

Finalized

Approved March 4, 2014

AGENDA
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION COUNCIL
Ackerman Grand Ballroom
February 25, 2014
7:00 PM

PRESENT: John Joanino, Avi Oved, Maryssa Hall, Daren Ramalho, Omar Arce, Sam Haws, Lauren Rogers, Armen Hadjimanoukian, Savannah Badalich, Jessica Kim, Jessica Trumble, Lizzy Naameh, Sunny Singh, Cynthia Jasso, Patty Zimmerman, Lauren Lazarovici, Dr. Berky Nelson, Dr. Debra Geller, Danielle Dimacali

ABSENT:

GUESTS:

I. Call to Order

-Joanino calls the meeting to order at 7:02pm.

II. A. Approval of the Agenda

-Oved moved to add SJP to Special Presentations. Hall seconded.

-Hall moved to strike EVP Travel and Advocacy Grant. Trumble seconded.

-Oved moved to have A Resolution to Divest from Companies that Violate Palestinian Human Rights to after Special Presentations. Haws seconded.

13-0-0 the agenda is approved.

III. Approval of the Minutes from February 18, 2014

-Oved moved to approve the minutes. Hall seconded.

13-0-0 the minutes are approved.

III. Public Comments

Jaimeson Cortez

-He invites everyone for the EVP Down to Fund campaign.

Johnny Tran

-He invites everyone to the South East Asian Admit Weekend to be hosts and have students in their dorm. Please email at seadmit@gmail.com.

Dr. Nelson

-He is glad to see everyone here, this is the third or fourth time this topic has come up while he has been at council. He wants everyone to keep in mind that this problem did

not originate in the Pro-Palestinian or Pro-Israeli. This is something rooted in Europe, it was Great Britain that made promises to both groups of people about the land. Here we are, 100 years later, debating something that started in Europe. Other parties at fault would be Russia, France, and Germany because these people were living in harmony together until Europe got involved. He doesn't want anyone to be mad at anyone here, move the anger elsewhere to where it really belongs which is the people from Europe who created this problem. The second thing he wants to share is the experience he had roughly 15 years ago, there was a longstanding organization that brought the alumni back here to meet. He was fortunate enough to attend the meeting, and what nestled in his mind was that one a leader alum stood up in front of the 40 people and said, "I want you to know that I did not like you then, and I don't like you now." All of you are bruins, think in terms of unanimity you have, and don't let comments become so deeply ingrained that you have an enemy for life. The problem with Californians is that Californians don't leave the state. He wants everyone to have a good concept of bruin fellowship. Look upon this as an intellectual gathering, and please, go bruins!

Brian Hertz

My name is Brian Hertz, and I'm a second year Human Biology and Society Major. I struggle a lot with this issue, which I have now seen divide this campus three times. In middle school, I had an English teacher who, in teaching us writing skills, always told us to pick one side of an argument and go all out with it. And I always hated that. I always wanted to acknowledge the other side of the argument. As a society we have been taught to pick our side and stand up for it. But sitting here and listening to this room, I know this is wrong. We shouldn't be taking sides. We should be coming together to find a way to actually improve the situation, both on our campus and in the Middle East. Rather than wasting blood, sweat, and tears fighting over a bill with no effect on the actual situation, we should unite our efforts to find real solutions that make nobody feel unsafe or oppressed. The two major slates on this campus are Let's Act and Bruins United. But voting either way on this bill will bring no Action and no Unity. So I'm asking Council to please not take a side on this issue, but instead encourage a bill that includes both sides and actually improves the situation. End this argument so we can work toward a solution instead of trying to win it.

