Who we are

The Wealth Press is a collaborative attempt to view the world through the lens of inequality and to see what we find. It has been created and edited by an open group of individuals with a concern for inequality and a need to voice those concerns.

What we do

We put those at the margins on the centre page.

We discover and share the voices muted by society.

We work horizontally and respectfully towards one another at all times.

What we stand for

We believe ideas should be shared, not owned.

We believe in equalising voices.

In empowering people to tell their own stories, we redefine the parameters of journalism.

We believe in investigation, in curiosity, and in questioning the status quo.

Get involved!

With the Wealth Press…

Anyone can get involved with the Wealth Press; whether that is as a writer, a designer, a web editor, a photographer, a sub-editor or simply as someone with an idea or a story that they want to be told. We actively encourage views from all sectors of society and believe good journalism must fundamentally be about presenting those views.

Come along to our meetings every second Saturday, or simply join us on Facebook on our Wealth Press page.

For more information email Aidan at aidanmmharper@gmail.com
With Wealth Equality...

Come join us at our mother organization: Wealth Equality. We give voices to those silenced by our current economic and political system. Not tied by national, cultural or linguistic boundaries, creating a model towards a better future for humanity, recognising the needs of every adult and child and enabling all to fulfil their true potential and feel valued within the world.

We aim to not only reimagine a world based on the equal distribution of wealth but to create practical steps towards making that ideal a reality. We do this through a wide variety of projects, campaigns and events based around the wants and needs of our local community.

Find us on

- www.wealthequality.org
- Facebook:
  - Wealth Equality
  - The Wealth Press
- Twitter: @Wealth_Equality

Upcoming Events

- 3rd March: documentary film screening They Will Have To Kill Us First: Islamic extremists have banned music in Mali, but its world famous musicians won’t give up without a fight. They Will Have To Kill Us First tells the story of Mali’s musicians, as they fight for their right to sing.
  - Deptford Cinema
- Wealth Equality general meetings (twice a month) – everyone welcome! Check Facebook page for more details
- Wealth Press meetings (twice a month) – check Facebook page for more details

Editors

Aidan Harper
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Jonathon Nomamiukor
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Wealth is the Economy

Gary Stevenson

60 years ago, you could buy a decent family house close to central London for just over twice the average salary: The equivalent of £60,000 in today’s money. Today that house would cost over £1,000,000. That’s one million pounds. That’s real. And no-one knows why.

In 2008, immediately after the onset of the global crisis, central banks all over the world (USA, Europe, UK, Switzerland, Canada, all Scandinavian countries and many more) cut interest rates to 0%. At the time, they, the governments, and traders and economists at investment banks predicted rates would stay at 0% for about 12-18 months. All of these groups predicted interest rate hikes in 2009, in 2010, in 2011, in 2012, in 2013, and in 2014. They are now predicting hikes in late 2015. They have been consistently wrong for over 6 years, and still have not changed their predictions, and no-one knows why.

Something is terribly, terribly wrong with Economics. Modern economists, as measured by financial markets, have incorrectly predicted recovery for six consecutive years in a row. They still predict an imminent recovery. Imagine if every single time you checked the weather forecast, for 6 years, they predicted that tomorrow’s weather in London would be sunny and 39°C. Would you believe them? Would they change their forecasts? When the forecasters are wrong, we all become forecasters. The universities are offering no solutions. We need to show what is the problem ourselves.

In 2010 I was an interest-rate trader in the financial markets. I needed to know why the predictions of mainstream economics were always wrong. Theory predicted that recessions were temporary, that living conditions and wages get better over time, and that, if we increase the money supply aggressively, relatively soon we should see a recovery. And yet none of these things happened. Houses, wages, and living conditions have been falling, and continue to fall, on a long term basis. Housing affordability has collapsed over a period of 60 years. Despite endless rate cutting and Quantitative Easing, there seemed to be no easing of the crisis for ordinary people.

Why? Mainstream Economists don’t know why. But we know why.

