Walk for Wat! Fight the Poll Tax!


On Wednesday, 28th March, people from all over Kent will set off from Canterbury and walk to London in opposition to the Poll Tax which comes into force on 1st April.

The walk which is expected to take three and a half days will attempt to reconstruct the historic advances made by tens of thousands of Kentish people in June 1381, and which led to the eventual defeat of the Poll Tax when it was last introduced in this country.

The facts surrounding the 'Peasants Revolt' of 1381 are often very vague since with the exception of one historic source, the Anonimale Chronicle, all contemporary accounts are based on hearsay. There is no doubt, however, that the events of June 1381 led to the most complete collapse of the old order, (Feudalism and serfdom), leaving only anarchy in its place.

The 'Peasants Revolt', as perhaps it should be known, since it attracted some popular support from all social classes, saw the governing classes in many areas helpless and bewildered. It was perhaps the nearest this country has been to revolution.

England in the late fourteenth century was suffering, not only was it still engaged in The Hundred Years War but its population had been drastically reduced as a result of the Black Death. Life was short and perilous; everybody was engaged on the land, protecting one's own interest took priority.

Canterbury at this time was a very important town, being not only the 'capital' of the Church of England, but also in terms of its economic activity. The majority of the population lived in the villages surrounding Canterbury and no one was allowed inside the city walls if they had proof of employment there. If caught without proof inside the walls you would have had a blazing fire and a horse cart and billet violently dragged out of the town!

And so it was that Parliament in 1380, in order to finance the war, made a radical mistake. It ignored two decades of non direct taxation, and instituted a level tax of 3d (1 shilling) on all citizens over the age of fourteen. It was a preposterous idea since under the ancient agricultural system many peasant farmers possessed no cash income at all. Considering the great difference between the rich and the poor it made no sense at all, and one wonders how Parliament seriously expected to impose it.

As expected, there was enormous evasion of the tax in 1380 and the population of England fell by over a third. The shortfall was so clear that the government that it required action. Tax collectors were sent into Essex and Kent and were met by resistance from villagers, and it is at this point that Wat Tyler enters the story.

Accounts vary but seems to be a tale from a village just outside Maidstone. He was interrupted at work one day by his wife who ran screaming hysterically that the tax collector had arrived at the house and was demanding a total of 3 shillings for themselves and their daughter. Wat returned to the house where a blazing argument ensued. The tax collector refused to believe that their daughter was under the age of fourteen and to prove his point lit the girl on fire, pulled down her knickers, and proclaimed she was over the age of puberty. Tyler by now had had enough; he picked up a stick and smashed the collector on the head. One account states that his brains were scattered around the room.

Tyler gathered some followers and proceeded to march on Canterbury where they occupied the town on the night of 10th June. They had set up a base for London to raise their objections to the King and all along the route they attracted and compelled support with a Robin Hood spirit that appealed to a sense of right and wrong. Marching via Maidstone, Rochester and Dartford, the rebels ransacked houses of the rich and freed prisoners from the jails. Led by Tyler, John Ball [an egalitarian priest] and Jack Straw, tens of thousands of Kentish people arrived outside London on the evening of 12th June and camped on Blackheath.

They were joined by a rebel force from Essex who had heard of the march from Canterbury and who also numbered tens of thousands.

On the following morning the rebels gathered at Rotherhithe and demanded to be met by the King. The fourteen year old King, Richard II, in a fit of insecurity decided to meet their demand and set off by barge from the opposite side of the Thames. It soon became clear that there was no way in which they could safely land, and unable to make themselves heard, turned their back on the crown and rowed to safety. Incensed by this, the crown poured towards the city of London, crossed London Bridge and entered the city.

Again, much ransacking and looting took place, and the Savoy Palace, residence of the much loved John of Gaunt, was burned to the ground.

It is unclear where the sixty or so thousand rebels slept that night. Sufficient to say that much ale was drunk.

Advisors to the King suggested that an army of loyalists should go and massacre the rebels in their drunken sleep, but with only a small force of loyalists in London at the time, the King decided to meet them the following day and concede to all their demands. They met in a large open space at Mile End, just outside the city, where the King was confronted by sixty-thousand men. He heard their grievances and gave them his word that he would adhere to them, saying that he would have letters written, bearing the Royal Seal, which they could take back with them to the villages from which they had come. He urged all but a few representatives to return home and many, respecting the King's word, did so.

What this was taking place, another group of rebels, including perhaps Tyler himself, invaded the Tower of London and beheaded Simon Sudbury, Archbishop of Canterbury and also Chancellor. Along with three or four others his head was placed on a spike, and displayed on London Bridge, like the heads of traitors.

This lost the support of many rebels, but there were still thirty thousand of them who slept that night outside the Tower.

London's morning sun rose bright and clear on the following day, that memorable Saturday, 15th June, 1381. The rebels remaining in London ignored the King's words and demanded to be met again. The King, having no alternative, told the rebels to assemble at Smithfield, where he would again listen to their requests. The King, on arrival at Smithfield, rode straight up to Tyler, at the head of the rebels. Tyler got off his horse and greeted the King as an equal. He then proceeded to list their demands, stopping only to order more ale. One of the King's spavins recognised Tyler for a thief and proclaimed this to the crowd; Tyler responded by attacking the man, only to be held back by the Mayor of London. Not wishing to see such behaviour in front of the King, the Mayor struck Tyler to the floor, where he was immediately surrounded by the King's men and stabbed twice through the chest, unseemly by his rebel army. Ironically enough, they thought Tyler was being knighted.

