

## JCR Meeting Minutes – Sunday 2<sup>nd</sup> week HT09

### 1. Budget

#### This JCR resolves:

1. To approve the budget for Hilary Term 2009

#### General Account

College grant 3941  
Arts Levy 1500  
Charities levy 1500  
Coke Machine 200  
Punt scheme 3500  
Total 10,641

Newspapers, both student and national -670  
Coffee machine -500  
Entz -200  
Welfare -200  
Women's Tea -120  
Men's Tea -120  
ISO -100  
Admin/Committee -200  
TV Licenses -60  
Arts/Clubs/Socs Payout -1500  
Charities Payouts -1500  
Punt scheme -3500  
Audit -200  
Total -8,870

Net Income over expenditure 1,771  
Old balance 7,621.46  
New balance 9,392.46

#### Private Account

Charities -500  
Arts motions -200  
Total -700

Net income over expenditure -700  
Old balance 9000  
New balance 8300

Proposed  
Tom Barker

Seconded  
Joe Fallon

(Passed nem com.)

## **2. Friedrich Schiller's Don Carlos translated by Poulton at the Oxford Playhouse**

### **This JCR Notes:**

1. Sovereign Arts is producing Friedrich Schiller's Don Carlos translated by Mike Poulton at the Oxford Playhouse in 5th Week.
2. This production has the largest cast and crew of any play this term.
3. This fantastic play's being marketed by Corpuscles.
4. The last production by Sovereign Arts ("The Winter's Tale") earned Corpus JCR ~50% profit.

### **This JCR Resolves:**

1. To support Oxford drama at its best and see the play in 5th week
2. To give a pro rata loan of £300 to the production company.

Proposed: Adam Hadley

Seconded: Jonathan Rhodes

(Passed nem com)

## **3. Charity Formal Hall in 5th week**

### **This JCR notes:**

1. 5th week is RAG week
2. On Friday of 5th week there will be a Charity Formal Hall to help raise money for RAG.

### **This JCR believes:**

1. It is a good thing to donate to charity as it helps others and raises the amount of happiness in the world.
2. It is a good thing to go to Formal Hall as that too, on the account of food and wine, raises happiness levels.

### **This JCR Resolves:**

1. To increase the price of formal hall for members of the JCR by £1.50 in 5th week, with proceeds going to RAG.

Proposed: Eluned Gramich

Seconded: Jeremy Lloyd

(Passed nem com)

## **4. RAG!**

**This JCR Notes:**

1. Oxford RAG (Raise and Give) is the charity fundraising society in Oxford.
2. This year money raised is supporting: Engineers Without Borders, Students Supporting Street Kids, Asylum Welcome, Jacari, KEEN, OxPAT, SeeSaw, Oaktree UK, Oxford Development Abroad and SightSavers many of which students at Corpus Christi are involved in.
3. 5th week of this term (Hilary) is RAG week and a lot of time and effort is going into running a range of fun fundraising events during that week.
4. Some money is needed to cover the overheads (printing of RAG mag, posters, flyers; room bookings; materials etc) on the events run during RAG week so that all the money raised during the week can be given to the charities listed in ii).
5. This motion is being brought before the vast majority of JCRs.

**This JCR resolves:**

1. To donate £60 to Oxford RAG to help the society cover its overheads during RAG week (5th week) so that more money will go to the nominated charities.
2. To mandate the college RAG Officer to organise (liaising with the Entz team) an internal RAG fundraising event on Friday/Saturday of 5th week with the proceeds going to Oxford RAG.

Proposed: Jeremy Lloyd (RAG Officer)

Seconded: Nikki Hutchison

(Postponed until Proposer – Jeremy – Arrives.)

**Extraordinary Motion – OUSU's response to Current Situation in Gaza****This JCR notes:**

- There is an ongoing conflict regarding the Gaza strip
- That a motion regarding this was brought before OUSU Council on Friday 1st Week which has been tabled until Friday 3rd Week to allow JCRs to receive mandates from their students

**This JCR believes:**

- That OUSU should have a policy on world issues and use their resources to express the opinions of Oxford University students
- That we should not take a political view on the ongoing conflict regarding the Gaza strip
- That civilian casualties on both sides should be minimised.
- We condemn the destruction of state infrastructure, especially educational institutions and healthcare facilities on both sides
- In a durable ceasefire between Israel and Hamas

**This JCR resolves:**

- To mandate the JCR President, OUSU Rep and the third vote to represent the views expressed in this motion at OUSU Council.

