

OUSU

council minutes

Minutes of 3rd week Council held at 1.45pm on Friday 6th February 2009 At the Oxford Union

- a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
- b. Matters Arising from the Minutes
- c. Ratifications in Council
- d. Elections in Council
- e. Reports from the Sabbatical Officers
- f. Reports from the Executive Officers who wish to make reports
- g. Questions to Members of the Executive
- h. Emergency Motions
- i. Passage of Motions Nem Con
- j. Motions of No Confidence or Censure
- k. First readings of Motions to Amend the Constitution or Standing Orders
- l. The Budget or Amended Budget
- m. Motions Authorising Capital Expenditure
- n. Other Motions
 - i. motions affecting ousu members as ousu members
 - ii. motions affecting ousu members as students at Oxford University
 - iii. motions affecting ousu members as members of the student movement
 - iv. motions affecting ousu members as residents of Oxford
 - v. motions affecting ousu members as residents of the United Kingdom
 - vi. motions affecting ousu members as citizens of the world
- o. Any Other Business

a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

No points arising from the minutes

c. Ratifications in Council

No ratifications

d. Elections in Council

No elections

e. Reports from the Sabbatical Officers

Verbal additions to Sabbatical Officers Reports

VP Welfare

Advised about Disabilities Committee Meeting

VP Women

Pointed out the work of Publicity Committee and suggested everyone should get posters

VP Access & Academic Affairs

Advised that the Shadowing scheme has gone well

No questions

f. Reports from the Executive Officers who wish to make reports

Environment & Ethics Officer

Advised that they are selling fair trade roses and chocolates for Valentines day

No Questions

n. Other Motions

I. Condemnation of Israel's attack on Gaza

Proposer unable to attend so Henry Ziai, St Johns will be taking it

Henry Ziai (St Johns)

I'm here on behalf of original proposer, he's a medic and has clinical schools. Firstly, this isn't about taking sides, the only standard to judge Israel's action on is based on shared values based on international law. Here distinction between whether right to go toward and then whether right in the actions during the war. A distinction used in law. During the law can condemn both sides on human rights grounds, although that's a separate case. Israel has no justification under just war theory on going to war. Was there just cause? Humanitarian or self-defence? Did it achieve its aims? Wasn't self defence, it didn't do to prevent rocket fire. Ceasefire brokered by Egypt, two reasons, for it, Israel didn't hold to not firing. No Hamas rockets were fired, and Israel broke the ceasefire, lots of undisputed accounts of that. So wasn't self defence because no rocket fire before it broke the cease fire. Was this a last resort? No on 14th November, was asked for a ceasefire but Israel said no. The cabinet didn't know about that. This is reported by the spokesperson for Israeli pm. Did it achieve its aims, no it didn't if trying to prevent rocket fire, it created more through the war. Was it a disproportionate response? No Israelis were killed in ceasefire so no. Lots of people think to be fair have to present the crimes of both sides. No because Israel started the violence with no need to. So on grounds of international law must condemnation.

(Clapping)

Chair: No clapping in council. SFQ?

Ruben Zeigler (Lincoln)

The one thing I agree is about the distinction in international law about what happens when you go to war and what happens in it. But on both of these aspects Israel is not in contravention. The motion concentrates on what happened during the war not how it started. Hamas did fire during the war at Israel. Hamas prides itself on doing it now during the ceasefire; there was a rocket into Israel this morning. Disingenuous to say that Israel was breaking the ceasefire. This other issue of the ceasefire in 2008 was that Hamas was obliged to not carry on smuggling weapons during the ceasefire, but it did that, which is why Israel was not happy with that. Israel withdrew from the territory during 2005. As a result Hamas carried on firing rockets to June 2008, so when did ceasefire knew that Hamas didn't care about the occupation of the Gaza strip. Israel wanted to ensure that the weapons would not be smuggled through. That is Hamas's purpose, it just fires rockets indiscriminately to Israel's civilians. When Israel attacked a Hamas militant it did so because until that point of time it had been breaching the ceasefire and Israel had no choice. After the Hamas willingness to continue the ceasefire in December, but it kept firing the rockets. During that time it could have show it's good will but it did not. Hamas charter: 'peaceful solutions' 'peace initiatives', so called are all contrary to the beliefs of the Islamic movement. The entire territory of Palestine is to raise the banner of Allah over the land'. Israel has not attacked the civilians of Gaza but a Islamic group.

(St Annes)

Why is OUSU becoming more like oxford union. We're not commenting on the murderous aims of Hamas. I am a student of this university and citizen of Israel. I want to register my discontent. OUSU does not represent me through this.

Guy Seller (Lincoln)

The first speaker said this is not about taking sides, then she took sides. Want to take issue with the second speaker. He said the only thing Hamas did wrong was killing civilians, but the other thing was using human shields, to bomb hospitals, to booby traps schools in Gaza. If OUSU doesn't want to take sides, if want to care about humanitarian sides should look at all of them.

