



St John's College Junior Common Room

Minutes - Extraordinary Meeting, Trinity Term 2020
Sunday 7 June 2020, via Zoom, 3 pm

1. Minutes from the Previous Meeting

2. Matters Arising from the Minutes

3a. Ratifications

3b. Constitutional Motions Requiring Ratification

4. Motions of Censure, No Confidence Motions and Emergency Charities Motions

a) The "International Students E&D Rep" No Confidence Motion

5. Other Motions

b) The "Black Lives Matter" Standing Policy Motion (as amended)

Amendment 1: Emergency Charities Motions Provisions

Amendment 2: Social Media Rep Mandate

Amendment 3: Removal of General Committee Route

Procedural Motion: That the motion be split and voted on in parts

c) The "Racism at Christ Church JCR hustings" Motion (as amended)

Amendment 1: Adding Provisions to Standing Policy

Amendment 2: Adding "Directly" before Cooperation

Amendment 3: Removing "Directly" before Cooperation

Amendment 4: Mandating President to Add to Duties of E&D Reps

d) The "Immediately Release the 2020 Admissions Statistical Report" Standing Policy Motion

e) The "Black Literature Matters" Constitutional Motion

6. Any Other Business

The meeting began at 3 pm, with Zara Hussain (Vice President) chairing and Lachlann Hinley (Secretary) as minute taker. Zara introduced the format of the meeting and noted that questions could be asked via the chat. Zara made members aware of the following points:

- The chat function was disabled, except for messages to the Chair or Secretary
- The JCR does not condone racist or insensitive comments, but the JCR is obliged to promote free speech

1. Minutes from the Previous Meeting

Available on the website [here](#). There were no objections.

2. Matters Arising from the Minutes

Following an online ballot, the “General Meeting Remote Access Improvements (Part I)” Motion, as amended Motion passed: 34 in favour, 6 against, 0 abstentions

3a. Ratifications

Returning Officer (1 vacancy)

No one stood for the position. Zara Hussain (Vice President) remained Acting Returning Officer.

Chair (1 vacancy)

No one stood for the position. Zara Hussain (Vice President) remained Chair.

Disabilities Equality and Diversity Rep (1 vacancy to join Alice Hackney)

No one stood for the position.

Suspended Students Equality and Diversity Rep (2 vacancies)

No one stood for the position.

3b. Constitutional Motions Requiring Ratification

i) General Meeting Remote Access Improvements (Part I) Motion

Proposer: Toby Lam

Seconded: Leo Warburton

The motion was **ratified nem. con.**

4. Motions of Censure, No Confidence Motions and Emergency Charities Motions

a) The “International Students E&D Rep” No Confidence Motion

Proposer: Phil Fernandes, President

Seconded: Jahnvi Kalayil, Equality & Diversity Officer

Relevant documents:

[Agenda Appendix 1](#) - submitted by Phil Fernandes, President

[Minutes Appendix 1](#) - submitted by Stan Szelag

Content warning

In discussion, issues raised include racism and sexual assault

This JCR notes that:

- a. *Stanislaw Szelag (International Students E&D Rep) has publicly expressed opposition to the backlash that has resulted from the recent insensitivity at the Christ Church JCR Hustings, dismissing the criticisms of the events as “a massive festival of virtue-signalling” ([Appendix 1](#))*
- b. *Phil Fernandes (JCR President) contacted Stanislaw asking for an apology to which he replied saying ‘No’ and showed no signs of remorse or understanding of his actions*
- c. *Stanislaw has continued to provoke Melanie Onovo (Christ Church student who spoke publicly about the hustings event), claiming that “people have overreacted”*

This JCR believes that:

- d. *By referring to the reaction to the incident at Christ Church as “virtue-signalling”, Stanislaw’s comments seek to trivialise the incident and downplay the hurt that the comments at the Christ Church hustings have caused*
- e. *E&D Reps carry a responsibility to represent the non-discriminatory interests of the JCR; regardless of role-related responsibilities, gaslighting and accusations of virtue signalling are not tolerated for a member of the E&D sub-committee*
- f. *Reasonable steps were taken to resolve this issue without resorting to a No Confidence Motion:*
 - a. *The JCR President gave Stanislaw the opportunity to issue an apology. Stanislaw refused to do so.*
 - b. *The JCR President explained to Stanislaw why his comments were insensitive and inappropriate. Stanislaw failed to show any appreciation that he had acted in a way that caused harm to others and showed no contrition.*
 - c. *The JCR President, in consultation with the JCR E&D Officer, asked Stanislaw to resign from his position on the E&D subcommittee. Stanislaw refused to do so.*
- g. *Having exhausted all other means of coming to an understanding, a No Confidence Motion is regrettably necessary in these circumstances*

h. *The JCR has no confidence in Stanislaw Szelag*

This JCR therefore resolves to:

- i. *Stanislaw Szelag cease to hold the role of International Students E&D Rep*
- j. *Call for a written apology from Stanislaw Szelag to the JCR and to Melanie Onovo.*

Proposing the motion, Phil Fernandes (President) said they had tabled the motion of no confidence following highly insensitive comments by Stan Szelag (International Students E&D Rep) on a public forum. Stan's comments related to the Christ Church JCR Hustings, where remarks were made by one of the candidates that have been widely referred to as racist. Stan Szelag dismissed this backlash as "a massive festival of virtue-signalling".

Phil Fernandes noted that Stan Szelag is both a JCR Official and a member of the Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee. Both of these roles carry a high expectation that members are sensitive and empathetic. Phil Fernandes said that, by making accusations of "virtue-signalling", Stan demonstrated a lack of sensitivity and empathy. Specifically,

- Melanie Onovo is a student at Christ Church who spoke out at the hustings. Stan referred to Melanie's concerns as "virtue signalling", which downplays the hurt caused by the hustings and trivialises a very serious incident.
- Stan was not in the position to determine what does and not represent racism. Stan should have known this, being a member of the Equality & Diversity Sub-Committee.
- Oxford African and Caribbean Society (ACS) released a statement saying, "*we are deeply distressed by the number of racist and insensitive comments, "jokes", posts, and actions carried out by students across the university, especially in its student community online spaces*".

Phil Fernandes said they, along with Jahnavi Kalayil (Equality & Diversity Officer), had tried to reach an understanding with Stan Szelag: Stan was contacted and given the opportunity to release an apology, although Stan refused to do so and did not admit to doing anything wrong, even after Phil explained why the comments were insensitive. Phil later asked that Stan resign, which Stan did not do. Phil said they were in the position of either 'turning a blind eye' or tabling a motion of no confidence. Phil Fernandes said the JCR must send a message that it condemns such insensitive comments.

