximity to the Eurocommunist current within the CPGB, which placed particular emphasis – also in the context of the miners' strike – on the decisive character of the struggle for popular opinion and the need for broad alliances beyond the labor movement (Ackers 2014). But for others, the same analysis did not translate into such a sweeping critique of the strike or the NUM.¹⁴ A good case in point is Ashton himself, who brought a Eurocommunist analysis of class and identity politics into the work of LGSM combined with unconditional support for the union.

Additionally, while Hall (1988a) contrasted the miners' strike with the struggle to defend the GLC of Ken Livingstone, which he considered to embody a truly new politics for the left and to have become "the most important front in the struggle against Thatcherism" (233), the two struggles in fact were deeply intertwined. With its engagement in cultural politics, its support for black, feminist, and gay and lesbian autonomous movements, and more broadly its recognition that "activism outside the state is the source from which a radical administration in power draws its political energies" (235), the GLC represented a new practice of 'local socialism' that the Thatcher government was determined to sweep away. But neither Thatcherism nor Livingstone's GLC traded in too clear-cut distinctions between 'old' and 'new' socialism, and it was at the GLC where the London Mineworkers' Defence Committee (MDC) was established during the strike (Kelliher 2018: 133-4). Moreover, in 1985, LGSM and LAPC themselves organized a conference and fundraising event at the London Lesbian and Gay Centre (LLGC), which depended on GLC funding. In other words, as Kelliher (2021: 84) argues, not only did the GLC play an active role in organizing support for the miners, but it also helped produce "the wider political urban infrastructure in which the miners' strike solidarity movement was embedded." Thus, while Hall (1988a: 241) argued that "Livingstone could never have fought the miners' strike as Scargill did", for he "would never have regarded the question of the ballot as unimportant, especially when entering so strategic a battle," Livingstone was of a different opinion: "Either we are prepared to combine with the miners in taking action which could be branded 'illegal' by the Tory Courts, or we collude in devastating the communities we're supposed to represent." (quoted in Kelliher 2021: 85)

A first lesson we can draw from this discussion is that, as Hall himself argued at the time, the 1980s must be understood as a moment of social transformation and political

¹⁴ However, Ackers (2014: 156) argues that "Eurocommunists with official positions in the party and trade unions could ill afford to launch frontal assaults on the leadership of the NUM or policies like striking without a ballot", so in general, "they were much more critical of the official conduct of the strike than their measured written statements would suggest."



realignment in which processes of recomposition of the working class, long-standing fault lines running through the left, and the consolidation of autonomous and intersecting forms of identity politics combined in multiple and contradictory ways. Between the late 1970s and early 1980s, Eurocommunism might have seized the terrain of identity politics more convincingly than other formations on the left, which engaged with the politics of gender, race, and sexuality only superficially and with a limited understanding of their relative autonomy from the domains of industrial relations and workplace discrimination (Cant 2010; Derbyshire 2018; Willett 2014). However, as we saw in the experience of LGSM, the ideological resources available *across* the left and the debates among its different currents and organizations helped shape the politics of identity and coalition in sometimes unexpected ways. The missed encounter between Hall and LGSM – which lays bare the contradictory ways in which Eurocommunism and the experience of the GLC’s local socialism could be mobilized in the context of the strike – further emphasizes that the links and divides between class and identity politics, ‘hard left’ and ‘loony left’, ‘old’ and ‘new’ socialism were not settled in the 1980s, but in the making. From a genealogical perspective, returning to this political moment allows us to revisit the field of political possibilities opened up by the mutually determining encounter between a fragmented left and a proliferating field of intersecting identity politics.

A second lesson concerns the relation between theory and practice. Hall’s understanding of that relation is well captured by Gramsci’s famous line “pessimism of the intellect, optimism of the will”, which Hall especially embraced in his writings on the rise of Thatcherism and the crisis of the left in the 1980s. We may add that, as a public intellectual, perhaps he saw the pessimism of the intellect rather than the optimism of the will as his most important contribution to those debates. This intellectual pessimism was considered profoundly damaging by others on the left (cf. Miliband 1985). However, there is something we can learn from it especially at a historical distance, for as Kelliher (2021: 202) warns, “[t]here is a risk that emphasising the solidarities of 1984-85, and the wider cultures in which they were embedded, becomes a retrospective exercise in fashioning victory out of a defeat.”¹⁵ This is particularly true when we focus on LGSM. The movie *Pride* has certainly contributed to the story of the group being rediscovered and remembered as a parable of success. As one reviewer puts it, while the movie has an “unabashedly political edge” – which is no small accomplishment giving its mainstream

