

# JCSU ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING

**Disclaimer: the minutes below are as an accurate record of what was said as it was practicable to produce. Many speeches were impassioned and a verbatim transcript of what was said is not possible to record. Indeed, many exchanges were too swift to minute. These minutes are not a perfect account of what was said, but it represents the JCSU's best efforts. The purpose of these minutes is to provide an official written record of the meeting, not a verbatim transcript.**

There will be an OGM of the JCSU on Thursday 18<sup>th</sup> February 2016 at 7PM in the Webb Library.

**Present:** the President (Daisy Eyre), the Vice-President (Ellen Parker), the Treasurer (Anand Sharma), the Secretary (Jamie Sandall), the Services Officer (Christina Lane), the Communications Officer (George Thompson), the Access Officer (Amelia Oakley), the Green Officer (Tim Lennox), the Ents Officers (Niall Devlin & Harrison MacNeill), the Women's Officer (Abigail Smith), the Welfare Officers (Joe Hamilton & Rebecca Lewis), the Mental Health and Disabilities Officer (Eddie Conway), the LGBT+ Officer (Andy Burnett) and the Racial Equalities Officer (Ore Ogunbiyi).

Absent: International Officer (Man Hon Ding),

## **1. Executive reports of actions since last OGM**

DE – Attended committees, sent presidential bulletins. Was successful with AB and rainbow flag will be flown. Started annual survey (Monday midnight deadline) interesting and helpful responses so far. Set up team first in Jesus. Had ballot and rents meetings. Hosted disability referendum. As an update on caff prices: working to lower to a more reasonable level (annual survey will be useful evidence for Tuesday's meeting), have also been conducting research from other colleges research at other colleges

EP – Organised halfway hall, coordinated over MCR stash, and attendee CUSU council with DE. Working with CUSU over writing letter to counselling service

JS – Have been organising meetings (including this one) and writing minutes. Organised society/club photographs for next term

ASh – Liaising with the finance officer, reimbursing societies

GT – Website consultation, JCSU website overhauled, offered IT support to committee

MHD (via GT) – Organized a meeting with exchange students. Organized a formal swap with Peterhouse. Pursued and begin to set up potential Easter term activities for welfare/stress reduction. In the process of organizing a survey for international students to better understand their needs

JH/RL – Organising wellness week, drafting policy for welfare on call. Wrote up confidentiality policy for all welfare issues. Secured a college councillor

OO – Most in the agenda (under matter (a)), talking to other BME officers about swaps looking to organised one for fresher's week

TL – Looking at Green initiatives. Secured IT commitment to make doubled sided printing standard. Green formal in the next week

CL – Organising room ballots, liaising with staff members about caff and rooms, helping to do annual survey

ND/HmCN – Organised bop, advertised on Facebook, set up for halfway hall etc.

EC – Main was referendum coordination, audiobooks for library

AO – Organised CUSU shadowing scheme, rewrote student room page, working with college on alternative prospectus, organised access forum (held tomorrow)

AB – Secured flag being flown at end of the month, set up anonymous texting service

ASm – Bought tampons/pads, organised movie/pizza night, attended student affairs committee regarding sexual harassment policy

## **2. Members' questions to the Executive**

Aiden Golden (AG) – progress on the pool table?

CL – Has proven very problematic: van broke down and didn't fit down corridor. Have had to get smaller table which I am hoping will arrive in the next couple of weeks

## **3. Junior Treasurer report on JCSU Enterprise Account**

ASh – To explain, there is a JCSU bank account for the majority of reimbursements. The enterprise account is used for rest of expenditure (gown sales, garden party etc.). The Reasoning for this is that main account is managed by finance office (signed by Senior treasurer). We have greater autonomy over this account. I present monthly statements at meetings committee. Stash was the first payment and halfway hall expenses. Enterprise account ran a deficit last year, hopefully break even this year (maybe even a surplus due to involvement with team first).

## **4. Ordinary Motions**

GT (Chair) – clarifies procedure for the meeting noting that non-Jesuan's may only speak at the invitation of the chair

Nadine Batchelor-Hunt (NBH) – why should Jason Okundaye (JO) not be allowed to speak? He can't vote. He should be given the chance to speak about his culture and his heritage

GT – issues is largely that others that have been consulted aren't present. The motion is yet to be opened to a university wide debate

NBH – not a debate, this is more than just Jesus college. This is about Nigeria. Why silence a black voice from this tribe? Why should we in this room be justified in silencing this voice? Will need to consult BME campaign moving forward

GT – this is a meeting of the college itself. Wary of creating a precedent

NBH – not a debate. Listen to what he has to say

GT – opportunity to introduce a procedural motion over who can speak. Anyone who does object should do so, my position is purely constitutional

OO – I am involved in the proposal. I am also Nigerian whilst JO is from Benin, I make a sufficient case for the people of Nigeria - we have consulted the government. I do think I have the place to speak on behalf of Nigeria, especially with the statement from the Minister of Culture and Information. This is still a collegiate matter; we are just asking for the mandate to continue

NBH – why are you scared about letting him speak?