Opposing the motion, Stan Szelag asked members to keep an open mind and said there were many factors that the motion "misrepresents". Stan said they had three arguments against the motion. First, that they were not being offensive; second, that the situation didn't impact Stan's obligations as a JCR Official; and, third, that the outrage represented in the motion was not as widespread as portrayed by the proposer.

Stan Szelag said that the Equality & Diversity Officer had committed publicly in a Facebook comment to try and get Stan removed from the sub-committee. This comment from the Equality & Diversity Officer appeared alongside comments from others that were abusive towards Stan.

On the first point, Stan Szelag said "he was not offensive" for the following reasons,

- Stan felt “being offended is not the measure of whether something is offensive or not”. Stan elaborated on this point by saying they had a “similar experience” to Melanie Onovo. Specifically, Stan had written an article about antinatalism and the morality of human reproduction, which received hurtful comments, but Stan did not consider the comments offensive. Stan said there was a distinction between being hurt and something objectively being offensive.
- Stan said that Melanie Onovo had encouraged people to contact St John’s College to complain about Stan, which Melanie said would help “root out the rampant racism in Oxford”. Stan believed this violated University of Oxford Statute XI respecting freedom of speech and harassment.

On the second point, Stan Szelag said that the concerns did not relate to the role of International Students E&D Rep. Stan explained,

- Stan said the JCR Constitution mandated the International Students E&D Rep to be a “point of contact” for international students coming to Oxford, as well as making the role responsible for organising termly International Dinners. Stan said the statements did not conflict with either of these duties.
- The motion said that the International Students E&D Rep should stand for the principles of equality and diversity. Stan said they did not have to agree with everyone in order to agree with the principles of equality and diversity. Having a different opinion does not make Stan unable to perform the function of International Students E&D Rep.

On the third point, Stan Szelag condemned the behaviour of the JCR President and the JCR Equality and Diversity Officer. Stan stated,

- The motion portrays Stan as being unaware of their words or not understanding the meaning of their words. Stan said this was “highly manipulative” and “unworthy of the JCR President”. Stan said the JCR President has a duty to reconcile sides in ideological conflicts.
- Stan said they were particularly concerned by the behaviour of the Equality & Diversity Officer. The JCR Constitution states that the Equality & Diversity Officer “*must represent and support the views of all E&D groups within the JCR*”.
- Stan said that disagreement, civil debate and diversity of ideas was fundamental. Stan worried that the motion reduced equality and diversity to race, gender and class. Stan said that the motion represented a “limited” view of equality and diversity, focussing on race, gender and class, but forgetting “the most important type of diversity is diversity of thought and viewpoints”.

Stan Szelag expressed concern about the procedure being used to try and remove them. Stan said that, if the Women’s Officer was being removed, there had to be at least eighteen members who identify as women voting in favour. The same rules do not apply for E&D Reps. Stan said it would be “really ironic if a bunch of outraged Britons voted out a International Students Reps only because they don’t believe he has the right to express his views in a civil manner on a public platform”. Stan said the motion was shameful.

Stan Szelag said the motion was “misguided” as it showed a lack of willingness to resolve disagreement through argument. Stan encouraged any members who disagree with these positions to send a personal message or state their objections in public. Stan had received private messages expressing support with their positions. Stan drew members' attention to the comment of Kamran Ali that criticised “cancel culture” (see [Minutes Appendix 1](#)).

Stan was asked a series of short factual questions:

Marco Fabus asked Stan Szelag whether membership of the Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee brought any obligations relating to conduct. Stan was not aware of any provision of the Constitution mandating that the International Students E&D Rep share the views of the Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee, so long as those views were not directly contrary to the values of equality and diversity. Stan did not believe their views were directly contrary to the values of equality and diversity.

Alex O'Connor asked whether Stan Szelag was arguing (i) the comments were not insensitive, (ii) that the International Students E&D Rep should be allowed to make insensitive comments, or (iii) both. Stan said they had not argued that the comments were insensitive, only that the comments were not offensive. Stan said the JCR was not the platform for discussing whether members are allowed to be offensive. Stan said they found the joke made at the Christ Church hustings “horrible insensitive” and a “poor joke”. Stan said they had a right to make these statements and to not be “terrorised” by the prospect of someone being upset.

Alex O'Connor further asked Stan Szelag whether, if someone said something insensitive, they should lose their position. Stan was worried that the terms ‘insensitive’ and ‘offensive’ were being conflated. Stan said they would not be in favour of removing someone from their position in these circumstances.

Emmett O'Leary asked whether Stan Szelag felt the need to raise a No Confidence Motion respecting Stan's concerns with the Equality & Diversity Officer. Emmett said this would allow the meeting to express its thoughts on the behaviour of the Equality & Diversity Officer. Stan said they did not believe “shooting each other with no confidence motions is the answer”. Even though Stan believed the Equality & Diversity Officer had participated in a “smear campaign”, they did not believe the JCR should concern itself with comments on Facebook.

Felix Stocker asked Stan Szelag whether the appropriateness of comments should be determined by the JCR Official making the comments or the E&D group they were supposed to represent. Stan said they'd put forward their views, but ultimately the decision rested with the members of the JCR. Stan said, ideally, voting would be restricted to international students, but under the Constitution the decision was vested with the JCR as a whole.

Felix Stocker said that the inference of Stan Szelag's position was that, if there was any chance of an international student finding the comments insensitive, Stan should step down. Stan disagreed and said that a *majority* of International Students should have to agree that the comments are offensive. Stan agreed with the principle of democratic voting and agreed that, if the majority of international students want to remove the International Students E&D Rep, they should be removed.

Milo Mallaby asked Stan Szelag to state when they believed “insensitivity” became “racism”. Stan said this had been raised in the discussion and depended on whether the individual had responsibility and control over an issue. Stan said they didn’t have much experience in debating these issues, but found the discussion “fun”, until it turned into controversy.

Gemma Robson said they assumed that the Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee addressed issues of racism as part of its remit. Gemma asked if Stan Szelag felt able to be a member of the Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee if they were unsure what constituted racism. Stan disagreed that combatting racism was a specific element of the role of International Students E&D Rep, but accepted the Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee may have to deal with issues of racism. Stan said it was very often the case that the boundaries of a concept were uncertain. Elaborating on this point, Stan said the boundaries of sexual harassment were unclear but rape could be identified when it happened. Stan said being uncertain about the boundaries of a concept did not make them ignorant of the concept.