Sara Burton (Hertford)

Echoes speaker from St Annes. We had a JCR meeting and only 2 disagreed that OUSU should abstain from votes under section 6. Not a decision taken lightly, many feel very strongly, but OUSU can't represent these views. If we had had a majority vote, but many people felt strongly against it, how can it work when there are only three votes. People are affiliated to OUSU because of the other things that OUSU does, so why should people be represented on the other things. They are just relying on me and JCR Presidents. This is doing nothing for the perception of OUSU as meetings of liberals trying to impose their views on everyone else. Therefore Hertford only wanted to be represented on motions that affect students as students.

Nevil Karachi (St Johns)

A lot of people in opposition are saying that Hamas is a terrorist organisation. We're not defending them, but to just think about their militarism is ignoring many things. They were voted in democratically, they do use violence, but this violence is tied to Israel's occupation of 1960s borders. People are ignoring the fact there has been no end to the blockage from 2007. Israel tightened it and didn't let much through and refused to negotiate. Israel supplied fatwa with weapons to promote a civil war. For someone who promotes democracy and has moral high ground, this is hypocritical. Questions St Annes. OUSU exists for the welfare of students, but to rule out political things is to disenfranchise many students. They opposed the invasion of Iraq. 12,000 new settlements were built in the west bank after response.

Oliver Lynch (Lincoln)

I don't think we can make the distinction in law from the first speech. Are they saying it is the result of the initial attack or what happened during it. This is the problem with whole issue it gets blurred. The gentlemen in opposition said Hamas broke ceasefire, that's not right, but even if so, Israel still has to show that it is a proportional response under international law. Just because Hamas broke one point in the ceasefire, doesn't mean that Israel is justified on anything. We need more clarity.

Nawar Suffolk (Balliol)

I wrote the initial motion and amendment 8, so please read the motion in light of that. These amendments have been brought in response. I understand the complexities of the Middle East. Not intended for OUSU to take a stance on the politics of the Middle East as a whole, the motion was just intended to show regardless of the nuances, just want to lament the loss of life together. I've been to some JCR meetings; the mandates have been given on politically charged debates that miss the point of the motion. So this isn't reflective of the spirit of the motion, so want to shove that to the side. And show this was a motion intended to highlight the human suffering in the Middle East. This is shown by us talking about universal measures like international law.

Noor Rashid (Teddy Hall)

Why have the previous speakers said what they said. Show what they're voting for and about not having an opinion. The opposition has been dishonest in what's happened so far. Trying to show a rose-tinted view of both sides. Saying that Israel not doing it bad, it invaded, equipped itself with nuclear power and then claimed that people are out to get them. Of course people are out to get them because they are a nuclear power. It is awful when the victims of a power are not allowed to defend themselves. Israel used white phosphorus on children. Objective about seeing the morality of the situation, but can still condemn the murdered as wrong. If you vote again this motion, you're saying that these people died in vain. If you abstain you saying that you're not represented by this motion. I want OUSU to condemn this motion, I want to condemn the bombing of hospitals, (over time, so stopped)

Katharine Terrell (St Hilda's)

I am a JCR President mandated to vote a way. We are voting as students as citizens of the world, OUSU should represent us on this. Anything we say will be judged as political so we have to be careful as that's how it will be judged. It doesn't matter we will always be taking sides. We have to be careful who we're alienating. Arrogant to think that we can take a side, we can't be taking sides. Is this a political or a humanitarian motion? If it's going to be this divisive, then is it worth it, then not worth it for us to take a position. We are here to represent the whole University, I want to abstain but I can't because I am mandated to vote. I hope we can come up with a humanitarian or political motion, decide which it should be and then vote.

Lewis Iwu (New)

This motion is about this motion, not students for students. If you think there should be a change you should bring policy. But what OUSU function is, is determined by its own membership and so far it has said that it wants to take a stance.

Niall Durmingan (LMH)

If we take a step back, it is a really pointless motion, no disrespect, but what is the point in taking such a division role, and alienating so many people to write a letter. What is it going to achieve. Everyone could donate money to the fund, rather than pass a pointless motion, that's not going to do any good. Well the world knows that Oxford is outraged, but if my family had been killed I wouldn't care what OUSU thinks and why should I.

Dan Lowe (Teddy Hall)

I wish this motion hadn't brought this discussion to the floor. Student lobby is a powerful lobby, it was the catalyst for the anti-apartheid motion. If you don't try you won't achieve anything. The name is currently the condemnation of Israel at this point, if we go back and talk about everything. Then we'll get lost in the whole debate, rather than this one humanitarian issue.

Alex Waksman (St Annes)

If this is about humanitarian issues, this is useless because everyone knows that students are against death. Should OUSU be political? OUSU has an important role on welfare and representation. Most people in my JCR didn't think so. Sorry if I feel skeptical about things changing.