AG – 3.2.3 states that a member of another college maybe present and speak with permission of chair

GT – not an assertion on my part, my concern over doing this without doing that is no differing view points

Freya Sorrell – OO, you can't assume you speak on behalf on JO?

OO – he has a right to speak for his tribe, I am from Nigerian and have done the research I feel I have enough representation for the proposal. There is no need

Ethan Axelrod (EA) – both OO and JO have knowledge that a lot of us don't have surely having as many different opinions is necessary

Marcell Fekete (MF) – we should hear his opinion; it is important

Gary Rushton (GR) – important to hear all viewpoints, want to hear arguments first

GT – not one of a personal matter, is a constitutional matter I am conscious of representing balance

ND – JO has contacted people from the tribe

GT – 3.214 vote on JO being heard

Yes – 49

No - 0

Abstain – 10

Procedural motion passed

**(a) To support the Benin Bronze Appreciation Committee's proposal that the Benin Bronze Cockerel in the Hall is repatriated to Nigeria, as outlined in the draft of the proposal from the Benin Bronze Appreciation Committee.**

**The JCSU notes:**

**1.** That the Cockerel in Hall is an authentic Benin Bronze which was taken from the Kingdom of Benin in 1897. In 1897, the British carried out a "Punitive Expedition" in response to an

earlier altercation in which a number of British officials were killed on a trip to the city. When the news of their deaths reached London, the punitive expedition was ordered and the British army arrived with reinforcements and completely destroyed the city, exiling the King of Benin.

2. While the city was destroyed, thousands of bronze and ivory carvings were looted and brought back to Europe, to be sold in order to fund the expedition.

3. The cockerel in hall found its way to Jesus College, Cambridge after a British Army Officer, Capt. George William Neville, bequeathed it to the College in 1930 after he died in 1929. He had 128 pieces and we believe that his son being a Jesuan was his connection to the College.

4. The Benin Bronze Appreciation Committee are in contact with a Nigerian government minister who supports the Benin Bronze Appreciation Committee's attempt to repatriate the cockerel.

**The JCSU believes:**

1. That the considering the moral case and the positive benefits outlined in the proposal the time is now right to repatriate the cockerel to the Royal Palace of Benin in line with existing protocol.

2. Given the extensive research they have done, and the combined experience they have of negotiating with the College, the Benin Bronze Appreciation Committee, exclusively, are the right body to continue to work on the proposal and to present it to the College, aiming for it to be discussed at College Council.

**The JCSU resolves:**

1. To support the Benin Bronze Appreciation Committee's draft of the proposal outlined in their paper, that the Benin Bronze Cockerel is returned to the Royal Palace of Benin in Nigeria.

2. To support their recommendation that the College hosts a repatriation ceremony where the Cockerel is formally handed over.

3. To support their recommendation that the College commissions a new work to go in its stead.

4. To give the Benin Bronze Appreciation Committee the mandate to continue to work on and adapt the proposal as they respond to different points of view, encounter new counterarguments and are presented with new evidence.

**Proposed by:** Amatey Doku (AD)

**Seconded by:** Ore Ogunbiyi, Jake Cohen-Setton, Benjamin Simpson (BS)

GT – invites speech by AD, the proposer

AD – I am Ghanaian, and am presenting the proposal that we should support 4 different propositions. I will start with a brief history behind the bronze. The bronze cockerel, an authentic Benin bronze, was stolen on a punitive expedition in response to the killing of British traders. The city destroyed with over 3,000 pieces of art being stolen. The Bronze in hall made its way into Jesus College after it was bequeathed by an army captain whose son attended the college. Has been in hall 20 years.

For us, repatriation is the only option. The moral argument is clear. Quote from proposal: “We cannot erase history. Yet the racist and ‘civilizing’ agenda of the colonising mission is something that today we not only disagree with, but renounce entirely.” It is inappropriate to celebrate a looted item.