Tyler found just enough strength to turn his horse, and with a despairing cry of 'Treason'. rode halfway down the open space to slide helplessly to the ground, in full view of the assembled crowd. A hull fell over crowds of Smithfield. It was a critical moment for all concerned. The fourteen year old King, without hesitating, rode up to the crowd and stated to them that, with Tyler dead, he was now their natural captain and anyone who would follow him should do so. He turned and set off, and after a brief hesitation, the crowd followed the King, leaving their leader lying mortally wounded on the ground of Smithfield. The party was over.

Richard returned to his mother at the Royal Tower, and proclaimed today I have recovered my inheritance, the realm of England which I had lost. The status quo was restored but the Poll Tax was never again collected. Until now.

The March, which is organised by Whistable Against the Tax, culminates in a national demonstration on Trafalgar Square on Saturday, 31st March. For further details of the walk and the demonstration, please contact Phil on 0227 795234 or Kevin on 0227 710902.
KRED - SHORTS

World Education Development (Support) Group

Event: Discussion
"Developing agents: Is their work a waste of time and money?"
Thursday 15th March
Darwin Lecture Theatre 2 7.30 pm

with
Frank Furedie: Chair of development studies UKC
Alison Barrett: Oxford Research and evaluation department
Steve Dawe (Chairperson)

Exhibition of new commissions at University

Two famous artists with close campus connections are exhibiting newly commissioned works in the Gulbenkian Theatre at the University of Kent at Canterbury.

The internationally renowned artist, Graham Clarke, has been especially commissioned to produce a limited edition etching of Canterbury and the University, and Teresa Henderson’s watercolours of the University, also specially commissioned in this the University’s Silver Jubilee year, are also on display.

Graham Clarke, who lives and works in Kent, has a daughter who is currently a student of Drama at the University, and Teresa Henderson’s father was the architect responsible for some of the first buildings to be put up at Kent - one of seven “new” Universities founded in England in the 1960s.

The exhibition is held in the Foyer of the Gulbenkian Theatre and runs from Wednesday 28 February to Saturday 24 March. Admission is free. Prints are available from the Information Office.

For further information please contact:
The Silver Jubilee Office, Cornwallis Building or Helen Harrison, Information Office.

On March 16, Sir Patrick Mayhew Q.C., M.P., the Attorney General to Mrs Thatcher’s government, will speak to K.U.C. at D.T.L.T at 7.45 p.m. This subject will be the future of the legal profession, but he will accept questions on any of the Government’s present policies.

Sir Patrick is, of course, a member of the Cabinet and this is an invaluable opportunity to speak to such a high ranking minister.

The meeting is open to all members of the University regardless of political belief.

Knife Attackers Jailed
Two youths who attacked a UKC student last December were recently jailed by Canterbury Crown Court. Anthony Chambers (17) of St Stephens Road, Canterbury and Benjamin Holton (aka Ackerman), aged 18, were sentenced to two and a half years each in a young offenders institution, for their attack on student Syed Aziz. Syed was threatened at knife-point, assaulted and then robbed of money and a watch. (Ref: K.R.E.D. 110).

A second victim of the attackers was a 33 year old sales representative Claude Jallit, who was cut on the face and robbed.

All the accused spoke of the pair’s shame and despair since attacking Syed and Mr Jallit. Counsel for Holton in particular referred to the pair’s poor living conditions in a squat, and hunger, and Holton’s alleged attempt at suicide while in custody.

Paul Waters

Vivisection Doubled in 1992?
Following the awareness of vivisection on campus it has been disclosed that animal experiments could be doubled by 1992, according to the European proposal for increased use of animals in cosmetics testing. Tests would become compulsory for all unproven ingredients, including even honey and lemon.

In 1988, nearly 17,000 animals were used in tests and then killed by the cosmetics industry. This is only a small fraction of the 3.4 million animal experiments conducted that year which were mainly for medical research. It is the aim of the Animal Rights Groups to reduce, refine and eventually use other methods of testing; however, this number will increase if this draft EC directive goes ahead.

Fortunately Britain, aligned with Germany and Holland, oppose this directive. A recent opinion poll showed that in Britain 85% of people oppose animal tests for cosmetics and toiletries and 58% would choose not to buy such tested products. The Body Shop and Beauty Without Cruelty, which conduct no animal experiments, have already declared that they will stop trading. Let us hope that there will be enough groups supporting them in order to prevent this from happening.

The Animal Rights Group in UKC apologise for having to postpone the debate on vivisection. It should now take place on Thursday 29th March at 7.30 p.m. Everybody is welcome.

Lisa Thompson (K)
Monica Golt (K)

"Nicaragua No Pasaran" a film by David Bradbury showing 8.15pm, Wednesday 21st March at The Canterbury Centre, St.Alphege Lane, Canterbury
Tickets £2 on the door

Pro-life, Pro-choice or just Pro-paganda?

Debate on Abortion: Rutherford 1/3/90
All the arguments presented were both coherent and articulate. On the one hand, Michelle Carlisle argued with the conviction of someone who knew exactly what she was talking about, backed up by a series of statistics and moving quotes from those who had their lives changed by exercising their right to abortion.