¹⁵ This thin line was already present in debates at the time and in the immediate aftermath of the strike. For example, Beynon (1985: 25) observed that “‘the movement’, if assessed from the standpoint of the TUC or Labour Party headquarters, is in pretty bad shape. However [...] another ‘movement’ may have been brought to life and been tapped by the strike. It has a future.” And writing in *Marxism Today*, Francis (1985: 28) explicitly asked: “was it a defeat or a victory?” His conclusion was that, while it would be “a most appalling exercise in self-delusion” to read the strike as a victory, it would be nonetheless too “simplistic” to talk in terms of victory *or* defeat, especially considering the scale of aggression that the government unleashed against the NUM and the resistance that the miners were able to organize (29).



target audience – “[t]he strike’s ultimate defeat is almost possible to overlook here, providing as it does only a momentary note of downbeat dignity before the heart-swelling crescendo of the film’s final scene in which the 1985 Gay Pride March is led by a cavalcade of miners.” (Jones 2014) Indeed, it is not only by virtue of the effective coalition forged with the miners during the strike that the story of LGSM lends itself to a narrative of success, but also because of its contribution – no matter how small or symbolic – to the concrete advancement of the struggle for lesbian and gay rights within the British left, especially the Labour Party.

However, this advancement must also be understood in light of the fact that by the 1990s, as Graham Willett (2014: 186) argues, the revolutionary left was experiencing a profound crisis and LGBTQ rights were eventually taken up by New Labour within a reformist and neoliberal framework. The result, in Britain and elsewhere, has been a selective yet effective absorption of an ostensibly ‘progressive’ sexual politics within a transformed neoliberal bloc, which Lisa Duggan (2003) has termed ‘homonormativity’: “the ‘gay equality’ branch of a multi-issue neoliberalism.” (47) The formation of queer Marxism and queer of color critique as critical currents in contemporary queer theory and politics can be largely understood as a response to this shift to the right (cf. Drucker 2015; Ferguson 2004; Floyd 2009; Puar 2007; Rao 2014; Rosenberg/Villarejo 2012). In this context, the most interesting processes of ‘political reactivation’ incited by *Pride* (cf. Grant/Kelliher 2019) are informed by a critical questioning, not a celebration, of the successful trajectory of sexual politics. For example, Sharif Mowlabocus argues that Lesbians and Gays Support the Migrants – which formed in the wake of the movie’s release, directly inspired by the story of LGSM – have reactivated the spirit of the original group yet with a difference:

LGSMigrants is not LGSM and never could be. They may share a common politics, a common ideology and a common belief in justice, but the newer group also recognises how [today] [...] queer folk risk becoming ammunition for politicians who, just 30 years ago, may well have been fighting against the tolerance and acceptance they now see as under threat from groups who migrate to Britain seeking refuge. (Mowlabocus 2019: 24)

Thus, on the one hand, while the story of LGSM functions as a source of positive inspiration and political identification, it speaks best today to the most *pessimist* analyses of the state of sexual politics. In this sense, Hall’s pessimism of the intellect is perhaps a good lens through which that story can be apprehended as a genealogy of contemporary queer Marxist and queer of color critiques of neoliberal sexual politics.¹⁶

¹⁶ It is worth mentioning that the proliferation of authoritarian populisms in the context of the ongoing crisis of the neoliberal center, including so-called ‘anti-gender’ movements (cf. Graff/Korolczuk 2022; Kuhar/Paternotte 2017), demands that queer Marxism and queer of color critique today expand their reach beyond this foundational critique of neoliberal sexual politics (Ferguson 2020).



On the other hand, the same pessimism prevented Hall from appreciating the emergence of LGSM and other similar groups within the folds of the miners' strike. In their critique of the analyses offered by Hall and others in *Marxism Today* at the time, Doreen Massey, Lynne Segal, and Hilary Wainwright (1983: 9) argued that their insistent pessimism about the left *depended* on ignoring the real coalitions built at the grassroots.¹⁷ This point acquires additional significance as we look at the missed encounter between Hall and LGSM from the vantage point of the present. While contemporary queer critiques of neoliberal sexual politics somewhat inherit Hall's pessimism of the intellect, it is precisely experiences such as that of LGSM that – if historically translated – can inspire today attempts to reconnect a progressive sexual politics with socialist, antiracist, and feminist projects of social transformation.