Georgie Bumpus asked whether Stan Szelag felt able to represent African American and other black students as International Students E&D Rep. Stan said they felt fit to represent all international students.

Amelia Holt asked whether it was appropriate for Stan Szelag to determine the “joke” made at the Christ Church hustings was not racist, if Stan believes they are unable to define what racism is. Stan disagreed with Amelia’s characterisation. Stan said there were examples of putative racism that required further thought. Stan said that the comment at the Christ Church hustings had not identified race as a “concept that is detrimental to the individual”, which is the definition of racism.

Items for Discussion

Alfie Deere-Hall asked about the enforcement of clause j. of the motion, which calls on Stan Szelag to apologise to the JCR and Melanie Onovo. Alfie said that Stan had shown “constant antagonism” to the wishes of the JCR. Alfie said the JCR should issue a statement outlining the steps the JCR has taken to resolve the situation and issue an unreserved apology, distancing the JCR from Stan’s views.

- Stan Szelag disputed Alfie’s characterisation of Stan’s attitude to the JCR. Stan said they would respect what the JCR decides and only had issues with the President and Equality & Diversity Officer.
- Alfie asked Stan whether, if Stan was removed, a personal apology would be issued. Stan said they’d wait for the results of the vote.

In response to Stan Szelag, Jahnavi Kalayil (Equality & Diversity Officer) said they recognised Stan’s personal opinion and points in their comments. Jahnavi said the motion clearly identified the elements of Stan’s comments that were inappropriate, specifically accusing Melanie Onovo of “virtue-signalling”. Jahnavi said this behaviour was unacceptable. Jahnavi urged the meeting not to be side-tracked by a debate about what does and does not constitute racism, but rather focus on the concerns expressed in the motion about the insensitivity of Stan’s remarks, given their position on the Equality & Diversity Sub-Committee. Jahnavi said that Stan’s accusations that the Equality & Diversity

Officer and President didn't hold views reflective of the whole JCR showed that Stan was unable and unwilling to appreciate why the comments were insensitive. Jahnavi hoped the JCR, by agreeing with the motion, would make it clear it condemned Stan's views.

- In response, Stan Szelag said they had not received any communication from Melanie Onovo that indicated they were offended. Stan said they would have considered deleting the comment if Melanie Onovo had expressed concern in private, but Stan was not happy with Melanie Onovo condemning Stan in a public manner and accusing Stan of racism.
- Stan Szelag felt that the Equality & Diversity Officer, in condemning Stan publicly on Facebook, participated in a 'bandwagon' alongside deeply abusive comments towards Stan. Stan thought this was "unworthy" of a JCR Official.
- Jahnavi Kalayil disagreed with Stan Szelag criticisms of Melanie Onovo. Jahnavi said that Melanie Onovo did not owe Stan any explanation of Melanie's feelings. Jahnavi condemned the comments that were abusive towards Stan.

Toni Busuttill said they had previously held the position of International Students Officer. Toni said that, when someone puts themselves forward to be in a position of power on the Sub-Committee, they assume a responsibility to represent people. Toni said, when an incident happens, the *opinions* of the individual are not relevant, only the fact they hold a position of responsibility and duties to be someone the community can turn to. Toni asked Stan Szelag to understand the impact of the comments, but Toni (who was visually upset) impelled Stan to see the issue in a wider context: the issue was not whether Stan, as an individual, agreed or disagreed with people's reaction to the incident at Christ Church, but rather an issue of how the community feels and Stan's role as someone who holds power in that community. Toni noted that Stan Szelag had volunteered to hold a position of power and that it was entirely appropriate for people to call people in positions of power out when they made statements that were inappropriate. Toni said Stan couldn't possibly understand the feelings of Melanie Onovo, who was a black woman, silenced in a JCR meeting, in the context of centuries of systematic oppression. Toni said there was no equivalence between this and Stan's article, which received negative feedback. Toni asked Stan to see this as an educational moment: that this motion wasn't about Stan as an individual and wasn't personal, but was about a pattern repeating itself that the JCR should decide to stop repeating. Toni urged Stan to apologise.

Marco Fabus said that Stan's response wholly focussed on the perceived validity of the Facebook comments. Marco said that the discussion should instead focus on Stan's duties as a member of the Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee. Marco noted that Appendix I of the JCR Constitution mandated the Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee, "*to develop, monitor and review policies and strategies in college to ensure minority groups continue to be recognised and catered for*". Marco said that, if an incident like the one had Christ Church occurred at St John's, the Sub-Committee would be expected to respond. Marco did not feel that Stan, having made the comments, could adequately do this. Marco said, as a result, they no longer had confidence in Stan to continue as a member of the Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee.

Gemma Robson spoke about the definition of offence. Gemma worried that Stan Szelag's comments "fudged the debate" about what is offensive and what is not offensive. Gemma recalled that the definition of "offensive" in the *Cambridge Dictionary* was something that

offends or upsets somebody. Gemma said it was clear that Melanie was both offended and upset. Gemma said the most worrying part of Stan's conduct was the unwillingness to engage, even though a member of the Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee must be able to understand the feelings of people from different backgrounds.

Arguing in favour of the motion, Phil Fernandes (President) said Stan Szelag had failed to address the concerns expressed in the motion. Phil said they'd tried to find a way around a No Confidence Motion through engagement with Stan, but Stan had refused to apologise for their actions. Phil said Stan had to accept a responsibility to represent the views and values of the JCR. This is a part of being a JCR Official. Phil said Stan "fell short of the mark".

Summarising the arguments against the motion, Stan Szelag disagreed that the statement made any comment that could be considered manipulative or targeting Melanie Onovo. Stan said the comment simply expressed the view that there was an "overreaction" to the initial incident at the Christ Church hustings. Stan disagreed that Phil had exhausted all avenues of coming to an understanding: Stan said coming to an understanding must include the possibility of understanding viewpoints, which Phil had not done. Stan said this made the motion "highly biased". Stan disagreed that the comments went against the views of the JCR, given Stan is also a member of the JCR, and they've always had a willingness to engage in debate over the appropriateness of the comments.

In response to Marco Fabus's points about the duties of members of the Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee, Stan Szelag said they disagreed that the comments meant they were unable to understand the views of minorities or that they had trivialised the incident.