Daniel Johnson (St Catherines)

I am mandated to vote against, because think that OUSU shouldn't take a political stance on the politics of the Middle East. Everyone knows this is a political issue. The reason I'm talking, if you disagreed don't abstain, vote no. That won't be saying that you don't care, you're just saying that you shouldn't take a stance. So anyone who disagrees vote no.

Amendment I

First Proposed Amendment

Speech in proposition:

Adam Parker (LMH)

Not addressing question of whether this is a political motion, but this is a political motion. If we want to try to have a motion dealing with Middle East conflict, we need to acknowledge the complexity of the issue. It is ridiculous to condemn Israel's actions without acknowledging Hamas's use of human shields. Reads quotes: John Holmes '... hamas' actions.... In violation of international law.' We all know there are two sides - the amendments are to bring attention to there being two sides to this.

Proposition to suspend points of information

Elliot Goland (

They are being used to badger speakers.

Opposition:

Henny Zini (SJC)

They are essential to dialogue we should be using them to challenge speakers facts and references.

Vote - Clearly failed.

First Proposed Amendment

Nabil Quereshi

Speech against: Amendment is factually inaccurate; on the use of human shields Amnesty International states that the facts outlined are inaccurate. No mention in news site of Hamas using human shields. Hamas tactics have not forced Israel's tactics.

Move to vote

Most people are mandated to vote on the amendments, whilst debate may have raised good points, it's irrelevant, most have mandates.

Adel Takirite (St Anthonys)

Many points need to be covered on this amendment, there has to be discussion. Many do not have mandates so more discussion is important:

Move to Vote passed

Summary speech in favour

Rufi Ziegler (Lincoln college)

Amnesty International, ' Hamas and others have unlawfully endangered others by their actions.' Hamas' agenda is to fire rockets indiscriminately. It has never argued that it is not a guerilla organisation. If OUSU condemns this operation, it needs to give due course to these points.'

Summary

Kanishkin Ariar (Balliol)

We have a conflict in discerning the actual facts of the matter. If we are not sure of the facts how can we pass a motion? Conflicts in the sources, both from Amnesty International. We are into saying we are not condemning Hamas, however the facts are not clear we need to be sensible and not vote for something which we are not clear about.

Vote on proposition 1:

For – 13

Against - 43
Abstain - 16
Move to recount - Speech for
Speech against
Paul Dwyer
Everyone's clear, we should move on

Request withdrawn

Amendment 2

Speech in favour
Adam Parker (LMH)
People are taking issue with factual accuracy - likely to be an issue throughout. People are looking backwards, we should be looking forwards. The international community is pushing for a rocket free environment. We should be pushing for an end to weapons trafficking. We need to look to change the title of the motion to reflect this. We are simplifying a complex issue, we need to send a message recognising this, moving forward we want to support a durable ceasefire.

Henny Zini (SJC)
This completely changes the motion. Many people believe that there are legitimate grounds for condemning Israel. This is misleading by implying that the attack was justified because of weapons smuggling. Israel's army is the 4th best supplied in the world, Hamas has a right to arm itself against this. I am not saying support weapons smuggling, but that is a separate issue. No rockets were fired by Hamas during the ceasefire. This amendment detracts from the issue at hand.

Move to vote

Speech in favour
Jason Keynes (SJC)
Heard good points for an against. But most have mandates.

Speech against
Nawaz Ahmad (Balliol)
I have important points I want to make, and many people have been mandated to use their judgement.

Vote on move to vote - Move to vote passed

Summary speech in favour
Adam Parker (LMH)
Need to be forward looking. Can't be simplified into the condemnation of Israel. Ignores the actions of Hamas. Even if we are going to abstain must support an amendment, which brings balance to the arguments.

In opposition
Noor Rashid (SHE)
Durable and long term are semantics. Durable has been used to prolong efforts for peace. Is being used by Israel to prolong the issue. A ceasefire should be just that, a ceasefire.

Vote

For - 33
Against - 27
Abstain - 14

Point of order to suspend the standing orders - Two speeches in proposition and two speeches in opposition

Speech in proposition

Alex Bulfin (Univ)

The pattern emerging seems to be a speech in prop, speech in opposition, move to vote, summary speeches. Have a single vote to make this the structure for the meeting - it's formalising what seems to be happening.

Rhea Wolfson (SHE)

Other motions are more controversial, more discussion may be necessary, we mustn't limit further discussion which may be necessary in more controversial issues.

Vote to suspend the standing orders

For - 38

Against -36

Amendment 3:

Speech in proposition

Raeli Bronstein (SHE)

We seem to be going around in circles... Some of what is going on is wrong, whatever side it is. We need to recognise that having to close universities in Israel and having people living in fear in southern Israel is as deplorable as what is going on in Gaza. We need to make sure the motion being proposed is balanced.