Economists (almost) all agree now that this ongoing economic contraction is caused by people not spending enough money. But they don’t know what caused this to happen. We know why.
Some economists think that people stopped spending because they lacked confidence. But we know that isn’t the truth. Some Economists think that people stopped spending because they can’t get access to credit. But we know that isn’t the truth. Any of us who have lived as ordinary people, amongst ordinary people (which unfortunately does not describe most professional economists) knows exactly why people aren’t spending any money. The reason we stopped spending money is simple: We just don’t have any money left. We’ve got no money, and we’ve got no more assets to sell. It’s no more complicated than that.

60, 50, 40, 30, 20, even 10 years ago, wealth was more evenly distributed throughout society. Governments had wealth, and people had wealth. All over the country, people had assets, by owning houses without enormous mortgages, by having pensions and savings and maybe even owning some land. Governments owned huge amounts of assets, public buildings and facilities that have slowly been sold off via privatisation over time. Because people and governments had assets, it meant that we were financially secure. That meant that we could spend the money that we earned in confidence. That in turn meant that, wherever there were people, there was spending. And that meant that, wherever there were people, there were jobs.

Our positions are no longer secure. Some families do still own property, but only secured by enormous mortgages. The assets that the government held for us have mostly gone into private hands, and what is left is secured only by enormous debts to the same wealthy individuals who took control of the rest of the wealth. Governments and individuals are in the same situation now. None of us are financially secure. That means we need all the money we can get, just to take care of our basic needs, which means we don’t spend money, which means we don’t have jobs.

But all that Wealth that used to be held throughout our society still exists, and more. Just that now it is held by an international, super wealthy elite.

This is the most important paragraph you will ever read. Ordinary people spend their money on goods and services. That creates jobs. The super rich spend their money on buying houses and land. That pushes house prices up. The more wealth that is held by ordinary people, the higher wages will be. The more wealth that is held by the super wealthy, the higher house prices will be.

There is only one way to raise wages and make housing affordable: We must reduce wealth inequality.
The Second Temple
Can Theatre Return to the Equality of Shakespeare's Day?

John Demerry Green

In 2013 the BBC's "Great British Class Survey" sought to find out whether social stratification exists in today's Britain to the extent that it did in the Victorian and other periods. The results were stark, and in addition to identifying a fractured middle class, the survey contained some fascinating insights into British people's participation (or lack of it) in the Arts and Humanities.

To analyze the study's results, the authors identified three indexes of class difference: 'economic,' 'social,' and 'cultural' capital. The last of these measures cultural interest and engagement on the part of each class. The authors demarcated cultural capital into two arbitrary but intriguing categories: 'emerging' culture and 'highbrow' culture. The first of the two was soberly determined to consist of activities like video games, social networking, sports, working out at gyms, attending rap and rock concerts, and that well-worn chestnut of the online dating profile, "hanging out with friends." The second, alarmingly, contained practically every leisure and professional pastime this writer holds dear, namely: classical music, historic architecture, museums, art galleries, jazz, French restaurants, and, of course, theatre.

Of the seven new British 'classes' identified in the study, only the two wealthiest, the 'Elite' and the 'Established middle class' scored anything like a thorough engagement with the highfalutin interests of the highbrow category. As those two classes make up only about 31% of the British public, this presents a troubling picture to those of us who advocate for more democratization in the Arts.

Why the pompous invocation of Shakespeare's era? As many readers may be aware, the Early Modern English attitude toward theatre was markedly different from ours today. Instead of perceiving theatre attendance as a mark of culture and refinement, whole classes of prosperous Londoners rejected it as the nadir of lewdness and frivolity. The burgeoning Puritan bourgeoisie, who would soon shake the English monarchy to its foundations, saw the great London playhouses as nothing but dens of vice, disease, and social agitation. Despite Early Modern theatre's rejection by its own 'established middle class,' however, it thrived on the patronage of elite aristocrats, and the mass attendance of the lower orders.