Concluding, Stan Szelag said they felt the debate was a reflection of a wider problem. While they personally did not agree with the term, Stan thought the debate was evidence of "cancel culture". Elaborating on this point, Stan said there was a tendency, where there was disagreement, for people to resort to "cancelling" them out of all reasonable argument. Stan said the test for removing a member from their position should be "genuine harm".

Stan encouraged members to oppose a culture of opposing debate that "has gone too far". Stan noted that the no confidence motion would represent an opportunity for members to oppose this anonymously.

Agreed (full results available on request)

5. Other Motions

b) The “Black Lives Matter” Standing Policy Motion (as amended)

Proposer: Phil Fernandes, President

Seconded: Ethan Joseph, Ethnic Minorities E&D Rep

Relevant documents:

[Appendix 2](#) - Proposed Statement from JCR President

This JCR notes that:

- a. *Following the brutal murder of George Floyd, there has been much discussion about the prevalence of systemic racism across all levels of society.*

This JCR believes that:

- b. *Racism is not an issue confined to countries far from our own, and the JCR should seek to do whatever it can to eliminate racism in all its forms*
- c. *The JCR condemns all forms of racism, and stands with black members of the St John’s College community - past, present, and future - in the fight against racism.*
- d. *The JCR ought to release a statement expressing solidarity with black members of the St John’s College community*

This JCR therefore resolves to:

Vote A: The Standing Policy Part

- e. *Mandate the JCR President to release a statement on behalf of the JCR expressing the JCR’s unequivocal opposition to all forms of systemic racism (see [appendix 2](#) for proposed statement)*
- f. *Mandate the JCR President to release a statement on the JCR website, also to be released on the Instagram page and via link on Twitter on behalf of the JCR expressing the JCR’s unequivocal opposition to all forms of systemic racism (see appendix 2 for proposed statement) [¶ f. added by amendment 2]*
- g. *Add items b. and c. to JCR Standing Policy under ‘Beliefs’*

Vote B: The Constitutional Part [¶ added by amendment 1]

- h. *In the JCR Constitution, replace Article §50g,
Emergency Charities Motions, mandating specific
expenditure of up to £300 from the JCR Emergency Charities
Buffer to a current appeal by the Disaster Emergency
Committee appeals for a current cause;*
with,
*Emergency Charities Motions, mandating specific
expenditure of up to £300 from the JCR Emergency Charities
Buffer to a cause, which is either:*

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A current appeal by the Disaster Emergency Committee; ii. A cause designated in a petition presented to the Secretary signed by 50 members iii. A cause agreed by two thirds of the JCR General Committee [¶ iii. removed by amendment 3] |
|---|

Phil Fernandes (President), in consultation with Ethan Joseph (Ethnic Minorities E&D Rep), thought it was important to express support for the Black Lives Matter protesters. This statement was originally intended to be from the JCR President personally, but Phil saw the EGM as an opportunity to gain the JCR’s approval. The motion would also add clauses to Standing Policy to support this ambition.

Phil Fernandes said they’d also signed the letter drafted by Oxford African and Caribbean Society, this was to be followed up soon by a joint letter from JCR Presidents in Oxford.

Phil Fernandes said it was important for the JCR to do more than simply express support for the Black Lives Matter protesters. Phil said there had been calls for the JCR to donate to certain funds, but there were legal complications in doing this. Phil had, instead, committed to widening the scope of emergency charities funding. Phil invited Oliver Tushingam to expand on this.

Amendment 1: Emergency Charities Motions Provisions

Proposer: Oliver Tushingam

1. **Insert** after d.,
 - e. The JCR ought to amend its Emergency Charities Motion Procedure to make it easier to respond to these events
2. **Insert** after g.,
 - h. In the JCR Constitution, replace Article §50g,

Emergency Charities Motions, mandating specific expenditure of up to £300 from the JCR Emergency Charities Buffer to a current appeal by the Disaster Emergency Committee appeals for a current cause;

with,

Emergency Charities Motions, mandating specific expenditure of up to £300 from the JCR Emergency Charities Buffer to a cause, which is either:

 - i. A current appeal by the Disaster Emergency Committee;
 - ii. A cause designated in a petition presented to the Secretary signed by 50 members
 - iii. A cause agreed by two thirds of the JCR General Committee

Oliver Tushingam recalled the protests underway in the United States and elsewhere. Oliver felt it was important to amend the Constitution to make the emergency charities procedure more flexible, in particular with a view to facilitate these donations. This would make it easier to present emergency charities motions.

Phil Fernandes **accepted the amendment as friendly.**

Issy Stephens (Social Media Rep) asked for clarification about how the statement was going to be released. Phil Fernandes said the JCR only has limited platforms to make a public statement, including the JCR website and Instagram account.

Amendment 2: Social Media Rep Mandate

Proposer: Issy Stephens

Seconded: Phil Fernandes

1. Insert at the end

- e. Mandate the JCR President to release a statement on the JCR website, also to be released on the Instagram page and via link on Twitter on behalf of the JCR expressing the JCR's unequivocal opposition to all forms of systemic racism (see appendix 2 for proposed statement)

Harry Sugden asked about wording of Amendment 1 and the requirement for an Emergencies Charity Motion to be approved by two thirds of the General Committee. Harry felt that item ii. (petition of 50 members) would demonstrate a cause had the necessary weight behind it. In response, Phil Fernandes said the cause would be brought to a General Meeting, where all members present would have to vote. Phil said there could be challenges, at short notice, in organising a petition.

Harry Sugden asked whether it was appropriate to have restriction at all on bringing Emergency Charities Motions to General Meetings. In response, Phil Fernandes said it was appropriate to have some sort of restriction to reflect the fact that the procedure is only to be used in emergencies. Phil said it was important to distinguish Emergency Charities Motions from regular Charities Motions. Also, Phil noted that the procedure could only be used to allocate up to £300 (the Emergency Charities Buffer).

Harry Sugden asked whether this put a pressure on members to obtain 50 signatures. Harry asked whether members could be trusted to judge when something was an emergency without the need for signatures. In response, Phil Fernandes said it was a matter of acknowledging that an emergency measure outside the usual framework of the Constitution.

Leo Nasskau agreed with Harry Sugden's concern about the mechanism that allows the General Committee to approve Emergency Charities Motions, circumventing the requirement for a petition with 50 signatures. Leo said this could be interpreted as General Committee members getting unnecessary "special privileges". Leo said the motion effectively considers about 14 members of the JCR General Committee as the same as 50 ordinary members of the JCR. Leo believed that the petition route was adequate for deeming whether a cause was an emergency. In response, Phil Fernandes said they'd be happy to remove the General Committee condition.

