

This was raised in the meeting, but I have kept it in a separate document to the minutes as the minutes go up on the AF discord and I those present did not think that this is the kind of thing that should automatically be shared on the discord. ● passed on this message:

“Rev was a long-time member of South Wales Anarchists, and a founder of Swansea Anarchists. He attracted controversy in Swansea Anarchists by posting MRA propaganda on the Facebook page, arguing with Black people that he should be able to say the n-slur, and pushing for the group to work with the BNP.

Sometime between 2015-2018, someone in South Wales Anarchists informed the group that Rev had sexually assaulted her. An accountability process took place, but Rev and his mates hijacked it and made it into a 'Where's-the-evidence' ordeal.

A later accountability process took place in the IWW, but it was poorly organised and never really did anything (he was made aware he was not welcome over this, accountability process failed but then a member made it clear they'd beat him up if he came back so he didn't).”

At the meeting I said I would check with others in the wider Fed what had happened with this, as I was aware of a process with Rev in the past, but not the details. I asked K from Bristol about it (I did not share the above message with them), and they gave me a fairly comprehensive answer:

“Someone from south wales spoke to me (and i think other afed members in the South West), I corrected them on one point (they told me rev had been kicked out the IWW), and answered a question they had, but wasn't the time or place to continue a discussion at that point. It did indeed seem like the stuff from a number of years ago. Back then it was investigated by IWW for a approximately a year after which they said there was no case to answer and reinstated Rev's suspended membership. He did quit due to ongoing hostility from those who raised the complaint in IWW.

In AFed we initially decided there was no benefit to conducting our own investigation before the IWW concluded theres. However since it took a long time we did confuct our own. I can sum up the result (from memory so may not be 100% spot on(. the IWW one reached similar conclusions.

Everything traced back to a number of things:

The first was people who had spoken to and been around a specific partner/ex partner of his (person1) they said he was abusive towards. However person1 was adamant (and has been for the five years since), that he was not abusive, and hates that their past is being used to accuse Rev of abuse.

The second was an ex partner of Revs (person2). Rev says that he is a survivor of abuse of multiple types at the hands of person2, and regrets being quiet about that in the aftermath. Person2 said that they hated Rev but didn't want any process or other formal consequences persued.

The third was the result of, as far as we could ever ascertain, rumours that were the result of references to the above two being spread from person to person (and changing or growing with multiple retellings), or spread maliciously. Either way they never traced back to anyone who could say they were directly affected or were in contact with someone directly affected (just they'd heard from someone, who heard from someone who... etc). Other things seemed to be invented almost whole cloth, eg a couple of people told us Rev was transphobic, but not anything transphobic he had said or done.

The fourth, was people who knew person1 and person2, and had heard the rumours above, and

decided that this meant Rev needed to be ostracised. I assume the majority (if not all of them) are acting in good faith, especially as person2 is certainly not at any pains to stamp out rumours. They were the group within IWW that raised the complaint, and have continued to tell people within South Wales that Rev must be excluded, and it appears 'by force if necessary'.

If there are accusations that are unconnected to the above (eg they have happened since 2018), or are connected but considered new due to someone wishing to come forward, then someone should tell any member of AFed they want to initiate a complaint against Rev due to his behaviour towards them, behaviour they witnessed, or behaviour towards someone they are acting under the direction of.

At that point a facilitator (ideally facilitatorS) for the process should be decided on. Ideally these should be people relatively unconnected to either party, yet people that neither party has a reason to distrust, any survivor especially should be ok with those chosen. The facilitators would then speak to both parties (including the perpetrator, though of course the name of the survivor/person raising the complaint can be kept confidential from them) before deciding upon which process to undertake and how much to involve other members of the fed.

In the case of Rev, I would be concerned about any process being used to re-traumatise him as the survivor of an abusive relationship. However being a survivor doesn't exclude one from also being a perpetrator of abusive behaviour or otherwise a risk to people's safety, so it certainly wouldn't prevent a complaint being progressed against him. We can't assume that any complaint has no-merit just because at least one previous complaint did (ie the one where the supposed survivor said they were definitely not abused). Also if this is the case an actual process is perhaps less damning than people spreading accusations person-to-person (which is how rumours start).

The details are in our handbook, it can (and usually will) be adapted, but the key principles and rough framework should be stuck to.

<http://afed.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/MEMBERS-HANDBOOK-web-version-2a.pdf>

K also added this when I asked if it was OK to share the above with the London group, which I have included as K has probably put their position across better than I could paraphrase:

“yeah ok, but I want to make it /very/ clear i'm not saying Rev is beyond reproach, and i'm not saying there is nothing to any allegations. Just that it is important to be aware. Also, assuming it's the same person (likely as the met some london afed/lafa folks the same day i met them), they seem very genuine to me and I'm not attempting to suggest they are being deceitful or malicious as that seems unlikely.

I would certainly consider myself too close a friend/comrade of Rev's now (in a way I wasn't in 2017 when the last investigation took place, tho to be clear I was not involved in that with either the IWW or the more ad-hoc AFed one) to facilitate stuff directly, although if we wanted a 'mixed group' I could lend a hand.”