According to most sources, a standing ticket to a major playhouse cost one penny. This was a third to a quarter of a day's wages for an unskilled labourer, or half the cost of a loaf of bread. For his penny the
labourer or apprentice could see the absolute best theatre on offer. From the late 1580s until 1648, stage plays were a popular art form of intricate storytelling, poetic power, and thematic sophistication. It was not only Shakespeare, after all, that made the era's drama unparalleled in almost any age – dramatists such as Kyd, Marlowe, Jonson, Middleton, Webster, and Ford all created masterpieces which were just as popular as the Bard's, and applauded by Marquess and orange-maid alike.

The affordability of admission is not the only evidence we have of Early Modern theatre's broad-based appeal. Many of the most successful plays were printed in small 'quarto' editions for the individual reader, becoming a staple of booksellers' stalls in St Paul's churchyard and elsewhere. It is from these editions that many works have survived which would otherwise be lost forever. The widespread availability of both performance and play-texts, along with contemporary witness accounts, all point to a singularly well-served theatre public – a public for whom neither lack of education nor even illiteracy were barriers to enjoying great comedies, histories, and tragedies.

The 'English Renaissance' theatre unfortunately has a very definite bookend in the year 1648. In this year the victorious Parliamentarians led by Oliver Cromwell permanently closed London's playhouses. Ostensibly to prevent the spread of plague or seditious assemblies, the move was then and now seen as the ideological triumph of Puritan anti-theatricalism. Professional theatre would not operate in England for twelve long years. When it finally did return, moreover, it was in many ways unrecognizable.

On his restoration to the British throne in 1660, Charles II granted a theatrical monopoly to just two professional companies. Play production was henceforth legally restricted to these two royally-sanctioned, 'legitimate' theatres, and prohibited anywhere else. By thus subordinating theatre activity to the royal prerogative, Charles was consciously re-casting the English theatre in the mould of Bourbon France and the Absolutist rule of Louis XIV, which had a similar system in place. Not every change wrought by this emulation of France was detrimental to equality. It was in this period, in fact, that women were first allowed on the English stage to earn their living as actresses. The Restoration and early Georgian eras also witnessed the first prominent women playwrights, such as Aphra Behn, Mary Pix, and Susannah Centlivre, whose primarily comic works expertly depicted the social milieu and politics of their time.

Despite the significance of female participation, however, the general trajectory of British theatre from this point forward was one of increased ostentation, elitism, and exclusion. Differences in theatre architecture,
stage design, and play content all contributed to this, along with the ever-present realities of corruption and political patronage intrinsic to a royal monopoly system. An artistic rupture resulting from these changes was apparent even to writers of the time. Comparing Restoration drama to what had come before it, Robert Dryden wrote “Our builders were with want of genius curst;/ The second temple was not like the first.”

The legacy of this system, that of two ‘legitimate’ theatre companies officially favoured over all others, endured into the mid-nineteenth century. And it’s from this model, unfortunately, and not Shakespeare’s, that professional theatre in the English-speaking world descends. Today the ill consequences of this heritage abound. The alienation of theatre from ordinary people’s lives, the sequestration of it in an haute-bourgeois bubble, the general lack of appreciation for our literary forbears (whether Shakespeare, his contemporaries, or those that followed them) – all these and more can be traced to the cancer of cultural elitism.

What remedy for all this? Recent examples of good-faith public investment in theatre and the arts are hard to call to mind. Hard, that is, if we restrict our thinking to ‘developed’ Western countries. We might find better, more relevant models in the leftist revolutionary democracies of Latin America. Bolivarian Venezuela, for one, has seen enormous benefits from its ‘el sistema’ programs which bring classical music – instruments, lessons, and ensembles – to young people in disadvantaged communities all over the country. These social programs, founded at first to provide the young with a refuge from criminal and gang activity, have blossomed into an inspiring success story, sending orchestras of talented young musicians on international tours and to prestigious competitions around the world. If ensemble music, why not ensemble theatre?