For the opposition, it is hard to find someone who breaks the Victoria-Gillick-Bible-bashing image of a "Pro-Lifer" so much as Dr Margaret White. Sensible, awesomely socialist and a devout feminist, she presented the main thrust of her arguments:

Abortion is not the solution to female emancipation. It is a cop out that allows men to maintain their dominant position in society and cheapens the role of women in particular, who are forced to have abortions in the light of a working woman. Further, abortion involves the murder of an unborn child, necessitated by society’s failure to provide proper social support for mothers and facilitated by the widespread dehumanisation of the baby: Why does a baby suddenly become "a foetus" when it is not wanted? And when is a baby alive before an abortion and certainly dead afterwards so why do people refuse to recognise the death of an unborn child?

Michelle Carlisle and Emma Guion recognised that abortion is never an ideal option, it is a back-up, which should be held in the context of better sex education and more widespread access to contraception. However, abortion allows women to decide if and when they become pregnant, providing greater female emancipation and a more dominant, self-defined role in society. A safety-net for women and a guarantee against unwanted children.

Priorities come into the question; how can you calculate the incredible burden to mother, family and society and weigh this against the right to life of the child?

The question of theaucha abortion was then raised (which is one necessitated by the threat to the life of the mother if the pregnancy was allowed to go “full term”). This procedure was fully endorsed by the pro-life speakers, a fact which visibly shocked Michelle Carlisle.

The pro-life speakers held the moral high ground and Dr White’s arguments on the death of a “something” in the womb and the baby-foetus terminology question were astute and never properly answered by the pro-choice speakers. However, the pro-choice arguments still held greater validity than those of their opposition. They admitted that abortion is not an ideal solution and they laid great emphasis on the larger social conflict involved.

The pro-choice lobby lost the debate 14:10, though only because the pro-life team managed to mobilise more of their supporters. They also lost the argument of the debate. Abortion is not something that is imposed on people. However, it is essential as one of the few props to women’s status in society. A major defence against the social hegemony of male-oriented, male-defined attitudes.

Further, in light of the present attitudes toward the provision of social services and community care, it is really plausible to expect that women’s potential in society will not be forced down by the weight of sexual stereotyping and the blanket endorsement of “family values” if abortion was criminalised?

600 women a day have abortions in England and Wales. 600 very hard decisions not to take on the responsibilities of parenthood, often in the light of previous parental experience. Should an all-embracing national policy be formulated to determine the results of 600 daily, separate, crises, all with varying causes and complexities?

The whole problem revolves around the question of contraception. Not only “Is abortion contraception?” but also the social role of contraception. Pro-choice explained their policies with energy and clarity; the base-line being the need for further sex-education and access to contraceptives.

The pro-life movement, however, is composed of a number of groups. There is an ultra-conservative wing of liberal socialists who condemn abortion as a tool of male domination and the wounding of the essence of new life. This group is married to a reactionary, conservative, Catholic dominated wing who wallow in the virtue of their own family values.

I talked to Mary O’Rawe after the debate. "The pro-life movement doesn’t have an official policy on contraception, but then it doesn’t have an official policy on a lot of issues that are nothing to do with abortion.” Another issue inadvertently slipped into the conversation.

"I couldn’t believe it," she confided to her friend next to me, "when she (Dr White) endorsed the therapeutic abortion, I’d really have to question the validity of that, I was going to say something but you can’t...

Careless talk, Mary O’Rawe, costs good propaganda.

Christina Hofman
Do I stand a loan?

Dear Kreb,

We are hearing a great deal about student loans lately, yet most of this comes in the form of rather bizarre proclamations about how we are "legitimately speaking" to the people. This seems to me, and to other students I have spoken with, that merely to address the problem is to allow it to win. It is not, however, to achieve very little. The present SU campaign against loans seems to me not only the passing of the moment but also just not wanting them. This impression is only reinforced by the rather bizarre positions about political parties that effect the poor, the poor statements about the real intentions of government. In introducing them to me, however, all arguments are wholly beside the point. They do not touch on the real issues behind the passing of the reason real reasons why students have a right to grants we need to understand why it is due of the community to provide them.

It seems to me that two factors underly the loan scheme, one about the nature of education, and one about the nature of grants. The first, the nature of education: higher education is a kind of "market" product consumed by individuals for their own purposes, as well as a commodity bought in a shop. I yet wonder if it is not also true to say that this is a false analogy.

Certainly it is a part of a government's function to facilitate conditions of just trade, but this is neither its first nor its greatest duty. The primary duty of government is to ensure that these advantages that naturally arise through a community being a community are enjoyed by all. This means that no section of the community is either subsidized or monopolized, and that any part of that natural advantage, and neither should any section of the community be subsidised or monopolized, and that any part of that natural advantage, and neither should be that has a title to it.

In principle, student loans break with this primary duty. Loans seek to extend the power of the community to receive the advantages of educated persons (employers for instance) while another seeks (students) meet the cost of education. Such an arrangement is patently unjust and divisive. It is no less absurd because the number of armed forces should pay back to the state the cost of his military education. It is absurd to think that anyone who is in favor of the introduction of student loans thinks the armed forces are a false analogy to students, and I challenge them to demonstrate it.