We are asking you to support the proposition that it be returned; that there be a repatriation ceremony; to support the recommendation that college commission a new work; and to give the BBAC mandate to continue to work on an adapted proposal and to enter the formal discussions and negotiations with college.

The minister saw the proposal this morning, he said he would be prepared to come to college for a repatriation ceremony (subject to confirmation). We have already started working on college, there is a meeting scheduled with the master tomorrow morning. The Arts committee will need to be consulted before going to college council. A repatriation society has also been consulted, they told of how much it means to the people of Benin. Emergency meeting will be called of ethical affairs; we need the mandate of the JCSU to continue.

Will be taken to College Council on the 7<sup>th</sup>. Optimistic over current position, we will ultimately get the people of Benin what they want.

Three important points:

1. It is a draft proposal, please give feedback. The Minister of Culture and Information will be giving feedback
2. In the proposal we assert that a repatriation would advance College’s financial position, we have reflected on this and it has been removed from proposal.
3. Very important that we’re clear with College, as they are spooked. Should be a positive occasion as before, as with previous repatriations. If college doesn’t get 100% behind this hard to see how a productive debate can be had, want to encourage college to do the right thing. Do email any of us if you have any questions. Thank you.

OO - seconded

MF – where would this cock go?

AD – going to the royal palace of Benin, home of the royal family (official residence) in line with current protocol. From there can decide whether to put in museum.

GT – invite points of opposition

NBH – I am an old JCSU racial equalities officer. I was part of the BBAC and I will explain my differences, I fundamentally believe should be repatriated and thank the committee for their work. It is the right thing to do. I am a co-founder of this society after my DoS approached me.

Several days ago, the committee produced this proposal I took issue with it after reading it. Here is a taste of proposal before: “being regarded more highly as a forward thinking centre of academic excellence.” This was removed at my request. Other language I took issue with included “reaping the benefits”.

The BBAC rejected any agreement over taking out any of the neo-colonial narrative. I am here to remove such language regarding gained prestige. Have contacted the wider BME committee and the FLY campaign – I was criticised over contacting these people by the committee. They argued I shouldn't be discussing with them before passing through the JCSU.

They claim that this is a draft, yet it was sent to Nigerian Government? Couldn't leave situation as it was, contacted academics over my concerns. Money is nothing to do with this, academics across the university have condemned this paper. All agreed that financial motives should be in no way included.

With these things considered, the position that the BBAC are “exclusively ... the right body to continue to work on the proposal” is an attempt to silence voices in the BME community. If we pass this motion, we tell such people that their views are irrelevant. I ran a previous campaign with comprehensive press management I know how it works, yet I was still unceremoniously removed from the BBAC

It is morally reprehensible to focus on positive benefits for College. Referring to it as a 'gift' is inadequate. Having made inquiries in wider BME found out Jason is from Edo tribe. Despite the massacre and unceremonious theft Jason was told his views would not be considered

GT – can we keep discussion to the motion

NBH – want to take the time to explain my position

CS – as a point of opposition from the proposal what are you opposing exactly?

NBH – want to take time to present in it's entirety

CS – taking out the content of the proposal from the motion which bits are you against. Please could you clarify for each point of the proposal

GT – NBH please continue and finish before JO speaks

NBH – if you haven't read it you shouldn't vote, the outcome of this votes represents every single one of you. The proposal mentions the University's global agenda, this should play no role in repatriation, this should be struck out. Should be referred to in original name (Okukor). Moreover, the gesture was phrased in the wrong language, it is an act of justice that is writing a larger wrong. The proposal states that the meaning and value of objects change, from whose perspective is this? Find this confusing. The proposal argues we should track its progress during it's repatriation, this is patronising, this is nothing to do with us? Their decision what they do with it

MF – if we give back (right or wrong) still want to hear what's happening to with it

JO – I come here today from Pembroke. I am from the tribe; it is disingenuous that AD has presented his argument as simply a matter of getting the statue back. Not sure how many of you have read through this unprofessional proposal, disgusting that the massacre of so many of my people is treated as a joke. Does not take into true consideration the true benefits of Nigeria. This is not about Jesus, or this paternalistic narrative. Spoke to my father, outraged that this can be phrased in such a manner. It is disrespectful to my culture; the Bronze is not referenced by name. Only one reason why I came, whilst I totally support repatriation, the conditions and circumstances under which this has happened are disgusting. BME community has condemned the proposal, I will condemn by writing an open letter if this is passed. The BBAC cannot think this is their exclusive the business. Why should I not have the right to speak, why is my opinion less important that a Minister who does not come from Benin? Appreciate that for me to come here, I am shocked and appalled this proposal is disgusting. This college knows this is disgusting. Insult that the can pass this without proper understanding. Insult that the BBAC will only think of the economic benefit. Idiotic and morally bankrupt to continue in this vein

GT – please keep this non-personal

NBH – it is personal, they said they didn't want him to speak and I won't stand for a black voice being silenced

OO – this is about the constitution, it is not about race

NBH – yes it is!