Amendment 3: Removal of General Committee Route

Proposer: Leo Nasskau

Seconded: Harry Sugden

1. Replace

- h. Emergency Charities Motions, mandating specific expenditure of up to £300 from the JCR Emergency Charities Buffer to a cause, which is either:
 - i. A current appeal by the Disaster Emergency Committee;*
 - ii. A cause designated in a petition presented to the Secretary signed by 50 members*
 - iii. A cause agreed by two thirds of the JCR General Committee**

With

- h. Emergency Charities Motions, mandating specific expenditure of up to £300 from the JCR Emergency Charities Buffer to a cause, which is either:
 - i. A current appeal by the Disaster Emergency Committee;*
 - ii. A cause designated in a petition presented to the Secretary signed by 50 members**

Phil Fernandes **accepted the amendment as friendly.**

Cas Burton asked whether the Amendment 1 (Emergency Charities Motion Procedure) turned the motion into a Constitutional Motion. Cas recalled Phil Fernandes' desire to get the motion passed to release a statement as soon as possible. Constitutional Motions require ratification, so the motion would not technically be passed until the next meeting. In response, Phil agreed that the motion would need ratification.

Procedural Motion: That the motion be split and voted on in parts

Proposer: Chris Hughes

1. That the motion be split and voted on in parts in such a way that the part of the motion that would amend the Constitution (clause h, inserted by Amendment 1, as amended by Amendment 3) would be voted on separately from the rest of the motion.

Chris Hughes said that, if the motion were split into parts, the Standing Policy provisions could go into effect immediately, if passed.

Procedural motion agreed (45 in favour, 1 against, 16 abstentions)

Oliver Tushingam said that now the constitutional part of the motion was distinct, they wanted to outline the arguments for passing the motion. Oliver said the consequential part of the motion was that it'd allow the JCR to donate to the protesters in the United States through an Emergency Charities Motion at the next General Meeting on Friday, 12 June.

Vote A agreed (127 in favour, 3 against, 13 abstentions)
Vote B agreed (125 in favour, 9 against, 10 abstentions)

c) The “Racism at Christ Church JCR hustings” Motion (as amended)

Proposer: Ethan Joseph, Ethnic Minorities E&D Rep

Seconded: Naomi Reiter, LGBTQ+ E&D Rep

The JCR notes that:

- a. Racial inequality is a problem we all have a duty to fight*
- b. College administrations, JCRs, MCRs and SCRs together are representative of Oxford University as a whole*
- c. Any incident of potential discrimination, whether it be because of race, sex, gender, disability or other protected identity must be investigated in an open and transparent manner*
- d. Christ church JCR TT20 Cake hustings candidate (Redacted) made a crude, callous and insensitive analogy about George Floyd*
- e. The JCR president of Christ Church sought to prevent other JCRs from debating these issues by appealing to the presidents of these JCRs to abuse their powers in his favour*

The JCR believes that:

- f. When one college fails to uphold the principles of equality, other colleges have a duty to call it out*
- g. In making their crude comment on George Floyd, the Christ church JCR candidate exhibited exceptionally poor judgement*
- h. The Christ Church JCR President and committee failed to deal with this issue appropriately*
- i. Calling out insensitive racist remarks made by office holders across the university is a duty for all of us*
- j. Christ Church JCR committee and the Christ Church deans have sought inappropriate and wholly oppressive measures against a student who sought to challenge a racist and insensitive comment*
- k. That the statement provided by Christ Church on this matter failed to adequately apologise for their efforts to other and shame Ms Onovo in to keeping quiet about the incident for fear of their own reputations.*

The JCR resolves to:

- l. Mandate the JCR President and General Committee to condemn Christ Church JCR president and other committee members who were negligent in their duties*
- m. Mandate the JCR President and General Committee to condemn the Christ Church deans for their handling of the situation.*
- n. Mandate the JCR President and General Committee to affirm their support for Ms Melanie Onovo*
- o. Mandate the JCR President and General Committee to request the public and wholehearted apology of the JCR committee and Christ Church deans for their actions*
- p. Mandate the JCR President and General Committee to refuse to accept any collaboration project with Christ Church until these measures are carried out.*
- q. Mandate the JCR Equality & Diversity Officer to bring a Constitutional Motion to the second Ordinary General Meeting of Michaelmas 2020 a Constitutional Motion to add to the role description of the E&D Reps (Standing Order Table Two, section 2.3a in the JCR Constitution): "VIII. Shall endeavour to condemn*

- and take effective action against endemic discrimination in College and the University as a whole. [¶ q. added by amendment 4]*
- r. Add items l. to p. to Standing Policy under Implementing Resolutions. [¶ r. added by amendment 1]*

Proposing the motion, Ethan Joseph (Ethnic Minorities E&D Rep) said that Oxford University was a racist institution and, as a related institution, so was St John's College. Ethan said that the incident at Christ Church revealed that people were not aware of the extent that the University was a racist institution and the implications of this.

Ethan Joseph, recalling earlier discussions, said some of the reactions to the statements of Melanie Onovo were criticisms that the statements were "disproportionate", or "virtue-signalling". Ethan said these criticisms miss the point: the issue is not restricted to the one incident at Christ Church, although that one incident has been horrific for Melanie Onovo. Ethan said there had been a "repeated failing" of BME students (and black students, in particular) at the University. Ethan said, as the JCR is a part of the University, the JCR had a duty to deal with this failing.

Focussing specifically on the incident at Christ Church, Ethan Joseph said the "Censors" (College Staff Deans) at Christ Church had dealt with the incident badly. Ethan also said that a lot of students had dealt with the incident badly. At a minimum, Ethan said the St John's JCR owed to Melanie Onovo, and everyone affected by racism, a commitment to deal with racism wherever possible.

Explaining the details of the motion, Ethan Joseph said that it sought to condemn the JCR President at Christ Church, as well as the other JCR Committee Members, all of whom had been negligent. The motion also affirmed the St John's JCR's support for Melanie Onovo and sought an apology from the negligent parties.

If the JCR failed to pass the motion, Ethan Joseph said the JCR would be saying "the diminishment of Melanie's experience, and the diminishment of the entire nature of racism within the University, was acceptable". Ethan said this was not acceptable at all, and urged the JCR to pass the motion. Ethan hoped that the issue would not prove contentious and concluded by saying "we could scream about racism until we're blue in the face, but until we do something, it's meaningless". Ethan said this extended to Oliver Tushingham's Constitutional Amendment, which they supported. Ethan reminded members that racism was not exclusive to "some corpulent white man sitting behind the culture desk of the *Daily Mail*", instead racism "is literally etched into the bones of the University".