Those who are against loans, simply because they do not like what they want them, I believe, either keep silent or reason their position through fear. They have yet to argue their case from a precise understanding of the principles involved (rather than mere slogans), that is to say, from a point at least until the day when we get a more enlightened government. The principles involved, i.e., have to try to demonstrate, demand that we look at the issue from a higher perspective than just the students.

Joseph Milne (D)
KRED Election Special

Bryan Davey
President
1990 – 91

Experience:
- JCR Internal Rep. May ’88 – June ’88: Rutherford
- JCR Secretary June ’89 – present: University

What the job involves:
The job of President is to lead and coordinate campaigns, and be a representative for students at this University. It is therefore important to be aware and open to the needs of all students, and campaign both on external and campus issues. I see the following campaigns as the most important in the year to come:

A Consent Echo:
To get cheaper food and drink, and stage better entertainments, our long term priority must be a Union building. At long last, the University has ear-marked a site for such a development, but surely in its Silver Jubilee Year, it should be giving us some of the £3 million needed for such a building. We must pursue in the next year, all possible means to finance such a facility.

Housing:
With the introduction of the Poll Tax in April, landlords will no longer pay rates on their properties. However, owners don’t pay falling in line with this change, if anything they are increasing. One reason is because of the severe housing shortage in the Canterbury area. Next October, there will be at least 300 students homeless.

A new accommodation being built by the University will not even match the existing student numbers. Clearly, we must pressurise the University into buying, and building, more accommodation at reasonable rates.

Safety:
The University has been forced by students to improve safety on campus. However, we must keep up the pressure to ensure all students are safe. It is important that emergency alarms are provided in all student bedrooms, and that students are educated about personal safety, and issues like rape.

Most importantly, we must make sure the University does not backtrack on the agreements made with the Students’ Union.

Loans and Tuition Fees:
The Student Loan is a farce costing more than the grant system it is intended to replace. In the next century, it discourages the less privileged from entering higher education. By October, it will either be defeated or, will be a reality. Therefore, we must also focus on the possibility of tuition fees, and further attack on the free education for further education.

Poll Tax:
From April, all full-time students will have to pay £60 for local services, via the Poll Tax. There has been no corresponding increase in the grant, but instead we face losing housing benefit and Income Support.

The Poll Tax is grossly unfair, and I support all resistance to the Tax. Personally, I will not pay it when it is introduced, as I believe mass non-payment is the most effective way to defeat the Tax.

NUJ:
The National Union of Students is our vital national link. It has led campaigns against the Poll Tax and Student Loans, and has sustained the Bank’s withdrawal from the Loans Scheme. It also provides legal and welfare services. It is, for example, co-ordinated legal representation for me, securing my acquittal of charges resulting from my arrest at Westminster Bridge.

Disaffiliation will only lead to isolation, and conflicts with our need for a strong Students’ Union.

Environment:
The SU has led a successful campaign on recycling in the last year. Its continued success depends, though, on co-operation with the University authorities, both providing better facilities and using more recycled products.

Services:
The library facilities are clearly inadequate. There is a need not just for more books, but also more photocopiers, and a review of the current fines system with a view to extending Reserve Section loans to 11 a.m. College Libraries are under-used and could be improved by concentrating on essential texts and opening for longer to suit the needs of students numbers which only make matters worse. While I was President of Rutherford JICRC we successfully achieved staff increases in the Dining Hall. I hope to extend vending facilities in Parkwood, and if elected, I will endeavour to improve catering facilities generally, across campus.

Catering:
The Breakfast system is unfair, all residents paying for a service that few use. We must examine the possibilities of extending breakfast hours and an "opting out" system, so those who don’t use the facilities don’t pay for it. Queues for meals are worse than ever, and increasing student numbers will only make matters worse. While I was President of Rutherford JICRC, we successfully achieved staff increases in the Dining Hall. I hope to extend vending facilities in Parkwood, and if elected, I will endeavour to improve catering facilities generally, across campus.

Other Services needed improvement, but have perhaps been neglected. The Bus Service has markedly deteriorated. The result has been higher fares, longer journeys, and a poor peak time and early morning service. We must extend the Late Night Minibus Service, and lobby the local bus company to improve services.

Similarly, Car Parking is also inadequate. I have led a campaign for additional spaces and garage facilities adjacent to Rutherford, for which the University is now seeking planning permission. But clearly this is not enough!

Why me?
I believe I am approachable, friendly and dedicated. My experience coupled with knowledge of student issues and University bureaucracy, shows my willingness to lead and represent students in a strong Students’ Union.

Helga Swidenbank
Women’s Officer
1990 – 91

The role of Women’s Officer is political one, and a position which entails the representation of, and responsibility to, all women on campus. The post involves the recognition of the fact that women are representative of diverse political leanings. Since my first year I have been involved in student politics on the Student Union Executive, as Executive Officer and Vice-President for Welfare, and as Executive Women’s Officer. I am an active member of the Women’s Group, the Reproductive Rights Group, and the Positive Images Group on campus. I was also on the occupation of the Registry last December.

The position of Women’s Officer has enormous potential to challenge and make significant changes in attitudes on and around campus.

A RIGHT TO CHOICE:
Women face constant attacks on their right to choose whether or not to have an abortion (the emotive research bill). It is essential that the Student Union has a Pro-Choice policy. I would act to condemn any legislation limiting such a fundamental choice.