Funding

The research for this article was supported by a Veni Grant awarded by the Dutch Research Council (NWO) for the project 'Digging Against the Grain: The Political Moment of Lesbians and Gays Support the Miners, 1984-85' (VI.Veni.201C.057).

Works Cited

- Ackers, Peter (2014). "Gramsci and the Miners' Strike: Remembering the 1984-1985 Eurocommunist Alternative Industrial Relations Strategy." *Labor History* 55.2: 151-72.
- All Out! Dancing in Dulais* (1985). Documentary by LGSM. London: Converse Pictures.
- Amos, Valerie, Gail Lewis, Amina Mama, and Pratibha Parmar (eds.) (1984). "Many Voices, One Chant: Black Feminist Perspectives." Special Issue. *Feminist Review* 17.
- Andrews, Geoff (2004). *Endgames and New Times: The Final Years of British Communism 1964-1991*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Beynon, Huw (ed.) (1985). *Digging Deeper: Issues in the Miners' Strike*. London: Verso.
- Butler, Judith (1997). "Merely Cultural." *Social Text* 52/53: 265-77.
- Callinicos, Alex and Mike Simons (1985). *The Great Strike: The Miners' Strike of 1984-5 and its Lessons*. London: Socialist Worker.
- Cant, Bob (2010) [1988]. "Normal Channels." *Radical Records: Thirty Years of Lesbian and Gay History, 1957-1987*. Ed. Bob Cant and Susan Hemmings. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 206-21.

¹⁷ The main target of Massey, Segal, and Wainwright's critique is Eric Hobsbawm, but the very title of their piece, "Stop the Great Male Moving Right Show!", is an explicit reference to Hall.



- Colpani, Gianmaria (2022). "Two Theories of Hegemony: Stuart Hall and Ernesto Laclau in Conversation." *Political Theory* 50.2: 221-46.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé W. (1989). "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 140: 139-67.
- Derbyshire, Philip (2018) [1980]. "Sects and Sexuality: Trotskyism and the Politics of Homosexuality." *Homosexuality: Power and Politics*. Ed. Gay Left Collective. London: Verso, 104-15.
- Drucker, Peter (2015). *Warped: Gay Normality and Queer Anticapitalism*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Duggan, Lisa (2003). *The Twilight of Equality? Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, and the Attack on Democracy*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Ferguson, Roderick A. (2004). *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer of Color Critique*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- (2020). "Authoritarianism and the Planetary Mission of Queer of Color Critique: A Short Reflection." *Safundi: The Journal of South African and American Studies* 21.3: 282-90.
- Field, Nicola (1995). *Over the Rainbow: Money, Class and Homophobia*. London: Pluto Press.
- Floyd, Kevin (2009). *The Reification of Desire: Toward a Queer Marxism*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Flynn, Brian, Larry Goldsmith, and Bob Sutcliffe (1985). "We Danced in the Miners' Hall: An Interview with 'Lesbians and Gays Support the Miners.'" *Radical America* 19.2/3: 39-46.
- Francis, Hywel (2015). *History on Our Side: Wales and the 1984-85 Miners' Strike*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Goodspeed, Ray (2019). "Lesbians and Gays Support the Miners – Solidarity Forever!" *Shafted: The Media, the Miners' Strike & the Aftermath*. 2nd edition. Ed. Granville Williams. North: Campaign for Press and Broadcasting Freedom, 65-78.
- Graff, Agnieszka and Elżbieta Korolczuk (2022). *Anti-Gender Politics in the Populist Moment*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Gramsci, Antonio (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Ed. and trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Grant, Catherine and Diarmaid Kelliher (eds.) (2019). "Pride Revisited: Cinema, Activism and Re-Activation." Special Issue. *Open Library of Humanities* 5.1.
- Hajee, Azim (1984). "Black Support for Miners." *Black Trade Unionist: Newsletter of the Black Trade Unionist Solidarity Movement* 2: 12-3.
- Hall, Stuart (1979). "The Great Moving Right Show." *Marxism Today*, January: 14-20.
- (1985a). "Authoritarian Populism: A Reply to Jessop et al." *New Left Review* 151: 115-24.
- (1985b). "Faith, Hope or Clarity." *Marxism Today*, January: 15-9.