Supporting the motion, Felix Stocker said "we cannot expect to deal with issues of racism using the normal channels of institutions". To illustrate the point, Felix said they'd been in contact with Melanie Onovo, who had been in hospital. When Melanie went to hospital, the nurses at first "did not believe she went to Oxford University" and thought "she might be making that up". Then, while Melanie was in hospital, the police had broken down Melanie's door and conducted a drug search. Felix said this demonstrated that the systems that Christ Church, the University, the NHS and the Police want to use in relation to Melanie are at the root of the problem. Felix said that people "like me who come from a more traditional Oxford background need to understand that, just because we feel that things aren't being done in the right way, doesn't necessarily mean they shouldn't be done that way" as the normal means don't function.

Responding to the specifics of the motion, Benedict Gardner said they supported the motion but noted that, as the motion was not a Standing Policy motion, it was not clear who in particular the JCR was asking to carry out the motion's effect. Benedict Gardner suggested mandating the JCR President to carry out the aims of the motion. In response, Ethan Joseph (motion proposer) said they'd like the message to come from College. Ethan noted that some of "the most powerful people in our college have been the worst at dealing with racist incidents". Benedict suggested mandating the JCR President to ask College to implement the objects of the motion.

Gemma Robson said, even if College refuses to make a statement, JCR members could still lobby the College, for instance by contacting tutors who sit on the Governing Body. Gemma urged members to consistently keep up pressure on College.

Amendment 1: Adding Provisions to Standing Policy

Proposer: Benedict Gardner

Seconded: Ethan Joseph

1. **Insert** before all Resolving clauses

"Mandate the JCR President and General Committee to"

2. **Insert** at end

- q. "Add items l. to p. to Standing Policy under Implementing Resolutions.

Ethan Joseph **accepted the amendment as friendly.**

Toni Busuttill suggested offering welfare provision for Melanie Onovo, to be decided in consultation with Melanie. Adding to this, Felix Stocker noted that Melanie Onovo has published a [Paypal link](#) and Felix asked whether members might feel willing to contribute personally. Toni said it was important to see Melanie Onovo as an individual as well as a representative for a wider cause. Ethan Joseph said the motion affirmed support for Melanie Onovo, but supported any further proposal to amend the motion to provide further support for Melanie.

Jahnavi Kalayil (Equality & Diversity Officer) asked for the President's judgement about the willingness of College to engage with the JCR and support the motion. Jahnavi noted, when dealing with Maggie Snowling (College President) in the past, it was hard to get College to commit to releasing public statements. Jahnavi suggested mandating the President to speak with Ian Klinke (College Fellow for Equality). In response, Phil Fernandes (President) said if the goal of the motion was to release a public statement, this was relatively easy; however, if the goal of the motion was to push for wider change in College, this would be trickier. Phil said that Maggie Snowling had offered to meet with a group of students to talk generally about some of the issues raised; Phil was unsure whether this would be the right platform to raise specific concerns relating to the Christ Church incident, but they'd wait and see.

Focussing on the specific provisions of clause b. (Refuse to accept any collaboration project with Christ Church until these measures are carried out), Amelia Holt asked for more details about the meaning of "collaboration". Amelia said they were keen to hold Christ Church accountable but was unsure whether the JCR should have faith in the Christ Church Deans apologising (clause o.).

Ethan Joseph said it was a fine line and it would be hard for the JCR to reasonably force the Christ Church Deans into apologising. Ethan suggested an amendment that, instead of asking the Deans directly to apologise, asked the Christ Church JCR to ask the Deans to apologise, which might be a more effective route at achieving the intended ambitions. Harry Sugden suggested that the clause be left in, given there are not many collaborative projects and, if one came along, the motion could simply be amended. Lachlann Hinley (Secretary) added that the provision would expire automatically within a year.

On a point of information, Phil Fernandes (President) noted that the Christ Church JCR Executive Committee had released a [statement](#) affirming their support for the College Deans. Phil asked members to read this statement and consider whether it fulfilled the terms of the motion. In addition, Ethan Joseph encouraged members to read a collection of information about the Christ Church incident, which had been [posted on Facebook](#).

Milo Mallaby expressed concern with the wording “collaboration” in the motion. Milo suggested that the Oxford SU could be considered a “collaboration” project, which would be prohibited by the motion. Milo also suggested that the motion could prevent the JCR from playing sports opposite Christ Church. Responding to the point about sport, in particular, Felix Stocker (Sports Rep) said they’d discussed the issue with others and agreed that a “collaboration” would involve any sporting event. Felix said that this would resemble the boycott of South Africa in sports in the 1980s and 90s. Felix thought this would be appropriate, given the circumstances at Christ Church.

Milo Mallaby raised the issue of the Oxford SU. Lachlann Hinley (Secretary) said they did not believe that this was a reasonable definition of “cooperation”, given St John’s JCR’s relationship is with Oxford SU alone and Christ Church’s participation is incidental. Ethan Joseph said they would be happy if “directly” was inserted before “cooperation”, to make it clear that the motion only intended to prohibit direct cooperation with Christ Church.

Amendment 2: Adding “Directly” before Cooperation

Proposer: Milo Mallaby

Seconded: Ethan Joseph

1. Replace

- q. Mandate the JCR President and General Committee to refuse to accept any collaboration project with Christ Church until these measures are carried out.’

with

- p. Mandate the JCR President and General Committee to refuse to accept any direct collaboration project with Christ Church until these measures are carried out.’

Ethan Joseph **accepted the amendment as friendly**. Ethan added these technicalities revealed a problem with the JCR, where technicalities were seen to get in the way of dealing with issues. Ethan said “I don’t love the bureaucracy of JCRs in general”, as it puts “barriers up, because it’s constantly people trying to fulfil certain requirements that are on a piece of paper before the requirements of human beings”. Ethan said it was not useful to continue to argue technicalities.

Leo Nasskau tried to object to the friendly amendment, but this was determined to be invalid. Leo Nasskau asked whether Ethan Joseph would accept an amendment to undo the effect of amendment 2 by striking the word “directly”. Ethan reiterated their criticism of the JCR procedure and asked for a vote.