SAFETY on campus must not be neglected. The success of the occupation must be built on. The University must not be allowed to compromise the demands agreed to.

AWARENESS of the complexities of issues such as rape is essential. Workshops to inform women, and men, of the realities of acquaintance rape should be provided along with provision for counselling for the victims of assault.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT guidelines exist but students have been kept in the dark. These guidelines should be issued to all students, and a forum provided for those who have suffered from harassment of any kind.

POSITIVE IMAGES of homosexuals have been severely affected by the introduction of Section 28 a few years ago. It is important that the homophobia which exists in society and on this campus is actively challenged.

SWISS Petition
We, the undersigned, would like to say that we have serious misgivings about the effectiveness of the current Swiss campaign and therefore with the Campaign Against Pornography. In voicing these doubts, we have no intention of and do not believe that we are opposing anybody, despite what Ms Guion wrote in last week’s addition of KRED. We believe that both the exchange of views in KRED and the Debate on Pornography which took place two weeks ago between members of CAP and the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) have been valuable in raising the issue of pornography that Ms Guion should attempt to denigrate this does CAP no credit whatsoever.

CAP continually restates the statement that they do not believe pornography causes rape. Ms Guion’s arguments in the poem, ‘. . . the permission, direction and rehearsal for acts of sexual violence,’ is the one issue we have discussed. Whatever the cause, there is no doubt that pornography is available and accessible to everyone. Women do not believe that pornography is no longer available in W.H. Smith, women’s oppression will be alleviated. Our aim is to fight the root causes of women’s oppression, and a good way of starting this is by defeating the current attacks on abortion rights, loans and the poll tax (which will have drastic effects on women).

KEYNES JCC
Proudly Presents
"THE EASTER EGGSTRAVAGANZA"
Featuring:
THE TURPIN BROTHERS BLUE BAND DISCO COUNTY DANCE DISCO BAND COUNTRY BAND (EXTENSION)
BUFFET BAR & COCKTAIL BAR (EXTENSION)
TICKETS £5.00 PER PERSON

MONDAY 19 MARCH

ENTRY BY TICKET ONLY
Sabbaticals

Jason Phillips
Social Secretary 1990 - 91

Jason Phillips has been selected as the new Social Secretary. Already it is clear that the next sabbaticals will face many new problems. Jason understood the opinion that the most pressing of these will be those posed by the non-existence of a union building capable of holding large gatherings. But can anything be done about this abysmal situation?

The only answer: keep on hammering the insatiable bureaucracy of the University. The problem. of course, is there in the present system of union premises. The union’s control over the premises is effectively non-existent and it obviously will not be possible to do anything about the premises.

The conference-centre mentality is seemingly all pervasive, even in the arguments concerning the construction of the new Japanese College.

Alternative entertainment seems to figure high in Jason’s priorities. Not “Alternative” alternative but the more down-to-earth kind that people would like to enjoy. Big bands to Kent may be doomed to failure so Jason is keen to keep big bands playing in London.

Glasgow will hit the reefs in a big way next year. Polls conducted through RED will give you the chance to decide what sort of music is wanted by the students. And will be provided at UC’s and concerts arranged in London will get the Jason-Phillips treatment. Concerts to be joined by coaches will be set up for West End productions and venues on the circuit.

In the battle of ideas, politics is definitely an important part of unionism only when people participate. Jason will not let apathy rule at Kent next year and considers the occupation of the Registry to be a case in point. At the right time and in the right circumstances Kent Students need no prompting to act. It also underlines the necessity for a strong and influential Student’s Union to encourage and focus such action.

On the campaign: “Horrible, for some it is an ego trip but I HATE seeing my face plastered all over college walls.” Thank’s must go to Anita Grover, “Paul from Keynes,” Justin and Julia and many other people for their help.

Christiaan Hofman (Electoral Correspondent)

Thatcher’s Albatross

The British economy at present is in some difficulty. It has the largest debt to other countries in its history and prices that are increasing faster than our main competitors. Yet the government continues to go ahead with its economic policies.

The cause of this crisis, however, is more fundamental in its implications than it generally suggested. It is not simply that Nigel Lawson gave away too much money to the shareholders. The increase in prices, the increase in interest rates, the decrease in investment, the decrease in economic growth, all of these are symptoms of a deeper problem. What we are witnessing is the return of “stop-go,” a problem which has been the main concern for all governments since the early 60s.

The underlying cause of stop-go is the uncomfortable 10% of British producers. It was noticed in the early 60s that Britain’s economy didn’t grow as fast as its main competitors (about 7% a year) and that consequently it was slipping down the Geneva table of industrial nations. The solution for governments for the last thirty years has been how to overcome this problem.

The response of Labour and Conservative governments to this problem differed in the last thirty years. Labour governments believed in “managed capitalism.” Conservatives, on the other hand, believed in “free market capitalism.”

Before the state played a large role in the economy. The banks regulated the money supply and the government controlled the exchange rate. The state played a large role in the economy.

By contrast, the Tory solution was devised by the Heath government though it was not put into practice until the early 80s. This was to create a hard line economic market which would drive inefficient “lame duck” companies out of the market. The state would play a small role in the economy.