Proposed: David Giles (OUSU Rep)  
Seconded: Katie Johnston (Returning Officer)

### Short factual questions

- Peter Hawkins: Are we going to vote on the OUSU motion as it stands? Because it's terrible.
- David Giles: No, there will be amendments to the OUSU motion; the point of this JCR motion is that it's an apolitical representation of what the JCR believe so that – though we can't guarantee what the amendments to the OUSU motion will be – our President, OUSU rep and 3<sup>rd</sup> vote will have an idea of what the JCR believe and therefore what amendments to vote for at OUSU Council.
- Adam Hadley: So does this current JCR Motion oppose the OUSU motion?
- David: As it stands, yes; the OUSU motion currently 'condemns Israel's attack on Gaza'; there's already an amendment proposed to change this to one that gives equal responsibility to both parties and it apolitical. So we're currently opposing the motion, but when it's amended we'll be supporting it.
- Adam H: But isn't 'equal responsibility' political?
- Preeti: That's a point for debate.

[No more SFQs, move to debate.]

### Points of Debate:

- Adam H: It *is* a political motion.
- David: It's intended to be minimally political, but retaining the 'civilian death is bad' aspect. The motion just expressed the JCR opinion.
- Katie Johnston: Passing or not passing this (JCR) motion isn't the issue, the motion is what the President, OUSU rep and 3<sup>rd</sup> vote will use in order to vote for and against amendments in a way representational of the JCR's views. The motion *doesn't* place blame equally, or place blame at all – hence it's apolitical.
- Rhiannon Ward: Did you word this motion or was it given to all JCRs by OUSU?
- David: The OUSU motion was worded by OUSU, this motion was worded completely by us.
- Jeremy: It's a bit spineless; why shouldn't we condemn Israel's actions?
- Katie J: The point is that several different political views may be held by the members of this JCR; we tried to find a common belief that all of us would share, e.g. death of civilians = bad etc.
- Adam H: I agree that it is spineless. Why shouldn't members of the JCR who want to condemn Israel condemn Israel, and those who wasn't to condemn Hamas condemn Hamas? There are reasons on both sides.
- David: The problem is that we don't know what the amendments to the OUSU motion are going to be. We *need* our motion to be a vague idea of what we

believe of a JCR. We probably *would* place blame equally based on this JCR motion as it stands.

No 1: Isn't it just your point of view, not the JCRs, to be apolitical?

David: The motion can be amended by the JCR if they want to, in order to properly represent their views.

Katie J: The motion as it stands represents a minimum to go on; do amend it!

Rhiannon: If we reject this, will you go to OUSU and vote how you like?

David & Katie J: You have to amend the motion, not vote against it. Those representing the JCR at OUSU Council need to go with a view of the JCR.

Meg: Does everyone know that if this motion fails, this JCR is effectively voting against the belief that OUSU should have a policy on world issues? If you don't agree with the motion, amend it now, and we'll find out what the JCR really thinks – so think before moving to a vote if you want to amend it!

Adam H: Proposed amending the motion to support a balanced laying of blame between Israel and Hamas.

David: Taken as Hostile.

#### SPEECH FOR

– Adam H: Everyone surely thinks that the blame is equal; it would be better to say this explicitly.

#### SPEECH AGAINST

– Peter Hawkins: Agree that the blame should be balanced, but this is still too vague; the amendment must be fleshed out, otherwise it's meaningless.

#### VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT

FOR: **11**

AGAINST: **25**

ABSTAINING: **2**

AMENDMENT FAILS.

#### Points of Debate:

Ruth Sinister: We could say that instead of blame, could approach it in term of Human Rights. Surely we should consider those that have been killed.

Adam H: But surely we should oppose the motion as it condemns Israel – unfair.

Ruth: But it does point out the loss of life.

David: If you want to support a certain direction, you need to propose an amendment.

Rory: Can't we ask that the amendments that OUSU propose are brought before all the JCRs? And then we can vote on them?

Meg: No; we can bring you the ones that they've decided now, but during OUSU council amendments will be proposed and voted on there and then; you need to give your representatives an idea of how to vote.

Laura Lee-Rodgers: Can't you just look at the resolves of the OUSU motion, and vote on those?

[Preeti reads out the resolves of the OUSU motion.]

Laura LR: It seems the only problem is the 1<sup>st</sup> one (condemning Israel's attack on Gaza.)

Katie J: Eventually the OUSU motion won't look like what it does now; we *need* a general policy.

Jeremy: Why don't we mandate our representatives to condemn Israel's action in Gaza?

Katie: Or, condemn 'use of disproportionate force leading to civilian death?

Peter Hawkins: But we have the same problem here, what's a disproportionate use of force? Needs to be specific.