- (1985c). “Realignment for What?” *Marxism Today*, December: 12-7.
- (1986a). “Gramsci’s Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity.” *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10.2: 5-27.
- (1986b). “On Postmodernism and Articulation.” Interview by Lawrence Grossberg. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10.2: 45-60.
- (1987). “Gramsci and Us.” *Marxism Today* June: 16-21.
- (1988a). *The Hard Road to Renewal: Thatcherism and the Crisis of the Left*. London and New York: Verso.
- (1988b). “The Toad in the Garden: Thatcherism among the Theorists.” *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 35-57.
- (1989a). “The Meaning of New Times.” *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s*. Ed. Stuart Hall and Martin Jacques. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 116-34.
- (1989b). “New Ethnicities.” *Black Film, British Cinema*. ICA Documents 7. Ed. Kobena Mercer. London: Institute of Contemporary Arts, 27-31.
- (1992). “Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies.” *Cultural Studies*. Ed. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula A. Treichler. London and New York: Routledge, 277-94.
- Hall, Stuart, Chas Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke, and Brian Roberts (1978). *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*. London: MacMillan.
- Hall, Stuart and Martin Jacques (eds.) (1983). *The Politics of Thatcherism*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- (eds.) (1989). *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Haslop, Craig (2018). “‘The Thing Is I’m Actually From Bromley’: Queer/Class Intersectionality in *Pride* (2014).” *Considering Class: Theory, Culture and the Media in the 21st Century*. Ed. Deirdre O’Neill and Mike Wayne. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 303-16.
- hooks, bell (1981). *Ain’t I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*. London: Pluto Press.
- Jessop, Bob, Kevin Bonnett, Simon Bromley, and Tom Ling (1984). “Authoritarian Populism, Two Nations and Thatcherism.” *New Left Review* 147: 32-60.
- Jones, Rhian E. (2014). “‘Pride’, Identity and Intersectionality.” *Velvet Coalmine* 11 Dec.: <<https://rhianejones.com/2014/12/11/pride-identity-and-intersectionality/>>. [accessed 11 Apr. 2022]
- Joseph, Miranda (2002). *Against the Romance of Community*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Julien, Isaac and Kobena Mercer (1988). “De Margin and De Centre.” *Screen* 29.4: 2-11.
- Kelliher, Diarmaid (2014). “Solidarity and Sexuality: Lesbians and Gays Support the Miners 1984-5.” *History Workshop Journal* 77.1: 241-62.



- (2018). “Networks of Solidarity: The London Left and the 1984-85 Miners’ Strike.” *Waiting for the Revolution: The British Far Left from 1956*. Ed. Evan Smith and Matthew Worley. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 125-43.
- (2021). *Making Cultures of Solidarity: London and the 1984-5 Miners’ Strike*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kuhar, Roman and David Paternotte (eds.) (2017). *Anti-Gender Campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing Against Equality*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Massey, Doreen, Lynne Segal, and Hilary Wainwright (1983). “Stop the Great Male Moving Right Show!” *New Socialist* January/February: 18-22.
- Massey, Doreen and Hilary Wainwright (1985). “Beyond the Coalfields.” *Digging Deeper: Issues in the Miners’ Strike*. Ed. Huw Beynon. London: Verso, 149-68.
- McIlroy, John (1985). “Police and Pickets: The Law Against the Miners.” *Digging Deeper: Issues in the Miners’ Strike*. Ed. Huw Beynon. London: Verso, 101-22.
- Mercer, Kobena (1994). *Welcome to the Jungle: New Positions in Black Cultural Studies*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Miliband, Ralph (1985). “The New Revisionism in Britain.” *New Left Review* 1.150: 5-26.
- Morris, Garry (1986). “Black Miners and the Miners’ Strike.” *New Beacon Review* 2/3: 40-7.
- Mowlabocus, Sharif (2019). “‘No Politics ... We’re a Mardi Gras Now’: Telling the Story of LGSM in 21st-Century Britain.” *Open Library of Humanities* 5.1: 1-28.
- Pimlott, Herbert F. (2022). *Wars of Position? Marxism Today, Cultural Politics and the Remaking of the Left Press, 1979-1990*. Leiden: Brill.
- Prearo, Massimo (2014). *Le moment politique de l’homosexualité. Mouvements, identités et communautés en France*. Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon.
- (2015). *La fabbrica dell’orgoglio. Una genealogia dei movimenti LGBT*. Pisa: ETS.
- Pride* (2014). Movie directed by Matthew Warchus. London: Pathé.
- Puar, Jasbir K. (2007). *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Rao, Rahul (2015). “Global Homocapitalism.” *Radical Philosophy* 194: 38-49.
- Robinson, Lucy (2007). *Gay Men and the Left in Post-War Britain: How the Personal Got Political*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Rosenberg, J. and Amy Villarejo (eds.) (2012). “Queer Studies and the Crises of Capitalism.” Special Issue. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 18.1.
- Rowbotham, Sheila and Jean McCrindle (1986). “More Than Just a Memory: Some Political Implications of Women’s Involvement in the Miners’ Strike, 1984-85.” *Feminist Review* 23: 109-24.
- Rowbotham, Sheila, Lynne Segal, and Hilary Wainwright (1979). *Beyond the Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism*. Pontypool: The Merlin Press.