Industry would emerge “leaner and fitter.” In contrast to Labour’s strategy this was a “free market” solution. The theory was that a “cold war” would be waged between the firms and the state. The firms that survived were competitive. In its fully developed Thatcherite version, the motivation to overcome this hard line environment was to be supplied by the “enterprise culture.”

What actually happened was as follows. A tight money policy in the early 80s produced a deep recession from which the economy began to recover in early 82. Between then and 1986 the rate of growth averaged 2%. This was not spectacular but the recovery was tentative everywhere. British investors tended to invest abroad where the economies were stronger. The uncertain conditions and the lack of guarantees on consumer goods reduced longer-term investment.

Arguably, the government’s economic philosophy did not take account of the effect that weakening the economy and denying government support would have on the recovery itself. Britain’s industries were smaller and lacked the finance to expand and invest in new industries. As a consequence they could not expand sufficiently to meet demand when spending was increased. Other countries were growing more quickly, in the mid-80s half passed Britain in the league table of industrial nations. Manufacturing Industry, the single largest sector of the economy, didn’t recover to its previous levels of output until fairly recently and then from below.

It was the conventional wisdom of the mid-80s that the decline in manufacturing was not important because it was compensated by expansion elsewhere, particularly in financial services. This has proven mistaken. The growth in financial services was in part boosted by factors such as the location of the recession which caused funds to flow into the financial markets, the rise in house prices caused by the drift south, increased mergers and takeovers which attract speculative money and the general volatility of markets caused by extra money chasing high interest rates in order to compensate for the lack of growth in manufacturing. The consequence was that once the markets to finance the increase in manufacturing started to decline these markets would follow.

The consequences for the economy in South East Asia and parts of the Third World has only been partially successful. As the oil surplus has decreased and finance suffered, the decline in the world economy has taken hold. This is a structural problem not merely a question of money supply.

The chart shows the difference between the actual deficits and the deficits that are now finding out. This situation is likely to be worsened by the single market in 1992 it will increase competition further. Finally, total free market economics may well have been a blind alley.

Ray Kelly (6)
FILMS

FRIDAY
Gorillas in the Mist
Sigourney Weaver - Brian Brown - Isla Blair
John Oman - Miiko
Directed by Michael Apted
Ctd. • Shh. • 15 • 129 mins.
This is the true story of anthropologist Dian
Fossey who single-handedly focused world
attention on the plight of the endangered
mountain gorillas of Central Africa. Sigourney
Weaver powerfully plays the determined lady
devoting nearly twenty years to observing and
trying to protect the gorillas who live in a small
area in the Virunga mountain range, which
extends into Rwanda, where she established her
Karosoke Research Centre. Her dedication
gradually turns to obsession and the isolated
naturalist was transformed into a bitter warrior.
Ultimately paying the heaviest price for her
commitment and proving for all time that the
most dangerous and destructive animal on this
earth is man.

THE BLUES BROTHERS

ENTS ... ENTS ... ENTS!!

The wonders of college bureaucracy will never cease to amaze me!

Our third and final Euphoria which was booked for Eliot Dining Hall at the beginning of January
was double-booked with the Hellenic Society's cultural night. So we have moved it to Eliot
JCR (no other dining halls available!) on SATURDAY, 17TH MARCH - make sure you get
there early to get a ticket and don't miss the final rave this term.

Belated apologies go to all those students who felt ripped off/let down/pissed off by the
'misleading' advertising for Euphoria '05. Saturday night will be non-stop house with guest
DJs plus live sampling from a bright new 'house' hope 'Milestones'.

Finally, I hope that you've all enjoyed some of this term's entertainment and thanks especially
to my regular gig-goers [they know who they are!] for making it all worth while.
MEGA CITY 4

The Darwin Dining Village was barricaded by vancing squads as Bast took the stage at the final raid night - Wednesday, 26th February. They threw themselves about stage in a maddening frenzy as they began to build an imposing wall of noise. A driving bass and rhythm gave support to screeching guitars and a saxophone, while the combination of chart-of-makes vocals, the drums and the vocal feedback from the audience, echoed off the walls and created an incredible wave that they tried to control. It sounded like a monarch, incrustuous union between the B-52s and the Butthole Surfers. However, sadly enough, the audience was far from the Nuggets' and their own gigs. M.C.A. also had an LP out (which is worth the few quid you can pick up for DC Records, called "Transphobia").

The new wave's main proma post-punk rock and roll, tight, fast and with killer melodies you just had to admit it. Mega City loved what they were doing and they made it come through as clear as the screaming guitars. Even though there were a few technical hitches, they kept the music going and didn't slow down themselves. The crowd picked up their energy and the front of the stage was soon swimming in a sea of thrashing fans. It was definitely a fun night for everyone, even though there could have been quite a few complaints from onlookers, the cloud of mental apathy that reigns on this campus will soon lift and the scene will improve.

Cheers
Guy Smiley [D]

FROWN ON THE TOWN!

It is quite a miracle for me to admit that I really didn't enjoy a musical, but 'On The Town' at the Marlowe Theatre managed to perform that task last week. The original show played its very first performances in 1944 based on a book by Jerome Robbins, with a score composed by Leonard Bernstein. The music was performed by Betty Comden and Adolph Green. Indeed, it received some fine reviews at the time and the New York Times called it the 'freshest and most engaging musical to come this way since the golden day of Ophelia.' I had only seen the 1945 film in which a lot of the music differs, but I still had quite a few memories of what the musical would offer. Unfortunately, the Marlowe production, produced and co-directed by Malcolm Knight, failed to fulfill these expectations and produced a disappointing evening.