Imran Ahmed (St Catherines)

We want to make sure that we approach this with a humanitarian perspective. Rulings of international courts and UN reflect that the status on the ground is not balanced. We have to reflect the status on the ground; we have to be fair on the facts and be balanced in relation on what's going on.

Move to vote

Lewis Iwu (New)

Lots of points to cover and most people already have an opinion. Need to move on with this.

Speech in opposition

Henny Zini (SJC)

There are many points in this amendment which need to be discussed and have not been heard...

Move to vote

For - 54

Against -19

Speech in proposition

Closing a university is a crisis. We need to keep this in.

Summary speech in opposition

Amendment is factually inaccurate. Whilst the general sentiment may be well intentioned, there are factual inaccuracies. There is no evidence to find that the university has closed at all. We need to recognise that one university was demolished whilst one other may not have even been closed. We need to be objective and look at the facts -there was no closure of the university and no sources were provided. This would render the motion inaccurate or imbalance it.

Vote on amendment

For – 24

Against – 35

Abstain - 19

Amendment 4

Speech in proposition -

Abdel Takriti (St Anthony's College)

Two types of motion purpose - One is to clarify. Another is to create some form of humanitarian deterrence. We need to say that this is an assault of Gaza, many killed are children and women, and this is an assault on a people not an organisation. The point of this discussion is that we need to deter the state of Israel. Destruction is not just of Hamas it is also of UN. We need to be precise this is an assault on the entirety of Gaza - people, livelihood, infrastructure. It is not just an attack on Gaza.

Speech in opposition -

Guy Salaam (Keble)

We need to remember this is a war - there are not precise numbers because of Hamas practice. Hamas are embedded and fighting from within civilian populations. These wars are ones we do not want to have. We should aim to distinguish between civilians and military. To say this was an attack on Gaza will dilute the issue and not reflect the attack was aimed at Hamas.

Kanishkin Ariar (Balliol)

Hamas's agenda is not that of the Palestinian people. Nations are not willing to say that Hamas is speaking for the Palestinian people. Egypt has declared that it will close passage to Gaza due to Hamas. If you condemn Hamas we should congratulate an operation to let the Palestinian people have humanitarian supply and to support the Palestinian people. Israel wants peace with the Palestinian people separate of Hamas.

Move to vote

Paul Dwyer (

Lots more to get through. People will have to start leaving soon. People have mandates, we need to move through.

Speech in opposition of move to vote

Henny Zini (SJC)

It is outrageous that we cannot present the facts to the motion. Some have places to go and some have mandates. Others have flexible mandates, and need to hear the facts to make an informed decision.

RECESS (5 MINS)

Chair move to vote on amendment for

Eliot Goelend: Point of order- quorum count

Chair: agreed

Quorum count. Quorum reached.

Chair: Now move to vote on fourth amendment

For - 47

Against

2/3rds majority for moving to vote

Chair: Can we have a summary speech in favour of amendment 4

Henny Zini (SJC)

It is about changing the motion to change it as an assault on Gaza rather than an assault on Hamas. This is argued by many human rights organisations that it is collective punishment on the Palestinian people. Lot's of points on the opposition have been rubbish, about not being about to distinguish between Hamas and the two people. This is an assault on the people so we should change the motion

Paul Dwyer (Can I make a point of clarification? There can be no points of information in a summary speech.

Eliot Golend (Pembroke)

This amendment takes out lots of it. It is the whole premise for our later actions, if we don't want the situation to go back in time, so we need to talk about this particular issue. It's not about Gaza in general. This motion notes all the details. This is the version that was written originally, this is just an amendment to remove all reasoning to make it straight condemnation the whole way through, without any methodology.

(Vote happens)

For - 25

Against - 24

Abstentions -17

Eliot Golend (Pembroke)

Arguing we should have a recount. We always do this when it's very close and a contentious issue.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds)

I think we can trust Madeline and Roseanna to count, we are intelligent and go to university and its quite simple.

Chair: we need 10 votes to have a recount.

Vote:

More than 10 votes were secured so a recount takes place

Results

For - 26

Against - 28

Abstain -16

Point of order to table this to the next meeting by

Confusion over tabling

Chair: Do you want it to come back next week or do we want to table it to go away forever

Sourav Choudray

Would we have to start again, or go from where we are now?

Guy Sellar (Keble)

It's going to be the Sabbath at 4:45pm so as an observant Jew, I need to go home in 5 minutes. If you want a serious debate on this then you need to have these people in the room. It's better for next week rather than in the absence of opposition.

Lewis Iwu (New)

Speaks against, we have tried to make this later this week. People should listen in their JCR from people of all faiths and none. We cannot table this again.

Chair: Vote, this needs a 2/3 majority.

Chair: All those in favour of voting for this please stand up.

Not a 2/3rds majority so fails

Point of Order: This is ridiculous because now all Jewish people have to leave, it makes a mockery.

(confusion)

Trying to get him to stop talking, he refuses, threaten to throw out of council. Lewis Iwu walks him out.