- Samuel, Raphael, Barbara Bloomfield, and Guy Boanas (eds.) (1986). *The Enemy Within: Pit Villages and the Miners' Strike of 1984-85*. London: Routledge.
- Schwarz, Bill and Alan Fountain (1985). "The Role of the Media: Redefining the National Interest and The Miners and Television." *Digging Deeper: Issues in the Miners' Strike*. Ed. Huw Beynon. London: Verso, 123-35.
- Seddon, Vicky (ed.) (1986). *The Cutting Edge: Women and the Pit Strike*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Shaw, Monica and Mave Mundy (2005). "Complexities of Class and Gender Relations: Recollections of Women Active in the 1984-5 Miner's Strike." *Capital & Class* 29.3: 151-74.
- Smith, Anna Marie (1994). *New Right Discourse on Race and Sexuality. Britain, 1968-1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Evan and Daryl Leeworthy (2016). "Before Pride: The Struggle for the Recognition of Gay Rights in the British Communist Movement, 1973-1985." *Twentieth Century British History* 27.4: 1-22.
- Spence, Jean and Carol Stephenson (2009). "'Side by Side with Our Men?' Women's Activism, Community, and Gender in the 1984-1985 British Miners' Strike." *International Labor and Working-Class History* 75: 68-84.
- Sutcliffe-Braithwaite, Florence and Natalie Thomlinson (2018). "National Women Against Pit Closures: Gender, Trade Unionism and Community Activism in the Miners' Strike, 1984-5." *Contemporary British History* 32.1: 78-100.
- Tate, Tim and LGSM (2017). *Pride*. London: John Black Publishing.
- Vittorini, Polly, Nicola Field, and Caron Methol (1986). "Lesbians Against Pit Closures." *The Cutting Edge: Women and the Pit Strike*. Ed. Vicky Seddon. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 142-8.
- Willett, Graham (2014). "Something New Under the Sun: The Revolutionary Left and Gay Politics." *Against the Grain: The British Far Left from 1956*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 173-89.
- Wilson, Colin and Ray Goodspeed (2014). "Dear Love of Comrades: The Politics of Lesbians and Gays Support the Miners." *Rs21* 21 Sep.: <<http://www.rs21.org.uk/2014/09/21/dear-love-of-comrades-remembering-lesbians-and-gays-support-the-miners/>>. [accessed 11 Apr. 2022]
- Winson, Rebecca (2015). "What today's activists can learn from the Lesbians Against Pit Closures campaign." *New Statesman* 4 Feb.: <<https://www.newstatesman.com/culture/2015/02/what-today-s-activists-can-learn-lesbians-against-pit-closures-campaign>>. [accessed 11 Apr. 2022]
- Yusoff, Kathryn (2015). "Queer Coal: Genealogies in/of the Blood." *PhiloSOPHIA* 5.2: 203-29.

Archives

Labour History Archive and Study Centre, People's History Museum (LHASC)

Black Cultural Archives (BCA)