Anais Engel

Hi everyone, my name is Anais Engel. Last year, the candidates from Bruin Alliance took the position that divestment is not an issue that belongs on the council table; however, maintaining that position now would be irresponsible because it IS on the table and has had an especially detrimental effect on campus climate in the past few weeks. The only strength of a USAC resolution is that it is supposed to carry the support of students throughout UCLA, like the movement for divestment during the apartheid. Now matter how genuine the intention is, this resolution does not carry nearly the weight that

the apartheid divestment did because it has clear opposition as well as clear support. Whether council members vote Yes, No, or Abstain, they are sure to damage their legitimacy and working relationships with a large section of campus. We are basically in a loselose situation if USAC votes on this resolution tonight; if it passes, many students will feel alienated and attacked. If it fails, many students will feel alienated and attacked. There is no way to attain the goals of both groups, but there is a way to compromise. So instead of voting up or down, USAC should refer the resolution back to its authors and ask that they draft a resolution that both communities can support, because that resolution will have a much stronger impact. We think that communities involved should consider investing in companies that are making positive steps towards Palestinian rights. That way, we can make progress on this issue and carry the movement forward instead of just fighting each other. And, because the mood is so tense in here, I have a joke for y'all. How many Trojans does it take to screw in a light bulb? One, but they get four academic units for it. *badum, tish*

Safwan Ibrahim

I'd like to address the letter written by the Bruins Against BDS to the UCLA community. In the letter they stated, "we believe that both the Israelis and Palestinians have a right to self-determination in their homeland." But Palestinian self-determination is an oxymoron when they currently live in a state of apartheid, where their lives are controlled by arbitrary barriers and checkpoints. And the fact is, so long as UCLA funds remain invested in these five corporations, then we as students are directly contributing to the long-standing status quo of injustice and inequality inflicted upon the Palestinians. But we are also in a very unique position to change this. Tonight we have the chance to say that we, as free-thinking, compassionate students of rich diversity, will not be held accountable for the unjust actions of others. We will not stand idly by and watch our brothers and sisters in humanity suffer for the monetary gain of corporate entities. We will lead the way towards a brighter future, the way Bruins always have, and stand in solidarity against all forms of oppression. I implore the council members tonight to seize this opportunity to do something just; to do something right; to something great. Vote "Yes" on divestment.

Elyssa Schlossberg

I read something today that I simply must address: Lizzy Naameh, the Daily Bruin quotes you in reference to this resolution saying, "It is not my job as a councilmember to speculate about whose feelings will be hurt... We need to vote for what we think is morally right." Well excuse me, but as a council member elected to represent the entire student body, first off, it actually is, literally, your job to take into consideration the feelings of misrepresentation and marginalization that this resolution imposes on an entire community. Secondly, what is morally right? It is morally right to uphold the standard of an adopted resolution as a representation of the holistic view of the entire student body. Just look around, I don't have to tell you how incredibly polarizing this divisive resolution is. Councilmembers, you all fully know that this resolution is NOT representative of all students, you fully know that UCLAs' Jewish and Pro-Israel

communities feel attacked, marginalized, and, should this resolution pass, silenced. What else is morally right? It's morally right to recognize that this resolution is heavily biased; it frames the question up for debate not as "WHO is responsible for the Palestinian-Israeli conflict?" Not even as "DOES Israel commit human rights violations or not?" No, instead, the question framing this debate is "SHOULD we punish Israel for committing alleged human rights violations or not?" That is an incredibly, inherently biased way to discuss this issue. As each claim in this resolution before you is either false, taken out of context, or widely disputed by experts, I can guarantee that this resolution does NOT do justice to the complex situation, this resolution is NOT representative of the views of the entire student body, and it is NOT council's place to take a stance on either side of this issue. One side alone is not at fault for what is occurring in the Middle East, AND this council has no right to support a resolution that marginalizes an entire community, both of which this forum cannot fail to recognize. I am a proponent of peace and a Bruin against BDS.

Paulina Jaafar

There are those who say that they don't oppose divestment themselves, but nevertheless refuse to back this resolution because they don't think it will be "effective." These people claim that it's pointless to pursue divestment because it's "only symbolic." For those of you who feel this way, I urge you, first of all, to remember the Palestinian students of UCLA who have been forced against their will to sponsor the actions of companies that are systematically harming their families. This bill would work toward helping them achieve a privilege that too many of us take for granted: the privilege not to invest in violence against our own communities. This is something bigger than mere symbolism. Wouldn't you be asking the same from the rest of us if it was your community? Finally, even though it's true that more steps would have to be taken after this resolution passes to get the Regents to pull our tuition from these companies, doing everything in our power to make sure this bill passes would send a firm message that we as students refuse to fund oppression any longer. To those of you who raise doubts about the "effectiveness" of this resolution, I ask: is it more "practical" for us not to do anything at all and keep funding violence and discrimination? Are you really refusing even to take a stand against human rights violations because it's "easier?" If the answer is no, then vote YES on this resolution. It's the least we can do.