Amendment 5

Henny Zini (Johns)

Vote for this it is factually correct. I've looked it up on many different sources. On the basis of factual correctness I am proposing this.

Alex Waksman (St Annes): This is factually incorrect. The president of Egypt has blamed Hamas for breaking the ceasefire. Hamas did not take up the

(Merton)

Israeli Government says that it broke the ceasefire.

Jim (Univ)

I don't know who broke the ceasefire first, but this isn't a constructive addition. We should leave this to history, so should vote this down.

(Christ Church)

You mentioned the Egyptian president, reads out a quote.

Roseanna MacBeath (Hughs)

Move to vote. Speech same as always, people always have mandates on this we need to get through it.

Beki Morgan (Pembroke)

It's more democratic to have a debate about this.

2/3s majority wins a move to vote.

Summary speech

Henny Zini

There are numerous sources on-line which confirm this including CNN, The Guardian, and The Financial Times.

Ruben Ziegler (Lincoln)

There are quite clear indications that Hamas was under the original ceasefire terms they were meant to stop smuggling weapons and they did not. And the new ceasefire says the same again. This is not only bias and one sided it is factually incorrect and so we should not vote for it.

Chair: Now voting for amendment 5

For - 14

Against:

(not going to count, the amendment clearly fails).

Amendment 6

Point of Order

Nawaz Ahmad (Balliol): Can I accept this as a friendly amendment?

(there is opposition, so still have the event)

Point of Order

Raeli Bronstein (Teddy Hall): Want to table this for the next meeting.

Chair: Can we have the same debate again?

Discussion.

Raeli Bronstein (Teddy Hall)

Not going to do the same thing, want to table it indiscriminately, so someone else would have to bring it back again.

Question: Would it be brought back in its present form?

Chair: Yes

Rhiannon Ward (Corpus)
Can more amendments be brought?

Chair: Yes

Raeli Bronstein (Teddy Hall)
I'm very happy for this to come back, but people have had to leave for their religious observances, so out of respect that they can not be here to engage you in a proper debate. We hope it does come back. This should happen out of respect.

Speech in opposition
Katharine Terrell (St Hildas)
We have been mandated by our college to vote. They who vote they feel strongly, doesn't matter about their religion. I appreciate there are some people who have to leave, but it's not about religion, we respect your religious observance.

Vote

For - 23
Against

No 2/3rd majority so the debate will continue.

Chair: So go back to amendment 6

Henny Zini
War crimes have been committed by Israel. There are laws about war and then laws about how the war should be done. These haven't been observed; they have been using human shields (although so have the other sides). Many different sources e.g. Amnesty, human rights watch say that it was grossly disproportionate.

AW
This wasn't disproportionate, needed to send in that many people, so that they didn't lose their own soldiers. Also they phoned buildings that were going to be bombed, so they do care. Very few people have qualifications of international relations, we don't know the substance.

Daniel Lowe (Teddy Hall)
You can't say there shouldn't be an investigation. Someone who is qualified in international law should investigate it.

Point of information: How are you going to prove that it is white phosphorus.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds)
Again, I'm not qualified, but it has been widely reported, and someone can look into it.

Henny Zini
Point of Information, Amnesty says it's about the burns

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds)
Israel haven't been denying it

Point of information
This wording says that there should be condemnation of the use of white phosphorus

Teddy Hall OUSU Rep
Why should we not have an investigation? It has been used, because there has been wide spread evidence that it has been used. If you use white phosphorus as a smoke screen in an area the size of London, with 1.3 million people that implies you can use any weapon you want and not have to abide by the consequences. We need to investigate it and we need to condemn it.

Alex Bulfin (Univ)
I think it's a shame that this amendment has been exposed as a bit rotten. It's becoming increasingly blurred, now we're not making any sense. We have mandate so I'm not pushing one side. Investigation might be good, but then the second half contradicts it.

Move to vote

Lewis Iwu (New)
We're going round and round, I think we should move on.

Henny Zini
Summarises, there are reputable organisations that have listed the war crimes; it repulses me that a group of students should be opposed to investigating disgusting atrocities, to deny an investigations? I don't understand that mentality. HRW have condemned use of children. UN Telegraph, times online, amnesty, have all condemned the war crimes on Israel. I don't think we should be opposing this.

Gabriel Cantanhede (Kellogg College)
I want raise the point of the motivation of writing to the majesty about the IDF. The first thing you said was that this is not a political motion. I went to Gaza, Hamas were shooting people in the bed, isn't that also a war crime, so shouldn't that also be condemned, isn't this partisan? There are lots of doubts that have been clarified with this motion. What is the use of time in investigating this motion.

Voting on amendment 6.