For naysayers and cold-water-throwers who despise the ‘unproductive’ use of public funds on the arts, we must point them to novelist Margaret Atwood’s 2008 comments in response to Canadian arts funding cuts. In one of her most cogent points, Atwood cited figures that in 2007 the culture sector generated $46 billion, or 3.8% of Canada’s GDP. Not only that, it employed 600,000 people, “roughly the same as agriculture, forestry, fishing, mining, oil & gas and utilities combined.”

As a heritage and tourism paradise attracting over 30 million people annually, this author is willing to bet the UK is even more heavily weighted toward the creative industries. Only good can come of developing a new, inclusive and well-funded approach to theatre.
The Enemy Within: Home and Politics

Subashini Nathan

Home is a primordial notion, found across all human civilisations throughout the world. It defines how people develop themselves and interact with others in society; it is a symbol of one’s existence, safety, autonomy and preservation. The home is at stake within every crisis, as it represents the individual and society within a historic narrative. Capitalism has transformed Home, separating it from its potential political force. The root of crisis today is the lack of cohesion between individual identity and fulfillment due to the Capitalist treatment of home.

The neo-liberal capitalist view of the home has established the home as a status, a symbol of class, a building with market value, that needs to be bought, sold, rented; forgetting the importance of family, personal development and memories that ought to be traced within the walls of the building. Home in its treatment by the state establishes a public/private divide that favours stripping the dignity of an individual and her rights on the basis of state-sanctioned greed. Home is limited to the living space and value of land, or a house or an apartment, which acts as a symbol and site of wealth. The emphasis on the location emulates the neo-liberal capitalist definition of home, functioning as investment and capital, creating and perpetuating a market of its own. The housing market is given the responsibility under the capitalist society to allocate to individuals who can afford it, a piece of land or into a building, where they may find or create a home. In creating ‘property values’ the housing market divides people into socio-economic classes by location, where the value of land in one area becomes higher than another, the value depending on the surrounding occupants.

A bourgeois sense of the individual dominates the idea of home, concerning itself for a rich personal life and acquisition of personal gain at the expense of social values. The role of the homemaker is ultimately reduced to a person who works to ensure she has a place to sleep for the night, instead of a site in which networks of meaningful social relationships can be formed. The purpose of Home has become a place of consumption, where leisure activities and escape from public life takes place. Home in a modern capitalist society functions as a major source of the individual’s wealth, marking their social status. The bourgeois norm, guided by liberal philosophy, conceptualises the home as a politically neutral space, absent of government, where “a man’s home is his castle”. Home is a symbol of privilege under capitalist societies, establishing the individual within a social hierarchy and
accepting the deprivation for impoverished families the space they need to live.

The central theme of liberal ideology is a commitment to the individual and the desire to construct a society in which individuals can satisfy their interests and achieve fulfillment. A commitment to the individual is focused on foundational equality, to share the same civil and political rights as all other individuals within society and provide an equality of opportunity. This belief in equality highlights an inherent contradiction found in liberalism, where equality is desirable only to the extent that it excludes social or economic equality. Liberalism sustains the inequalities inherited from the feudal system and class structures, which prevents the nation from finding its own identity. The neo-liberal capitalist system does not force society to direct wealth and housing disproportionately towards reaching the goal of equality, more crucially, it does not force a redistribution of land. This preserves ancient power structures that allows a third of the land in the UK to belong to members of the aristocracy. Land is a fundamental human right as it brings bread, and above all, dignity. Land is an important site within the establishment of a home; it is a space where one is allowed to exist, and anchor his identity. It is currently estimated that at least thirteen million people in the UK live in inadequate, cramped conditions, rife with crime, unable to claim a dignified standard of living due to the lack of purchasing power required to own a Home.