The story of 'On The Town' is a simple one. Three sailors (Steve Allot, Chip Joseph Matheson) and Gaby (Steve Grant - yes, him of Tight Fit fame) have 24 hours leave from the Navy and are able to spend it in New York. While they are there, they fall in love, respectively, Claire DeLorean (Zaal Burrow), Kitty (Rebecca Crow) and Ivy Smith (Meriel Bradley). There is no criticism here, musically are not always known for their complex story lines, and when involved in the spectater should have no problem in suspending belief as people consistently break into song and dance. But the way the twenty-four hours in New York was approached by those involved in the staging of this production, really did make it a day too long.

For what professional to be a professional production, much of the direction, scene setting and ordering of choreography only appeared amateurish. And that is not to criticise amateur musical productions to any extent, but this supposedly had the resources, talent and facilities of professionalism. Where was it?

The use of a backdrop and strobe lighting to cover scene changes were crude and amusing when they shouldn't have been. The musical number 'Get Yourself Carried Away' the ordering of song and dance balance, and the choreography seemed to want to use the 'Primitive Man' dance in the film which seemed unrelated and out of place. Much of the action jammed or exploded was difficult, especially when it was difficult to watch, as the character with many of the scenes with war scenes, especially the scene in which Ronggets hurt, are very rarely as we watch hands and legs getting blown up.

On his return home, Ron gets in a Bronx hospital and survives under horrifying conditions. He finds out that he is not going to die after all. He is also innocent. Going back to his family, he feels isolated from everyone. He also thinks that his wife for his country is not appropriate and he wants to get married. Ron does not listen to his wife and in the end he is set free but a fellow soldier is accidentally shot. Later on, he gets hurt and is paralysed. He is transferred to a war scenes, especially the scene in which Ronggets hurt, are very rarely as we watch hands and legs getting blown up.

Torch Song Trilogy, can be seen at the Gulbenkian Theatre next week, and tickets are available now.

A DANGEROUS CRUISE

BORN ON THE FOURTH OF JULY

This long awaited film that reveals at last the truth about Vietnam not only to the American public but to the world in general. After a lot of Rambo movies, our mind has been confused as far as Vietnam is concerned and we perhaps thought that the war in Vietnam consisted of a series of battles and not one of the nation's past. This film tells us the truth about Vietnam and the truth about war in general. What does film as a highly disturbing images in which one views deaths in all its phases and women get killed alongside with soldiers.

Tom Cruise in an almost certainly Oscar winning performance plays a Vietnam veteran, Ron Kovac. The story of Ron Kovac's experience in Vietnam is a true one and becomes the story of not only all Vietnam's veterans but all war veterans in general. We watch the life of Ron Kovac who was ironically born on the fourth of July, the day of the American independence.

At first, we see him as a child getting birthday presents on the day of the American independence. As he grows up, he gets uneasy about things. He falls in love with a girl but also wants to join the Marine forces and go to Vietnam in search of his friend who was missing. Ron's family is not happy about the possibility of getting killed in the war. Ron does not listen to his father and he goes to Vietnam. He is set free but a fellow soldier is accidentally shot. Later on, he gets hurt and is paralysed. He is transferred to a war scenes, especially the scene in which Ronggets hurt, are very rarely as we watch hands and legs getting blown up.

Wooden Furniture

Stroking the plywood-like complexion of Michelle Pedder's interior, through that evening. My fellow Clott, Trevor and I had gone to find some furniture, remembered to say towards the place like a thousand suns with their truly banal mediocrity. We were instantly dazzled by their drip presentation and the downright vacuum-like spaciousness of their music. Clearly, the result was the best of the best, and our patience ran out, and our patience thin. With our last Marboro locked between our fists, our eyes were to discover that the truth suddenly hit us like a bolt of lightning. Furniture were awful.

The music was like a grey day in Gloucester (i.e., lack lustre in the year of being alive). The only composition of note was the Stillburn 'Brilliant Light'. Our only salvation from its chipboard grave in a flow of indolence. As for the rest of the set, spending the evening with Sir Geoffrey Howe, a dead lame and a collection of works by Barrymore would have been more entertaining. As it was, we were all left stolid. We would strongly recommend that only the furniture about it is the stuff you buy from MFL.

The Clott Twins (E)
Rowing Club give Head

UKC Rowing Club

The Heads at Henley and Marlow having been postponed earlier in the term due to bad weather, both the two men's crews and the women's crew at long last set off for the Medway Head of the River.

Once there, the boats were assembled and the various adjustments made before a short warm up. The men's first crew (Rob Taylor, Dave Dejong, Paul Taylor, Jason Murray with Cathy Falkiner as cox) were off in the first division of the day. However, due to a last minute change in the order of the middle pair, they could only manage a frustrating time, although they could console themselves with the fact that they finished third out of fifteen at the Exeter University Head earlier this term.

In the second division of 40 boats the men's second crew (Steve Twadd, Dave Ziegler, Tom Kier, Rob Newman, with Karen Lawson as their vocal cox) and the women's crew (Cathy Falkiner, Pol Kellet, Lucy Amis, Janine Collins, with Sue May as cox) competed. The men's second crew surprised their own expectations by finishing second in their category on the 3500m course, being pipped to the post by just 2 seconds. The women's crew, despite catching an early crab, also finished a creditable second in their category with a gutsy row.