Amendment 3: Removing “Directly” before Cooperation

Proposer: Leo Nasskau

Seconded: Jahnvi Kalayil

1. Replace

- q. Mandate the JCR President and General Committee to refuse to accept any direct collaboration project with Christ Church until these measures are carried out.’

with

- q. Mandate the JCR President and General Committee to refuse to accept any collaboration project with Christ Church until these measures are carried out.’

Leo Nasskau, speaking in favour of the amendment, said that the issue was one which the JCR “should really care about”. Leo believed the best way for the JCR to demonstrate this would be by “making significant sacrifices”. Leo thought it would be interesting to know the opinion of the JCR.

Amendment agreed (24 in favour, 10 against, 9 abstentions)

Jahnvi Kalayil (Equality & Diversity Officer) asked if the Constitution could be amended to include in the role description of Equality & Diversity Reps a mandate to “*Endeavour to condemn and take effective action against endemic discrimination in the College and the University as a whole*”. Oliver Tushingam suggested that a Standing Policy Motion should be passed to mandate the President to bring the issue as a Constitutional Motion in Michaelmas. Jahnvi said they were happy to take on this mandate.

Amendment 4: Mandating President to Add to Duties of E&D Reps

Proposer: Oliver Tushingam

Seconded: Jahnvi Kalayil

1. Insert new clause

- q. Mandate the JCR Equality & Diversity Officer to bring a Constitutional Motion to the second Ordinary General Meeting of Michaelmas 2020 a Constitutional Motion to add to the role description of the E&D Reps (Standing Order Table Two, section 2.3a in the JCR Constitution): "VIII. Shall endeavour to condemn and take effective action against endemic discrimination in College and the University as a whole."

Ethan Joseph **accepted the amendment as friendly.**

Agreed (108 in favour, 16 against, 20 abstentions)

**d) The “Immediately Release the 2020 Admissions Statistical Report”
Standing Policy Motion**

Proposer: Sofia Henderson, Women’s E&D Rep

Seconded: Ethan Joseph, Ethnic Minorities E&D Rep

This JCR notes that:

- a. *It has been revealed that the University of Oxford has delayed publishing student admission data due to “world events”.*
- b. *An email communicating this was emailed to staff on the afternoon of Wednesday 3rd June 2020, reading: “After careful consideration of the current world events and also learning that Cambridge will not be publishing its admissions data until late June, the decision to postpone the release of the annual admissions statistical report has been taken”.*
- c. *The Black Lives Matter movement has recently risen to particular prominence following the murder of George Floyd, an innocent black man, by Minnesotan police, prompting protests across the globe.*
- d. *The University’s 2019 undergraduate admissions statistical report, released in May 2019, revealed that 18.3% of its 2018 UK intake identified as BME, compared to 25.6% across all UK universities in 2016.*
- e. *Of this 18.3%, only 2.6% identified as Black.*
- f. *In January 2020, the University released BME undergraduate statistics for their 2019 intake, revealing that 22% of students of its 2019 intake identified as BME.*
- g. *Of this 22%, only 3.1% identified as Black.*
- h. *Of first-year undergraduate students across the UK in 2016, 8% were Black.*
- i. *The University has received criticism in the past, from press, politicians and students, in response to its low numbers of Black students.*
- j. *The University has also received criticism for its institutionalised racism.*
- k. *On Tuesday, 2nd June 2020, the University released a short statement on Twitter, reading: “We’re committed to supporting our community in opposing racism in all its forms, including upholding anti-racist values.”*

This JCR believes that:

- l. *The University’s reference to “world events” is in reference to the Black Lives Matter movement and the protests following the murder of George Floyd.*
- m. *The University has therefore chosen to delay the release of its annual admissions statistical report because of fear of fresh backlash and reputational damage.*
- n. *Institutionalised racism remains deeply entrenched in the UK, including in the University of Oxford.*
- o. *The University’s refusal to release admissions statistics at the usual time shows an unwillingness to be critically reflexive and thus is in direct contradiction to its recent statement on its commitment to uphold anti-racist values.*

This JCR therefore resolves to:

- p. *Mandate the JCR President to send an open letter to the University of Oxford and the Vice Chancellor, demanding that the University immediately release the 2020 admissions statistical report on its 2019 intake.*

- q. *Mandate the JCR President to also include in the letter the demand that the University of Oxford publicly release a plan of action for raising the percentage of UK-domiciled students who identify as BME, as well as the percentage of UK-domiciled students who identify as Black African or Caribbean in particular, to at least the average across UK universities.*
- r. *Add items p and q to the JCR Standing Policy as Implementing Resolutions.*

Sofia Henderson (Women's E&D Rep) said a leaked email revealed the University intended to delay the release of the annual admissions statistics report "due to world events". Sofia said this was unacceptable and contradicted the University's commitment on "upholding anti-racist values." Sofia said it showed the University was more concerned for its reputation than the welfare of black students, who often found they were the only black students doing their subject in a given year.

Sofia Henderson said the motion would mandate the JCR President to write a letter to the Vice Chancellor demanding the release of the statistics.

Ethan Joseph (Ethnic Minorities E&D Rep) said clause q. specifically called on the University to "publicly release a plan of action for raising the percentage of UK-domiciled students who identify as BME, as well as the percentage of UK-domiciled students who identify as Black African or Caribbean in particular".

Phil Fernandes (President) said the situation was "bizarre". Phil had received indications from the Oxford SU that the statistics are actually *better* than expected, but the University didn't want to take away from the "discourse over world events". Phil said one College Bursar had reportedly called the matter "a massive cock-up over communications".

In response, Sofia Henderson said it was their impression that the University was "trying to cover its back". Ethan Joseph added that the JCR should advocate for transparency wherever possible.

Amelia Holt said, even if the University had made a mistake in their communications strategy, it was still a major blunder that came across badly. Amelia encouraged the JCR to agree with the motion. Both Sofia Henderson and Ethan Joseph reacted with a thumbs up.