Mass construction of poor quality housing, evictions of entire societies, gentrification and the greed for land driven by neo-liberal policies causes a rupture in history, requiring a person to exist without the support of artefacts, rituals and practices found within family. Collective preservation relies on recurrence, a repetition of oral history and traditions to keep preserving meaning, to give context to the life of the person within a social environment. The socio-political attack against the Irish community, the Black community, the working class and now the Muslim community seems almost purposive. The ability of these communities to collectively preserve history and provide meaning to a person’s life has been driven out by neo-liberal policies, which fails to realise the importance of Home - something that every person, regardless of their wealth or income should have access to. It is no coincidence that British politics focuses on targeting communities who maintain and protect their strong sense of solidarity, identity and political will through the Home.

Home ought to be, and originally was the site of resistance, a space of liberation for families in the middle of oppression and domination. The capitalist regime values the home - it is no accident that the law systemically attacks and destroys efforts of people and communities to construct home-place. Politically neutralising the home reduces the important potential contribution the domestic world has towards
stabilising problems within society. This neo-liberal system has nurtured an environment rooted in self-dissatisfaction and disillusionment, which only the space of a Home can adequately address.

The working class identity, which had provided a voice for the proletariat in politics, thrived in an era where Home and the community were recognised as political space. For less than a century, society has worked towards a culture of nurturing working class consciousness and freedom. This was cut short under Thatcher, and administrations since have done little to change it. The family unit, after being de-politicised has become the site of violence, driven by people who have inherited an identity of rage and dissociation borne from generations of oppression.

Within certain communities the Home has become a site of violence and abuse; on average every week, two women die from domestic violence in the UK. There is an absence of real social intervention or discussion of moral or ethical issues to effectively politicise the home and protect women from abuse. The outcome of disempowerment has been a vicious cycle for families, where children are trapped into inheriting inter-generational psychological trauma, masked by violence. There is an urgent need for home to be rediscovered and for the political-juridical order to reflect the ordinary.

The proverb “I am who I am because of other people”, is an idea central to the harmony between individuals living within tribal groups, villages and communities. Homemaking consists in preservation to anchor the shifting identity of the individual and group, the creative and moral task of reconstructing the past and present. If the main dimension for understanding Home is time and history, the family collect events and relationships onto the organic narrative of collective identity, preserving their history. The crisis today, the sense of dissatisfaction, and disempowerment has been through the eradication of the Home and the loss of its political power, caused by the enemy within.
Lessons From the Past: How Economic Myths From the 70s Are Used to Justify Austerity

Aidan Harper

"History repeats ... first as tragedy, then as farce" – Karl Marx

When we are told we are going to suffer, we justifiably ask for an explanation. If we have an operation, it tends to be because there is an illness that requires an intrusive medical procedure to cure a particular ailment. Similarly, if we are told that the economy is in need of fixing and thus requires a painful procedure to cure it, we are justified in demanding a valid explanation for the ensuing hardship that will inevitably occur.

In the last 50 years there have been two periods of severe economic restructuring that have had inflicted devastating and lasting damage on Britain’s communities. These periods are Thatcher’s years as prime minister from 1975-90 and the post-2008 crash austerity measures by the Lib-Con Coalition and now the Conservative government. This economic restructuring consisted of free trade, open markets, privatisation, deregulation and reducing the size of the public sector. These resulted in massive unemployment – from an already high 5.3% in 1979, to a catastrophic 11.9% in 1984. Although this then fell to 6.9% in 1990, it is somewhat covered by the massive rise in those people classed permanently sick – between 1981 and 1991, those considered permanently sick had risen from 772,000 to 1.7 million. Poverty and inequality also increased, with 13.4% of the population living under 60% of median incomes in 1979, increasing to 22.2% (or 12.2 million people) in 1990.