For - 24
Against - 33
Abstention - 18

Paul Dwyer (
Request that we not read amendment 7

Clear 2/3s so move on to amendment 8

Amendment 8

Nawaz Ahmad (Balliol)

This motion was intended to be something we can unite around. But this isn't what the motion was doing last time, so I wrote this to change it. I've gone away, added some amendments to make it clear to you that this is not divisive, we are using objective measures, humanitarian and international law. Some of you didn't take these amendments into account. Please read and know this isn't divisive, we want to try to transcend our partisan allegiances. We just want to acknowledge what happened on the ground and show that this is wrong. Trying to show why the motion is there, why it exists- the politicisation of this has obscured the fact of the matter. Don't let the history of Hamas or Israel cloud this, this is about the current conflict, the humanitarian situation, resonate with the situation and then take a stand.

Martin Nelson has taken over the chair. He says is there any opposition.

Yes

AW

This is still political, you say about the amount of mosques that have been destroyed, but I could say about human shields. We don't know all the facts. This isn't non-partisan. It draws on so many statistics that we can't clarify.

Will McCullum (Wadham)

A balanced argument. There are 1300 Palestinian dead and 13 Israelis, so there are 1300 reasons to vote for this. We're never going to get away from politics. And every figure of this has been sourced. Every thing has been noted. This is a worthy amendment.

Magd:

The idea that this is a less partisan amendment, we have already debated this. We debated about the title change in a previous amendment. This is far more divisive. In terms of sources, there's been a lot of debate around statistics. As someone who works on medical issues, and has done in Palestinian authorities. And know how hard it has been to get these correct. This idea that we at OUSU can show that this is a non-political fact is ridiculous.

This idea that the amount of people kills is the person in the right is a ridiculous idea. Hamas could just be crap terrorists. They put bombs in mosques and in houses

Nawaz Ahmed (Balliol)

We're not saying we're right because more people have died. We're just saying that this is a tragedy. We need to call upon our common humanity to condemn this. If you have concerns about other political issues or tragedies then bring it to OUSU council. We should be commended for making OUSU relevant. I have a fact sheet to verify any of the statistics in this, come and ask this for me.

Point of order: Paul Dwyer, move to vote.

Speech in favour:

This is the biggest amendment we've had so far, we keep going backwards and forwards,

Michael Stark (Hertford)

We can't move to vote, this would override all the other things we spent longer talking about.

Speech in favour of motion:

This amendment tries to pick out politics from this. To bring each line in the motion to bring it back to humanitarian questions. We have explicitly put in a condemnation of Hamas rocket fire. We have

taken all reasonable steps to try to make this as clear and non-partisan as possible. We might want to apportion blame equally, but this was an asymmetric conflict. We should feel proud to condemn this. Regardless of the plethora of political opinions in this room, we can move above this to condemn the loss of life.

Reuben

We are going back and forth. On the one hand some people have clear political views on this sometimes its cleverly hidden and sometimes its not so cleverly hidden. If it is political then they should just say so and show how they have hidden some of the facts they don't like. The only thing this mentions about Israelis killed, but there is much more. The strength of one side doesn't show who's right and who's wrong. And it is bad that there were so many people who wanted to discuss this and couldn't.

For -28

Against - 30

Abstain -15

Nawaz asks for recount

Asks for ten votes, get ten votes, so we have a recount.

For - 31

Against - 27

Abstain -15

Amendment passes.

Go straight to whole motion.

Move to vote.

Chair: Can we have clarification of the amendments that passed.

2 and 8 are the amendments that passed.

Chris Blake (Hughs)

(speech in proposition of the move for a recorded vote) I was mandated to ask for a recorded vote. Think it's important to know because it's a divisive issue.

David Barclay (Worc)

Hard to know how to vote now it's been changed by the amendments.

Enough votes to have a recorded vote

Move to vote

Any opposition to vote?

No

Summary speech in proposition of the whole motion:

Jack Matthews (Peters): In my role of common room support officer, I ask people about what OUSU should be doing. And they've said, that with this motion, it can't represent everybody, so I don't see how we can send something into the outer world which a large proportion of people are against. We can only unite around the idea that people are dying. We could have done something far more simple in council last week in 45 minutes that did. It is not over politicised so I hope you vote against this.

Nawaz: This isn't about the merits of OUSU as appropriate for this forum. That can be discussed later. So don't vote against this because you think it isn't, it is constitutional. It may have been interpreted as a political motion, so that's why we went to change it. Don't vote down because there is opposition. That's always going to happen. I've gone round to common rooms, and people are proud that we are doing that as future leaders we should condemn things, it is in line with our humanitarian values. Please don't dismiss because of all the other things that we have been discussing. Think about just the motion we have, with the new amendment we just passed. It's important that we as OUSU say something about what has happened.

Martin Nelson (LMH): Move to recorded vote (explanation). Madeline is helping.