JH – restores order to me meeting

GT – invites JO to continue speaking

JO – the opinion of two white men is not valid, whilst I respect their research and interest how can you can present such a disgusting document? Have any of you actually read this? Contains poor grammar, clearly no consideration on this. Has too much emphasis on Jesus college, this is actively morally reprehensible. Location of it in Jesus is irrelevant, I am not afraid to say that this is not the concern of the white population of this University. They attempted to shut down my voice, you cannot keep shutting down black voices. If you respect blackness, and human dignity you will not support the BBAC. The proposal has to be restarted and the whole BME community consulted. The fact that this is so disorganised, is being rushed because AD in graduating. This is an insult to all your intelligences. Fundamentally, there are so many issues with this document

Sogo Akintaro – I am also Nigerian. Want to thank the committee for their work. This is something that needs to be done. Appreciate everyone's input. This isn't about us at Jesus college, or who put the proposal together, this is about the people of Benin and artefact itself. Yes, inclusivity needs to be worked on. Should be receptive to people's opinions and appreciate Jason's concerns. Up to college what they do with it, after that people should be consulted. Should be done as quickly as possible

OO – a lot of the rhetoric over it being a draft, it was sent to Minister of Culture and Information for him to raise issues. That’s why it’s a draft. He raised no such concerns. Worse for us to say the people of Benin should be cornered about this. He is elected to speak on behalf of the people and if the Nigerian Minister of Culture and Information has no issue with it, we are in no position to tell them what they should and shouldn't be concerned about. All sorts of respect for people living in diaspora, but the bigger picture is that we need to repatriate this. We spoke to a bronze repatriation expert who said that grown men cried after the return of pieces in 2014. If you have issue talk to AD, the bigger picture is that we get this repatriated. Don’t loose site of what matter here

AD – procedural motion that this is put to a vote

MF – Can that document still be change?

OO – yes

Ben Appleton – possibility that the proposal be amended if vote is delayed?

GT – reads motion in full. And clarifies what is happening. Procedural motion to move to vote on the motion:

Yes - 24

Abstain – 6

No - 29

GT - proceed with procedural motion rejected

DE – want this motion to be passed. Possible that we could find a way of moving forward if we were to change the exclusivity clause

JO – too focused on idea of exclusivity. I have no faith in people currently orchestrating this. I have been told I can’t voice my opinion. Reject not so that it can be amended; from start to finish this has changed, been unprofessional, disorganised. The college is aware and unhappy; they will throw it out. I want it returned, your college is aware of this proposal they are prised off and they think that it is a joke, do you think they time to listen to a joke?

AD – Firstly, at no point have we said he couldn’t speak. Secondly, college isn’t pissed off, they are nervous. We have a meeting tomorrow morning, and it has been confirmed that a decision will be made on the 7<sup>th</sup>. Needs to be passed by ethics and works of art committee before going to council. They do not think it is a joke, taking this very seriously. Hope people have confidence that they won’t throw this out

Bethany Hutchinson – glad JO was able to speak - appreciated hearing your opinion. I do have confidence in people running this campaign. Glad this has been brought to student body, valid concerns over proposal. I have concerns over problematic exclusivity clause, believe an amendment is necessary

FS – concern at just changing it that as discussion tomorrow has already been arranged for tomorrow. Concern that it is already arranged and contaminates only two people



Will Thurwell – The big issue is the exclusivity; it is only motioned in the ‘JCSU believes’ section. Are we voting on ‘the JCSU believes’ or ‘JCSU resolves’?

GT – less important than resolution. But there is an important interrelation

OO – think that as much as it isn’t mentioned in the resolution, it gives us a mandate to continue. Implied that we will be given mandate to continue.

RL – if this is rejected what are plans moving forward?