What then was the justification for the decades of harm inflicted upon society? Thatcher’s mantra was that ‘there is no alternative’ to economic liberalism – the idea that free markets, free trade, and capitalist globalisation are the only way for modern societies to develop. This ideology formed the intellectual basis for the brutal public spending cuts, the selling off of public assets, and the crack down on union power which characterised Thatcher’s premiership. This language of common sense politics has repeated itself word for word thirty years later, with Cameron stating that ‘there is no alternative’ to the austerity policies his government has inflicted on Britain since 2010. In both instances there has been a narrative characterised by ‘economic realism’, which has been espoused by a right wing establishment composed of politicians, think tanks, and the media. This economic realism forms the framework of a narrative in which the only choice the country could make that wouldn’t lead to the absolute destruction of the economy would be cuts to public services. This form
of rationalisation has been explicitly asserted by Chancellor George Osborne who has stated that the ‘alternative to cuts is economic ruin’.

What are the justifications for austerity?

The mythology that surrounded Thatcher fused itself to a particular political narrative that has dominated British politics over the last forty years. She has been credited as the woman who ‘saved our country’ from the jaws of economic collapse. The story goes that Britain was the ‘Sick Man of Europe’, who needed drastic economic reforms in order to cope with the fact that inflation was out of control; the unions had a stranglehold on the country; our inefficient nationalised industries were a shambles; and that the post-war mixed economy model had failed.

If we take a closer look, we see that this particular image of Britain in the late seventies was an illusion that helped establish a basis from which both Thatcher and Cameron could legitimise their brutal spending cuts. Firstly, whilst it is true that in 1975 inflation hit 27 per cent, this was mainly because of the Yom Kippur War oil price shock, which saw oil prices quadruple, and not a sign that the mixed economy model was failing. Secondly, North Sea Oil had begun bringing in huge amounts of revenue – so much so that energy secretary Tony Benn had set up the state-owned British National Oil Corporation (which, interestingly, can be compared to Norway’s own incredibly successful state-owned company Statoil). This revenue contributed to an economy that was improving at an impressive speed, with Britain recording a massive trade surplus of £246m in December 1978. Furthermore, living standards were also improving and life was often pleasant – as historian Dominic Sandbrook has noted, so much so that a study by the New Economics Foundation has deemed 1976 to be the ‘happiest year’ from 1945 to date. We see now that Britain was a country which with improving living standards, time for leisure and a population which hasn’t been happier since; it was thus not in need of the brutal economic restructuring that Thatcher inflicted upon it.

Compare this again to the myths surrounding austerity. Much like the oil-shock induced inflation crisis created the necessary political conditions which Thatcher capitalised on, Cameron and Osborne have similarly exploited a moment of extreme crisis in order to inflict their own brutal political agenda. To make things clear – the global recession that started in 2007/2008 was not caused by excessive government debt; it was caused by a sub-prime mortgage crisis in the US in which thousands of individuals found they could not pay back their bank loans (which were given out irresponsibly by predatory lenders hoping to make a quick buck). This ‘toxic debt’ caused a crisis of confidence in the global market as banks found they were holding on to debts that could not be repaid. As the markets crashed and banks realised they
had billions of pounds of worthless assets, the entire financial system verged on collapse. It was therefore the risky behavior of banks, and not of governments, which caused the global recession. Rather than letting the entire system collapse, the British government (amongst others) decided to ‘bail out’ their banks. In the UK, this cost an estimated £124billion.

So why then is the government cutting public services if the root cause of the crisis had absolutely nothing to do with the recession? Why is there a focus on benefit fraud and ‘scroungers’ despite the fact that benefit fraud only 0.7%, or £1.2billion worth of benefits was fraudulently claimed in 2011-12 (compared to £70billion lost through illegal tax evasion in the same year)? Why are we told the austerity measures are working and our economy is recovering when we are suffering from the biggest fall in standards since the Victorian era? And why are migrants coming to the UK blamed for every ill in society when they contribute a net £20billion to the UK via tax a year? Nothing, it seems, adds up: we are presented with a version of reality that is an illusion.