Vote:

Yes - 21

No - 40/39

Abstain -15

Recorded Vote Results

Duncan Cook	Jesus College	JCR President	Yes
Edison Huynh	Jesus College	JCR OUS Rep	Yes
Ian Bhullar	Keble College	JCR 3 rd Vote	Yes
Oliver Linch	Lincoln College	JCR 3 rd Vote	Yes
Jake Leeper	LMH	JCR OUSU Rep	Yes
Hannah O'Rowne	Balliol College	JCR 3 rd Vote	Yes
Amy Gilligan	Exeter College	JCR 3 rd Vote	Yes
Katherine Terrell	St Hildas College	JCR President	Yes
Rebecca Darts	St Hilda's College	JCR 3 rd Vote	Yes
Jason Keen	St Johns College	JCR President	Yes
Leonie Northedge	St Johns College	JCR OUSU Rep	Yes
Rebecca Findlay	St Johns College	JCR 3 rd Vote	Yes
Jack McGinn	Queens College	JCR OUSU Rep	Yes
Alex Bulfin	University College	JCR President	Yes
Alice Heath	University College	JCR 3 rd Vote	Yes
Will McCallum	Wadham College	SU President	Yes
Maleka Khar	Wadham College	SU	Yes
Anna-Maria Ramezanzadeh	W College	SU	Yes
Catherine Philips	Wadham College	SU	Yes
Will Lanier	University College	MCR OUSU Rep	Yes
Rachel Cummings		VP Women	Yes
Zain Talyarkhan	Keble College	JCR President	No
Chiara Best	LMH	JCR 3 rd Vote	No
Laurence Mills	Magdalen College	JCR President	No
Tom Meakin	Magdalen College	JCR OUSU Rep	No

Matthew Chan	Magdalen College	JCR 3 rd Vote	No
Yuan Yang	Balliol College	JCR OUSU Rep	No
Alan Rimmer	Christ Church	JCR President	No
David Lakha	Christ Church	JCR 3 rd Vote	No
Preeti Dhillon	Corpus Christi	JCR President	No
David Giles	Corpus Christi	JCR OUSU Rep	No
Rhiannon Ward	Corpus Christi	JCR 3 rd Vote	No
Sara Bainbridge	Mansfield College	JCR President	No
Kath Davies	Mansfield College	JCR OUSU Rep	No
Ed Finch	Mansfield College	JCR 3 rd Vote	No
Alistair Haggerty	Merton College	JCR President	No
James Nation	Merton College	JCR OUSU Rep	No
Matthew Ranger	New College	JCR President	No
Toby Vacher	New College	JCR OUSU Rep	No
Jake Anders	New College	JCR 3 rd Vote	No
William Blawe	St Annes College	JCR 3 rd Vote	No
Richard Batcheler	St Annes College	JCR OUSU Rep	No
Alex Waksman	St Annes College	JCR 3 rd Vote	No
Adrian Johnston	St Catherines College	JCR President	No
Thomas Haynes	St Catherines College	JCR OUSU Rep	No
Elizabeth Intsiful	St Catherines College	JCR 3 rd Vote	No
Jemma Trive	St Hildas College	JCR OUS Rep	No
Sanjay Nanwani	St Peters College	JCR President	No
Tendai Sibanda	St Peters College	JCR OUSU Rep	No
Rachel Rauch	St Peters College	JCR 3 rd Vote	No
Charlotte Sapmoun	St Edmunds Hall	JCR President	No
Stuart Ingham	St Edmund Hall	JCR 3 rd Vote	No
Jim O'Connell	University College	JCR OUSU Rep	No
David Barclay	Worcester College	JCR President	No
Minesh Tanna	Worester College	JCR OUSU Rep	No
Matthew Grant	Worcester College	JCR 3 rd Vote	No
Joshua Seidman-Zayer	Lincoln College	MCR President	No
Reuven Ziggler	Lincoln College	MCR OUSU Rep	No
Paul Dwyer	Keble College	VP Access & Acc Aff	No
Jack Matthews		Comm Rm Supp Off	No
Iain Large	Balliol College	JCR President	Abstained
Caroline Daly	Pembroke College	JCR President	Abstained
Jigar Patel	Pembroke College	JCR OUSU Rep	Abstained
Beki Morgan	Pembroke College	JCR 3 rd Vote	Abstained
Aveek Bhattachaya	Sommerville College	JCR OUSU Rep	Abstained
Chris Blake	St Hughs College	JCR President	Abstained
Harry Harding	St Hughs College	JCR OUSU Rep	Abstained
Joseph Wabs	St Hughs College	JCR 3 rd Vote	Abstained
	St Edmunds Hall	JCR OUSU Rep	Abstained
Loren Parry	St Johns College	MCR President	Abstained
Alex Phil	St Johns College	MCR OUSU Rep	Abstained
Lewis Iwu	New College	OUSU President	Abstained
Rosanna McBeath	St Hughs College	VP Welfare & Equal Opps	Abstained
Kaushal Vidyarthee	Wolfson College	VP Graduates	Abstained
Daniel Lowe	St Edmunds Hall	Env & Ethics Officer	Abstained

Ian Lyons

St Edmunds Hall

Grad Acc Aff Officer Abstained

Any other business - None

Election of pub – JD Wetherspoons

Hustings

Academic Affairs Campaign Officers

Declarations:

Tom Parry (SJC)

Not a member of a political party, no censure or election from council. No anticipated absences.