Considering that neither of these crews had rowed competitively this season due to the weather, it was an admirable showing, and special mention must go to Steve, Pol, Lucy, Dave, Karen, Cathy, Rob, Sue and Janine, who put in a lot of overtime the day before the Head loading up the trailer - an eight hour marathon due to a boat falling off the trailer and to the minibus and trailer getting stuck under a bridge. They all showed resilience in the face of extreme embarrassment.

Rob Newman (K)

Not just a Beach Game!

Volleyball

Forget football, forget hockey, forget rugby, UKC has a new sporting force! Having so far swept all before them in the local league and winning a tournament held at Brunel University, the Ladies Volleyball team destroyed the opposition to win the U.A.U. Volleyball Championship at Bangor.

After making an early start to the day, in order to arrive in Bangor in time to play at 6 o'clock, UKC found that their opponents, Birmingham, had not yet arrived. However, following the subsequent 2-hour delay, after waiting for Birmingham to arrive, UKC proceeded to overcome the Birmingham team 2 sets to 0 (15-10, 15-8), thus setting the tone for the weekend.

UKC's first opponents on Saturday were Loughborough (rumoured to have a National League Division 1 player), followed later in the day by Exeter; both followed the same path as Birmingham (15-13, 15-9 and 15-13, 15-5 respectively).

After the Exeter game, however, the organisers of the tournament decreed that UKC should play their semi-final against UEA immediately (the only team to have won a match against UKC this year) only giving them 15 minutes rest after strenuous complaints by the UKC coach, Colin Willcock. Despite this handicap though, UKC were in good form and defeated UEA in straight sets (15-9, 15-7).

The final against Manchester, was scheduled for 12 o'clock on Sunday, but true to form did not get under way until 2. This delay did not seem to matter though as UKC stormed through the first set to win it 15-5, but Manchester (despite the absence of their National League player) fought back to win the next 2 sets; 15-13, 15-7.

At this point it looked as though UKC would end as runners-up, but due to superb support from the bench and 'Southampton's Men's Squad' plus UKC supporter Dave Shires, UKC showed great resolve and determination to win the next set 15-9 and so level the set score at 2-2.

Under immense pressure, but with 'loud' support (thanks Southampton!), UKC edged ahead in the final set. Playing presently and with a good solid team effort UKC took the final set 15-11 and with it the Championship Trophy, proudly collected by Captain Jane Lawrence.

Therefore it is congratulations to: Jane Lawrence (C), Stefania Albionetti, Barbara Capellmann, Arshia Faridani, Hanna Hekkala, Branka Krenel, Melike Kuhnert, Helga Michaela, Francois Riera, Edith Sandrin and Colin Willcock (coach).

Alan Russell (R) Volleyball Secretary

REPORT ON ENVIRONMENTAL DESTRUCTION

THE FATE OF THE NORTHERN SEA

The recent North Sea Ministers conference in the Hague has now ended with some degree of optimism, but then the last two times it met also similar conditions.

In 1984 the conference agreed to 'work towards an end of dumping of polluted materials in the North Sea.' Again in 1987 an agreement was signed to 'phase out the dumping of industrial wastes by 31st December 1989, with the exception that inert materials which cause no harm to the marine environment could be dumped.' So what is the result of these two statements?

Every European country stopped dumping last year. Every country except the United Kingdom.

In the UK instead of stopping all dumping, of even lowering the amounts of polluted matter that enter the North Sea, we just chose to dilute it. The Government did indeed restrict the amounts of dumping which could take place by British industries, but these have been regularly and openly broken with only a few prosecutions. Five European neighbours have made objections about the UK Government and its policy on sea dumping, but these have been ignored.

On the European Market 100,000 chemicals are registered, and of these just 22 are on the Government's 'Red List' - these are substances which Government inspectors have agreed are dangerous to water and where emission should be controlled. Other countries have higher standards, the EEC blacklist contains 129 chemicals which give cause for concern.

Seawage sludge is the result of treating raw sewage which contains many of the industries waste chemicals. The UK produces 30 million tonnes of seawage each year. Of this 50% is recycled for use as fertilizer and 20% disposed of on land, but that leaves 30% being dumped at sea from 14 different sites. While other EEC neighbours have all completely stopped their dumping on seawage sludge at sea, the British Government is seen to justify the action and allow such toxins as mercury, lead and cadmium to pollute the marine environment.

Toxic waste is still being dumped at sea, just off the North Yorkshire coast. Such practices were only stopped by Germany last year after continuous campaigning. The overall result of such pollution is cancer in fish and the possible link in the food chain to man. Large areas of sea have become dead due to lack of oxygen caused by algal blooms.

Nobody seems to know what chemicals are being dumped in the North Sea. Nor do we know exactly what the combined effects they are having. Instead of prohibiting any dumping at sea the UK Government are content to just monitor the situation, by which time it might be too late.

The achievable aim must be to stop all discharges to sea by the year 2000, but this objective requires action now. The next North Sea Ministers' conference is in 1995. The only way it will be able to state that no dumping takes place in the North Sea is if you continually campaign and highlight the need for action. Don't let the North Sea die.

David Carr (D)