Alexandra Kichayeva

To the Undergraduate Student Association Council

As an Israeli Muslim Arab, I was subjugated to brainwashing against the Jews while I was growing up. I was taught that we should hate them because they took our land, and that no Jewish person should be living here. I was told by a few of my own family members that the Jews were planning to throw us into the sea and until that happened I would be suffering in Israel because I was an Arab. I decided to explore the situation on my own, I went out and started meeting new people, I met a lot of Jews... What struck me at first is that they didn't hate me like I was taught to hate them, but rather I felt care, respect, love, and a want to co-exist. I began to realize how lucky I was to be born in Israel, to live in a free, democratic, and first world country with lots of opportunities. Last year, I started learning in a Jewish school.

Its not easy to be an Israeli Arab Zionist in an Arab Society. I was attacked physically several times, and insulted a lot by my Muslim neighbors. But with the support of my amazing mother and my friends in the only country in the entire Middle East where freedom of speech is allowed, I will continue to speak out for what is right. I know that there are other many other Israeli Arabs that feel the same because almost 90% of us said that they would rather remain an Israeli than become a Palestinian citizen, but they are afraid of being hurt. That is why I am asking the world to please listen and protect the truth about Israel. The world needs to wake up.

Stephen Kraman

I respect everyone who is both here in this room, and has given their comments tonight. Everyone here has every right to their opinion, and I'm glad that it can be heard. I don't want to speak on the specific content of this resolution. I've heard the arguments for both sides and I myself am unclear on which way I stand. What is clear to me, however, is the divisiveness of this issue. I worry that regardless of the outcome we will be marginalizing students on our campus who will now feel alienated by our student government. That is not uniting the student body. That is not what USAC should stand for. This should not be an issue where one side wins or loses because right now it looks like the entire student body will lose. We should not directly hamstring the efficacy our student government by taking controversial stances on issues outside of our scope. I support dialogue, and I support compromise. But I do not support this resolution.

Angelina Ellyason

'Non-violence' and 'peace' are not synonymous. BDS supporters may be utilizing 'non-violent' tactics but they are not advocating for a peaceful two state resolution that recognizes the legitimate rights of both parties. In fact, they are advocating for a resolution that eliminates the state of Israel altogether. The boycott directly and indirectly minimizes the potential for Israelis and Palestinians to work with, interact with, and get to know each other so as to humanize "the enemy" and reduce conflict. The BDS method actually pulls Israelis and Palestinians further apart thus perpetuating conflict. This same effect will occur on campus if this resolution is passed tonight. How will I be able to feel safe voicing my opinion on the conflict if my student government has endorsed the denial of my right to self-determination as a Jewish, pro-Israel, pro-Palestinian and pro-peace student. I am a proponent of peace and a Bruin against BDS.

While I was standing in line waiting for my turn to speak, I over heard someone behind me say "so fucking selfish" as a fellow anti-BDS student was speaking. Time and time again, the world has viewed the Jews right to existence as "so fucking selfish". To me this is the essence of this bill.

'Non-violence' and 'peace' are not synonymous. BDS supporters may be utilizing 'non-violent' tactics but they are not advocating for a peaceful two state resolution that recognizes the legitimate rights of both parties. In fact, they are advocating for a resolution that eliminates the state of Israel altogether, as declared by the BDS Movement. The boycott directly and indirectly minimizes the potential for Israelis and

Palestinians to work with, interact with, and get to know each other so as to humanize “the enemy” and reduce conflict. The BDS method actually pulls Israelis and Palestinians further apart thus perpetuating conflict. This same effect has already occurred at UCLA--just look at this room. Can you imagine what will occur on campus if this resolution is passed tonight??. How will I be able to feel safe voicing my opinion on the conflict if my student government has endorsed the denial of my right to self-determination as a Jewish, pro-Israel, pro-Palestinian and pro-peace student. I am a proponent of peace and a proud Bruin against BDS. I hope your decision will not strip me of my Bruin pride.