The answer is as clear now as it was 40 years ago. The crisis we face now is not an economic one but a political one. If we look at the years leading up to Thatcher and the early years she remained in charge we see some spectacular similarities to what is happening today: an distant crisis precipitates an economic crash; a right wing party supported by a right wing press offers a way out; excessive state expenditure is blamed for the fragile state of the economy; brutal austerity measures are implemented which harm both the economy and the communities which depend on the government; and finally, public anger is diverted to convenient scape goats in the forms of migrants, benefits claimants, trade unionists and public servants.
A Model Image: Some questions about the subjects of our journalism

Reflections on local tourism, amateur journalism and interacting respectfully.

Hannah Emery-Wright

I recently went on an exotic island holiday. There were palm trees, white sandy beaches, ridiculously aquamarine water. The lot.

Zanzibar is big on tourism in the traditional sense; lots of food, lots of tacky gift shops, dolphins. It is also quite good at ecotourism; giving tourists an educational opportunity to visit local communities and see how they live sustainably within their environment.

Some would say this is a chance for western tourists to go gawk at the local way of life (aka slum tourism). Slum tourism is a (somewhat controversial) type of tourism which involves visiting impoverished areas.

I justified it to myself by wanting to get in touch with the local culture and like any good tourist, I was constantly snapping.

The following discussion is prompted by the contents of one of the photos I took as a tourist.

- I question why an amateur photographer might be drawn to certain subject matter e.g. things which are different to their own experience.

- I mention the implications this has for the bigger picture of wealth equality and,

- The implications this has for this journal and how we can minimise the negative connotations of photographing our subjects.

Before starting here is a brief explanation of how I am using the word “exotic”:

Exoticism as a discipline has its roots in European colonialism, it basically means the “charm of the unfamiliar”. It makes the unknown culture an “other” by judging it by through the lens (no pun intended) of one’s own culture, e.g. European. It is also linked to ethnocentricity. All fancy words for racism.

Issue 1: Taking pictures of exotic foreigners

Questions raised:
Do such pictures come from or add to “poverty porn”; wanting to take pictures of poverty stricken yet exotic faraway people?

Poverty porn is any type of media which exploits the condition of the poor in order to promote donations or coverage. In some ways taking photos of people that live differently from us, for the sole purpose of artistic creativity is self-serving as it takes but gives nothing back. Perhaps a way to test this is by asking:

Would I take pictures of kids on a local estate?

Definitely not. For one I would probably get screamed at by my neighbours for being creepy and inappropriate. Also, perhaps I just don’t find the kids here that interesting. Or at least when we perceive a situation or subject to be normal and familiar we are less attuned to appreciating its value. This leads on to:

Issue 2: Being more interested in development elsewhere

Similarly to it being often more interesting to take photos of things which are not every day to you, we can become so wrapped up in reducing negative impacts of wealth equality elsewhere that we neglect our local community.

Wealth Press stands for equal rights and voices for people locally and globally. But this means caring about those faraway people not because they’re exotic, but because they are people. It means the kids I can hear playing outside are equally as important, deserving and interesting as a child in Zanzibar. It means not being so wrapped up elsewhere that we cease to care about our community. So what can we do...?

Issue 3: Take an active interest rather than being invasive

Should I be taking pictures of someone else’s child in their own home?

As we launch the first edition of this journal it is worth questioning our modes of journalism. Learning to be respectful of those we are trying to help and meeting each other on the same level as human beings rather than focusing on potential differences.
**Does this mean I should only take photos locally?**

I am more comfortable taking pictures in environments I don’t know than I would be standing on Homerton High Street. I think this is something that needs remedying. Given the right context taking more photos locally rather than just on holiday is a potential way to break down our own fears of engaging in our communities. E.g. take an interest, see the local stories, value them as equally as those that appear initially more “exotic”.

However, I did ask the mother if I could take the picture and she gave permission. One good thing about eco-tourism is that photos are allowed in a controlled way with consent.

**Concluding tips:**

As journalists writing about potentially sensitive issues I think it is important to:

- Respect consent
- Not question our motives so much that it prevents us from interaction
- Take an active interest in all stories and practice seeing them everywhere