NBH – it is an intrinsically positive thing, wasn’t supposed to be about division. Issues came with inclusion of neo-colonialist rhetoric, want a broader inclusion of BME community, JO etc. We need to go back to drawing board – th most important voice is JO’s. Why rush it though? Decolonising in this University won’t happen quickly, it is about changing the dynamic in college. Believe that this Bronze will go back, but it’s about how we do it. Need to eradicate such colonial narratives. We are an academic intuition; we know this is morally wrong to propose this in this way. Want to start this the right way. The BBAC has already drafted articles for Varsity, this is so snakey. Want to involve everyone invested in doing this the right way

OO – small point regarding keeping it secret, had to keep relatively quiet as we didn’t have the mandate to carry on. This has got to college, we would have got in trouble if we did not have a clear and strong proposal. We needed time to prepare that. Wasn’t about hiding things from people, we are coming to the students now to ask for your support. We are open to suggestion and this is why we are presenting this to you now. College would have been a lot more nervous if they hadn’t been presented in such a way

CS – in terms of college taking it seriously they have removed from hall - clearly concerned. If we reject the motion it shows we are not committed to the issue. Might not take as seriously next time. Should be seen as the beginning of a process. Before it gets to College Council there is the time where people can get involved. By voting this through we will allow more dialogue

JO – I challenge BH’s confidence. I have zero confidence. Not serious or professional enough. Don’t believe your confidence overshoots mine

BH – I never said that, at all

AO – would like to propose amendment given the meeting is tomorrow. Goes forward as a draft with current committee, just a discussion. I propose that the current proposal goes forward as draft. After this all we be involved in amending proposal. Might not be feasible for the 7<sup>th</sup>, after all consultation will got to next College Council.

BH – want to go through, my amendment is similar. Most important thing is that it’s returned. Agree with AO.

GT – calls a recess. Exacting wording of motion worked out by NBH, AD, OO, BS, JO, AO and JS.

AO – Amendment:

The Master will be informed that the college support the proposal to repatriate the Okukor. After this stage, an expanded committee will meet, including other members of the BME community, to redraft the proposal. It will then be submitted to the next college council committee, provided the proposal has been finalised.

GT – vote on the amended Motion

Yes – 55

Abstain – 0

No – 0

GT – motion passed

Applause

GR – who will decide the committee?

AD – no formal agreement, anyone interested can help with finalising

NBH – deciding when finalised shouldn't be an issue, we don't disagree now – will be consensual

BS – want to clarify something regarding College Council: the proposal is just a way of convincing them

NBH – procedural motion to take the amended motion to a vote

GT – vote on the procedural motion to move to vote on the amended motion

Yes – 55

Abstain – 0

No - 0

GT – vote to pass the amended motion

Yes – 55

Abstain – 0

No – 0

GT – Motion passed

Applause

**(b) Introduction of Emergency Meetings**

**The JCSU notes:**

**1.** That there is currently no effective means through which we can call emergency open meetings to declare agreement/disagreement with CUSU referendums and other issues that

unexpectedly arise in term.

**The JCSU believes:**

1. That the ability for the college to democratically voice their opinion on pressing issues throughout term is essential.

**The JCSU resolves:**

1. To amend the constitution to allow for the calling of emergency meetings by the JCSU to discuss and take votes on pressing issues unrelated to constitutional change that cannot wait for OGMs or AGMs, such as in the case of CUSU referendums.

**Proposed by:** Eddie Conway

**Seconded by:** Niall Devlin

AO - procedural motion to delay this motion to next meeting

Yes – 31

Abs – 0

No - 0

**(c) Funding for Jesus College Amnesty International Society**

**The JCSU believes:**

1. That the newly formed Jesus College Amnesty International is in need of £60 funding for Lent and Easter term. This funding would go towards the organisation of the termly fundraisers, printing of urgent action letters and providing snacks for Amnesty meetings.

**The JCSU resolves:**

1. To allocate the £60 requested to cover the detailed expenses.

**Proposed by:** Ellie Williams

**Seconded by:** Benedict Welch

EW – just founded, requesting £60 worth of funding to cover expenses

GR – seconded, very important cause

GT – No opposition speeches: motion passed nem con

**(d) Budget for Women's officer**

**The JCSU believes:**

1. That the Women's Officer is in need of £120 funding, for Lent and Easter, and

retrospectively Michaelmas. This funding would go towards providing free sanitary products, organising activism events, and providing food for events.

**The JCSU resolves:**

1. To allocate the £120 requested to cover the detailed expenses

**Proposed by:** Abigail Smith

**Seconded by:** Rebecca Lewis

ASm – a mix up meant I did not receive a budget this year. Would like £120 for tampons, sanitary pads and snacks.

GR – is this sufficient?

ASm - yes

RL - seconded

GT - no opposition speeches: motion passed nem con

**5. Emergency motions**

**6. Any other business**

**The meeting closed at 9:30PM.**