KateTungusova

-Queer identified students on this campus face daily waves of contradiction. Despite UCLA's pervasive diversity marketing, we lack all gender inclusive bathrooms, are forced to interact with a police system that lacks proper sensitivity training, and encounter daily microaggressions on campus and in classrooms. But there is nothing quite like the hypocrisy our regents and university put us through when our tuition is funneled towards violent destruction of homes and resources in Palestine. And so in acknowledging and respecting intersectional queer identities and the way in which they've chosen to claim their liberation, I am here in solidarity with Palestinian Queers for BDS, which is an organization that in 2010 called for international solidarity from LGBTQ groups around the world.

We cannot call ourselves allies or advocates of human rights while we silence Palestinian voices. Our complacency destroys safe spaces. Our financial support of Cemex, HP, Caterpillar and more, stifle progress and moves us farther away from justice. Like UCLA did 30 years ago from apartheid South Africa, and just weeks ago from the prison industrial complex, vote yes to divest now for the students you see before you who oppose funding violence against communities in Palestine. Divest because it works, because it's nonviolent, and because this resolution is not asking of you to confront issues of borders or Israel and Palestine and speak for a people whose reality we don't live, but can choose to support through holding our university accountable. There can be no dialogue in destruction, but there is opportunity for liberation from violence in divestment. Be an ally, vote yes, and support divestment from corporate America's imperialist violence.

Kareem Mulzain

He identifies as Lebanese, he doesn't view it as anti-semitic or his Jewish heritage. He supports the UCLA divesting from the 5 companies mentioned in today's resolution because he is against occupation of indigenous land. He visited Lebanon every summer as a kid, Israel's occupation extended 18 years, from 1982 to 2000 he was unable to visit the home and his relatives were prevented from leaving. It followed the tropes of national security, underlying the occupation was a plan for annexation. Israeli isn't about security but rather territorial expansion. That is why Israeli has demolished over 15,000 Palestinian homes and 50,000 Israeli have been built since “peace talks.” These

companies are benefiting and our regents are complicit and implicated us through their investments. As a UCLA Lebanese Jewish American he urges council to vote yes.

Ay Shahan

-Indian international student and board member of United Arab, this council has stood on the side of justice and she urges them to be consistent for UCLA to be responsible for moral obligation. Divestment is not an attack on Jewish people or faith just like divestment on prison isn't an attack on America as a whole. We keep talking about how divisive this bill is yet so many students from different backgrounds come together to stand for PAlestinian rights. We talk about positive campus climate yet we are currently investing in oppression and violence. Where's the positive climate now? In the words of Malcolm X, The truth is on the side of the oppressed. Thank you.

Putting aside all issues, she wants to focus on what passing this resolution would do for Pro-Israel students. Fyeahsjp tumblr that isolate my community. The first is a picture of Barney Stinson throwing confetti that says it will be a year of divestment. To trivialize this issue and this is disrespectful. There's a meme of someone crying and said "when Pro-Israel students see our divestment wall." She is a bruin against BDS

Ben Offedate

He's from England and a project director for IYTP. He wants to say that he doesn't think that a tumblr page is a good reason to like support the continuation of human right abuses. Last summer, he worked for a social justice organization in Israel called Yadid and it called for advocating for Bedouin who are continually displaced. Government policy seeks to remove land from the land they legally own, yet authorities refuse Bedouin villages public water and transport. The Bedouin are Israeli students and he hopes that gives perspective on the West Bank where systemic oppression is only fiercer perpetrated against Palestinian communities. He thinks its really important that we all support the bill because this bill involves that we do not support the imperial ideology that involves taking the land of indigenous communities in Palestine.