Aim to work closely with exec to make OUSU closer to college. Previously JCR welfare officer. Aims to bring similar support on academic affairs. E.g. Educate in academic affairs. Meetings for dissemination. Coordinate campaigns. E.g. 24 hours libraries Aim to support VP in study skills workshops and exams script requests. Exam technique help would aid transition to university. Trained peer support - able to help with stress of exams, etc. Currently campaign to release exam scripts - can find out why you lost or gained marks.

Monik Plant (Trinity)

Not a member of a political party, no censure or election from council

Have experience in aiding A' level decisions at sixth form. OUSU has a role as providing a hub of guidance. We should aim to better publicise our current campaigns. Aim to help with schemes that are not well publicised - second years assisting first year's. Main aim is a web based forum for students, different students can discuss their academic issues and organise skills sessions. Would like to reduce exam stress. Discuss with senior tutors to ensure there is sufficient space and facilities during exams. Would like to open discussion to ensure there are adequate facilities

Lewis Goodall (SJC)

Member of Labour party, no censure, no con ejection. NO absences

Oxford opportunity bursaries- transform opportunities for students. Many students are not aware of all the bursaries that are available. Aim to centralise the bursary information on OUSU online. - link to student number and inform what bursaries are available to you. There some difficulties with Oxford education - some students are receiving below par tutoring. Some students are waiting unacceptably long times for their essays. Each student should be getting feedback - must get value for money. We need an online forum - discreetly e-mail OUSU to report malpractice/poor tutoring. Sit on history undergrad JCC - many key books are only in specific libraries, recommend key books to be placed in all college libraries.

Questions:

Jack Matthews (SPC)

How do you propose to engage with individual common rooms

Monik Plant

Talk to each OUSU rep or JCR president. Canvass opinions from all colleges. Also talk with senior tutors to determine and seek to reduce academic inequality.

Lewis Goodall

Hope to have good working relationship with JCR Acaffs, have at least one per term a session to talk with OUSU acaff officer's

Tom Parry - Meet with JCR acaffs. Support when welfare officers was good. Would like to apply to acaff situation.

Daniel Lowe (SHE)

Have you ever been a JCR Acff

Lewis Goodall

No. Stood in first year but lost, passionate about issue

Tom Parry

First year didn't feel inclined to run - Welfare officer in second year

Monik Plant

No, not experienced enough in first year, now a second year and would rather focus on OUSU

Jack Matthews (SPC)

What do you think of disparity in Oxford Opportunities payments depending on year of matriculation. What do you propose to do about this?

Tom Parry

Not clear on the issue, but shouldn't matter about the year of matriculation. Will need to look more into the issue but this inequality seems unfair.

Monik Plant

Should lobby with university to get this changed. It is unfair

Lewis Goodall

This is an unfair inequality, depending on the year of entry you may or may not qualify for bursary.

Jim O'connell (Univ)

What step are you going to take to standardise forms of academic feedback?

Monik Plant

Student survey. Organise formal college feedback sessions and put information back to analyse

Lewis Goodall

Go into each college and establish the key issues. Student survey is also important and may be most standardised way,

Tom Parry

Agree with previous points. Would be able to more easily liaise with common rooms, can help common room officers to organise such events.

Charities and Community Outreach Officer

Anastasia Molovick (Keble)

No political parties censures etc no absences

2nd year Ppeist. Work in OUSU on E and E committee - have worked with OUSU. Have been E and E officer at Keble JCR. At School organised successful charity events, see RAG as a main charity group in oxford. There needs to be help from OUSU to organise charity events. Would like to hear student views to organise good events. Want to increase fundraising for Eco charities, assess student feeling.

Adam McIvor (Jesus) - What would you do in terms of outreach?

During first year organised competition for school children. Many don't engage with local people.

Outreach project and those engaging with local children should continue. There are lots of opportunities which should be encourages

Rachel Cummings OUSU - What do you think of OUSU in general and how should it be improved?

It is an effective lobby but there needs to be more outreach to the common rooms and the publicity needs to be improved to make more aware of the events that OUSU starts.

Jack Matthews (SPC) - How would you support all common rooms (including MCRs) through your role?

There needs to be better publicity, send out e-mails to let people know what's going on. Meet with common room charities reps to ensure people in the colleges known what's going on.

Graduate Welfare Officer

Tahul Abdum Rahman

No political parties, no censures/ejections and no-cons, Absent MT 2001
Statement read by RO

Disabilities Officer

Lucy Edwards

No political parties etc. No absences
Statement read by RO