Laura LR: Jeremy's proposal was more specific.

Ruth: Can't we condemn both sides? Both actions were unreasonable.

Jane Sancinito: We could combine that to say 'we condemn the use of violence'?

Laura LR: But we're expressing the views of the JCR more explicitly by voting amendment to condemn each side separately.

Jeremy: Proposes amendment to: 'This JCR opposes Hamas' use of terrorism in the region.

SPEECH FOR – Jeremy: The currently motion is too woolly; by allowing those here to vote for motions condemning Israel and Hamas's actions then we can get a better idea of what the JCR believes, e.g. is it justified to fire rockets etc.

SPEECH AGAINST: [no speech against.]

Rory: Can we vote for both? (Yes)

Ruth: Is your intention to highlight a bias on either side?

Jeremy: Intention is to get a clear idea of what the JCR believes; a scale of the opinion.

Rory: Doesn't this nullify the 'apolitical' part of the motion?

Meg: Not necessarily; we're can vote to condemn a group's actions and still make it about Human Rights and not politics.

Katie Bayliss: Can't we have a referendum?

Meg, David and Katie J: Too complicated, and still wouldn't achieve getting an idea of what the JCR thinks; this isn't a 'yes/no' question. And we wouldn't have time before the next OUSU Council.

FOR: **35**

AGAINST: **3**

ABSTAINING: 3

AMENDMENT PASSES.

**Points for debate**

Katie J: As Jeremy's amendment was passed, it is now his motion.

Jeremy: Proposes an amendment to oppose the way Israel has conducted war in the Gaza strip.

**SPEECH AGAINST**

– Peter Hawkins: 'Conduct' is too vague. Israel has just been defending itself. It's tried to minimise civilian casualties, and when these have happened it has apologised.

**SPEECH FOR:** [no speech for.]

David: If we accept this amendment, can we later change it? (no, it must be voted down *now* and then subsequently re-worded/changed.)

**FOR: 25**

**AGAINST: 7**

**ABSTAINING: 8**

AMENDMENT PASSES.

[Preeti reads out motion as it now stands.]

Ned Gramich: Now to we have to change the wording from 'apolitical'?

Meg: Having an apolitical view alongside these amendments means that out representatives can oppose all destruction and civilian death etc., rather than automatically having to vote for political motions this way or that.

**MOVE TO VOTE**

**FOR: 36**

**AGAINST: 1**

**ABSTAINING: 4**

MOTION PASSES.

**[Return TO Motion 4.]**

**SFQs:**

Rory: If RAG doesn't use all the £60, will we get what they don't use it back?

Jeremy: No, effectively it's a donation.

**MOVED TO VOTE**

**FOR: JUDGED AS OVERWHELMING.**

MOTION PASSES.

## **Appendix – Original OUSU Motion**

### **1. Condemnation of Israel's attack on Gaza**

#### **Council Notes:**

1. Israel's assault against Hamas, beginning on 27th December 2008, which has levied a massive toll on Palestinian civilians.
2. That nearly 1,200 Palestinians have been killed since the violence began (BBC News, 18th January), of which almost one third are children.
3. That 18 Israelis have been killed by Hamas rocket fire since 2001.
4. The destruction of the Islamic University, the first and most important institution of higher education in Gaza, which serves more than 20,000 students, 60% of whom are women.
5. The ceasefire announced by Israel on 18th January.
6. The ceasefire declared by Hamas on 18th January, to continue indefinitely unless Israeli forces are not withdrawn within a week, and crossings are not opened for the entry of humanitarian aid, food and other necessities for the people of the Gaza strip (BBC News, 18th January).

#### **Council Believes:**

1. That Israeli bombardment has levied a hideous toll on the impoverished population of Gaza, displaying disregard for civilian life.
2. That the Israeli attack has been entirely out of proportion given the scale of Hamas attacks on Israel.
3. That the significance of the destruction of the Islamic University cannot be overstated, since Palestinian students from Gaza are barred by Israel from studying either in the West Bank or abroad.

#### **Council Resolves:**

1. To condemn Israel's attack on Gaza.
2. To condemn the destruction of the Islamic University.
3. To mandate the OUSU President to write to Tzipi Livni, Israeli Vice Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, demanding that this delicate ceasefire be maintained for the sake of Palestinian and Israeli lives, and to ensure that all borders are opened.
4. To mandate the OUSU President to write to Rt. Hon David Miliband, UK Foreign Secretary, demanding that full-scale diplomatic efforts continue to maintain the ceasefire, and to ensure that all borders are opened.
5. To commiserate the loss of lives on both sides of the conflict.