Denise Pannagulian

Internal representative for IDEAS at UCLA. They stand by SJP in their revolution to divest from systemic oppression. These companies profit from the status quo by keeping th ePAlestinians as a second class citizens. Their anti immigrant law that prevent us from working and separate from our families is our struggle. Our Palestinian brothers and sisters are facing the same systems of oppression. PAlestinians have to go through those checkpoints everyday, and Palestinians have been dehumanized for far too long. You can do more than create dialogue, you can divest. Divestment is directed towards corporations not communities, as tuition paying members we refuse to have our tuition dollars involved in human rights violations and we refuse to heart the very people we share the same struggle with.

Omar Zaza

Programming director from SJP, and his grandmother was expelled from Palestine. People who say its in “in a vaccuum” and it makes something simple an impossibility. You’ll hear how these are necessary. This logic leads to the view that Palestinians that they are shoved away. Many of you are members of communities that instead of receiving sympathy you must listen to racist. How many of you are tired of hearing that people of color commit more crimes? There are companies that profit from human oppression.

Jiovanni Nunez

He is from MeCha and more importantly he is a bruin whose money is in this issue. It’s been claimed that is a “contentious and divisive issue for higher powers of government.” For us as students at UCLA this isn’t contentious because no one wants to be involved in human rights violation. He’s here to tell you that taking a stance is anything but neutral. By refusing to acknowledge human rights violations and maintaining investments we are condoning their actions. Voting not to divest is the same as continuing to invest in violence. The issue here is the issue of human rights.

Grad students of public health

The checkpoints that are dispersed violate Article 13 of Human Rights states that everyone has the right to freedom and movement in their own state. These companies infringe on these rights. 74% are controlled by checkpoints on the border and Palestinian land. Between 200-2005 there were 67 births at checkpoints and 36 new borns died and 29 mothers. Over 991 incidents of Palestinian ambulance and at least 83 deaths happened because of the prevention of access. Despite the fact they carry documents, it takes hours to get to work. It disrupts the orderly operation of the hospitals. As a student of Public Health she is concerned that our money is preventing quality health care.

Katherine Lahsanhouser

She is here to support divestment because she has heard the stories of those affected by occupation through words and emotions. She can see the parallels of other histories. Voting on divestment is one step and its not enough but it shows that the university can choose to stand on human rights.

Farria

Yesterday Daily Bruin stated that USAC should table the resolution. What she sees before her it has empowered students to stand, speak, and come involved. In Angela Davis “we remove ourselves from agency and power when we assume we have none.” She asks that councilmembers stand up and represent intergrity that true bruins have. She wasn’t aware that any of these billion dollar corporations represented any students at

UCLA. It is not physically possible to divest from a nation of community, all of this is asking is to divest from these companies. She asks that my student representatives end subjugation.

Tiffany

The proposed resolution signals out Israel. This ignores the other occupations of other countries. The elephant in the room is the extremist BDS movement behind this resolution. Ahmed, ending occupation doesn't mean anything if it doesn't mean ending the Jewish state. Supporters of BDS seek the destruction of Israel. They seek anti peace and anti-Israel. It is directly tied to a bigoted national movement.

Nihal Satyadev

My name is Nihal Satyadev and I am a UCLA student – a UCLA student who has close friends that are both pro-divestment and anti-divestment. I understand that there are many people in this room with personal ties to this resolution. This room is evidence of my primary issue with this resolution – it is divisive and pits communities against each other. Since 3rd grade, I have been working with an organization called Pratham to educate elementary school children in India, trying to bring them out of the vicious poverty cycle that facilitates child labor. While teaching in India, I have watched a six year old boy bring his two year old sister to class because their older siblings and parents were off working. [I have seen countless people struggle tirelessly to carve a path of equality for themselves, without any hint of success. I understand that taking action towards human rights and social justice is painstakingly difficult and takes understanding and awareness from both sides. While I am neither Israeli nor Palestinian – I am invested in this issue, because I am an advocate for human rights. With that being said, I will be the first one to stand behind a resolution that supports human rights – not a resolution that seeks to marginalize an entire community and their right to a state. This resolution is as much about what it doesn't say as it is about what it does say and is tied to an issue that dates back generations. None of the council members today have the right to pick one community over another. The occupation must end, but divestment is not the realistic way to go about it. I encourage USAC to be critical in their thought process and remember that this is not a black and white issue. There are many ways to endorse methods to solve these human rights issues besides divestment. I am Pro-Palestine, Pro-Israel, and Pro-peace and I will not support a resolution that does not align with my values.