Agreed (116 in favour, 9 against, 18 abstentions)

e) The “Black Literature Matters” Constitutional Motion

Proposer: Leo Nasskau

Seconded: Gemma Robson

This JCR notes that:

- a. *Racism exists across the world and Oxford is not immune from this.*
- b. *Much of this racism is covert or implicit, rather than overt, and significantly stems from a lack of understanding.*
- c. *This could be tackled by supporting non-academic Black literature, which helps people understand how Black creators contribute to our society.*
 - i. *This extends to academic literature published by Black publishers but not included on Oxford reading lists.*
- d. *Secondly, in academic reading lists at Oxford, material by Black authors or on the topic of racism is less common and difficult to locate in libraries.*
- e. *JCR members thus miss out on this crucial perspective and an understanding of how Black creators contribute to and improve our society.*
- f. *It is important that Black-publishers provide opportunities for underrepresented Black creators.*
- g. *The Library is “happy to discuss the scheme” and was enthusiastic about making it work.*
- h. *The JCR allocated £2,700 for art purchases recently.*
- i. *This motion would create a JCR Society for this end, ensuring that Gemma’s notion is practised well into the future.*

This JCR believes that:

- j. *The JCR should help members engage with literature produced by Black creators. As a result, they better understand how Black people contribute to our society more generally.*
- k. *The JCR should support Black publishers and bookstores because it is important to provide Black creators with opportunities. This is important at any time, but these beneficiaries are also under particular pressure due to coronavirus and many small bookstores are closing.*
- l. *The members of the JCR nominated to initially run the JCR Society are fit to do so.*
- m. *We should ensure that JCR members who wish to study race relations and race issues are not prevented from doing so by lack of reading material.*

This JCR therefore resolves to:

- n. *Insert in Appendix VII of the JCR Constitution:*

Black Literature Society

Purpose:

- i. *Maintain a “reading list” during every academic year, with input from the informal but JCR-administrated BME Facebook group (“St John’s BME Community”), as well as recognising suggestions from the entire JCR, which contains literature:*
 - a. *by Black creators of non-fiction, short stories, or poetry;*

- b. *published by publishers who emphasise Black creators; or*
 - c. *concerning race relations and race issues which feature on a reading list.*
- ii. *Buy literature on that “reading list” in July and August, delivering books ideally before Week 0 Michaelmas*
 - a. *Where possible and in consultation with the Disabilities E&D Rep, the Society will also make available books in an accessible format, such as by buying digital versions in addition to physical copies.*
- iii. *Make this content available to members of the JCR, in consultation with the following, whilst noting that there may be other avenues for making content available beyond the following:*
 - a. *The College Library*
 - b. *The JCR E&D Sub-Committee*
- iv. *When carrying out its functions, the Society shall consider the following purposes*
 - a. *To help people engage with literature produced by Black creators. As a result, readers will understand more how black people contribute to our society more generally.*
 - b. *To support Black publishers and bookstores, giving Black creators opportunities. This ensures that their necessary perspective is heard.*
 - c. *To provide valuable, intellectual, and academic materials for use of the JCR which should be made widely available to JCR members.*

Yearly allocation

- i. *£2,000 in 2019/20*
- ii. *£150*

Designated contacts

- i. *Chair: JCR President (currently Phil Fernandes)*
- ii. *Secretary: BME Rep (currently Ethan Joseph)*
- iii. *Treasurer: Gemma Robson*

- o. *Mandate the JCR Treasurer to create a new budget for the Black Literature Society in the 2020 Budget.*
- p. *Mandate the JCR Treasurer to decrease the Financial Motions Budget by £2,000 and increase the Black Literature Society budget by £2,000.*
- q. *Noting that this is a particularly important and emergency case, mandate the JCR Treasurer to bring a budget-reallocation motion to the next JCR meeting to replenish the Financial Motions Budget if deemed necessary.*
- r. *Mandate the JCR President, JCR Treasurer, JCR Equality & Diversity Officer, JCR Equality & Diversity Sub-Committee and JCR General Committee to work to implement this motion.*

Speaking favour of the motion, Leo Nasskau said that recent events “had inspired people to take action”. Leo hoped the motion would help tackle racism by Black Literature Society

which would aim to create a reading list made up of the following categories: Black creators of non-fiction, short stories, or poetry; literature published by publishers who emphasise Black creators; and thirdly, books concerning race relations and race issues which feature on an academic reading list of a JCR member. Both the JCR President and the Ethnic Minorities E&D Rep would help lead the new society.

Leo Nasskau had considered suitable solutions for storing books that were purchased. The College Library was enthusiastic about storing most of the books bought, so long as 'ground rules' were established. In addition, bookshelves should be installed in the JCR Office, similar to the current arrangements for DVDs. These bookshelves could also carry commemorative messages respecting the ambitions of the project. Leo said that the Society would also be consulting with the Disabilities E&D Rep about buying books in an accessible format, where possible.

Leo Nasskau outlined three arguments in favour of creating a new society:

- First, to help people engage with literature produced by black creators. This would help members of the St John's College community understand how important black people are for our society.
- Second, to support publishers and bookstores that focus on publishing and selling content from black creators. These shops are very small and are thus particularly threatened by the coronavirus pandemic, so it is an added benefit that we can support some small businesses at this time.
- The society would ensure that valuable, intellectual, and academic materials are provided to the JCR and members of the College more generally; namely, by buying material on reading lists.

Finally, Leo Nasskau discussed financing. This year generally the JCR has underspent compared to its budget and we have a lot of money, and the motion asks for £2,000 initially to buy digital and physical literature and facilitate sharing it with the JCR, and then £150 per year thereafter to make sure that this as a project lasts.

Leo Nasskau said the JCR President had told them that the amount being asked for is fine. Leo said the JCR had spent £2,700 on art recently, which demonstrated the necessary resources existed.

On a point of information, Tom Ritter noted that the MCR operated a similar scheme called the "Uncomfortable Library", with a special focus on intersectional literature. Tom noted that this scheme worked effectively and relied on a sign-out scheme for material. Tom said this demonstrated such schemes were viable.

Supporting the motion, Gemma Robson said they had come across small bookshops, focussing on literature from black creators, which struggled in the best of times. Gemma noted these bookshops were important to them personally, as a black person, and in the interests of wider cultural understanding. Gemma said that these independent book shops often had expertise in identifying literature relating to the African diaspora and black British culture. Gemma suggested this could be a starting point in identifying appropriate books to buy.

On a point of information, Ben Robinson (Treasurer) said there was currently £2,864.44 in the Financial Motions Budget. Leo Nasskau said that the motion mandated the Treasurer to replenish the Financial Motions Budget from other areas in the event it was expended. Phil Fernandes (President) said that the motion was fine this term, owing to the unique financial situation of the JCR.

Agreed (127 in favour, 2 against, 11 abstentions)

6. Any Other Business

Invalid Motions

Lachlann Hinley (Secretary) noted that invalid motions were submitted. Lachlann said there was more information on the agenda explaining why the motions were invalid.