Youmun Alhlou

As an international development studies major I am highly recommended to study abroad to complete my language requirement, and so I did, and I chose Arabic, synonymous with my Arab heritage. Being an Arab-American at the Hebrew University was definitely an experience. Everyday I walked up the stairs to get to my class on the third level and I would look out the window to see a city called Issawiya, one that is divided, divided by an illegally built apartheid wall between Jerusalem and the West Bank. Seeing this wall every day really put things in perspective, the city, once vibrant and full of motion was separated by a wall, one that only half of the city's residents could cross over, unless

granted a permit. The completion of this wall includes house demolitions, human rights abuses and violations and just pure wrong-doing. The resolution states: "Caterpillar, cement roadstone Holdings, Cemex, General Electric and Hewlett-Packard have violated the universal right "to life, liberty and security of person," "to education" to "privacy, family [and] home;" "to own property, and ... [not to] be arbitrarily deprived of property"

A Palestinian resident of the West Bank is unable to enter Israel for education without proper permit, unable to enter Israel for work without proper permit, and unable to enter Israel for medical reasons without proper permit. Keeping in mind that Israel is also their home and they also have the right to return to their homeland. Unlike most people voting on this resolution or even fighting for this resolution, I have had the wonderful opportunity from September to January to live in Jerusalem, right in the middle between East and West Jerusalem. For those who have never visited the country, it is a division that clearly depicts the difference between the lives of Israelis and Arabs in the countries. East Jerusalem, although filled with friendly and welcoming Palestinians, is full of half built half demolished homes, with almost little or no land. West Jerusalem on the other hand, mirrors very closely to a mix of Western Europe and the United States, filled with bars, stores, and streets with designer stores at everyone's leisure. With the UC's help in investing in the stated companies, parts of the country like West Jerusalem will only continue to grow, giving less and less land and rights to the Palestinian people, ones who like many other world citizens ask for one of the most basic human rights, to live.

Alvin Chen
Yes, divestment.

Daniel Shamoelian

I do not support any form of human rights violations, and I do not dismiss any country from committing human rights violations. Nor do I believe we should divest from any nation. If indeed the authors are concerned with violations of international and human rights law, it is notable that they focus none of their attention on known human rights violators that occur against the Palestinian people in Lebanon and Jordan. In these two countries, Palestinians are rarely afforded equal rights as citizens and are often treated as second class civilians. In countries like Saudi Arabia, women are barred driving alone, may not leave the country without their husbands in consent. In Syria, Assad has been slaughtering his own people yet countries choose to single out Israel as a human rights violator. As a result, I urge council to note that this bill is biased and ignores human rights violations occurring in nations other than Israel and the occupied territories. I am a proponent of peace and a Bruin against BDS.

Last summer I worked with a social justice organisation in Israel called Yedid. Our project involved advocating for Bedouin communities in Israel, who are the poorest and worst-represented group in Israel. Government policies have repeatedly sought to remove lands from Bedouin that they legally own. Authorities refuse Bedouin villages public services such as water or transportation that are afforded Jewish settlements just

hundreds of metres away. Bedouin villages are regularly destroyed to make room for such inane projects as desert tree-planting.

These Bedouin are Israeli citizens.

Such systematic oppression is only fiercer when perpetrated against Palestinian communities in the West Bank; the authorities have even less accountability; the communities are even more vulnerable to abuse.

As a Jew and as a human being I feel that I have the obligation to urge the USAC to support this motion to divest, sending a message that it is unacceptable to use student and university money to support businesses that propagate human rights abuses.

Thank you

Sarah Wolley

My name is Sarah Wolley, I am a Jewish UCLA student, and I support divestment. I am here today partially to honor my great grandparents, who came to this country to escape persecution and the threat of death during Russia's pogroms. All of my relatives who stayed were killed in the pogroms or the holocaust. I am alive and well because people across the world, in the US, were there for my great grandparents when everyone around them was stealing their homes and killing their people. I do not think any of my ancestors would have wanted me to fund violence and injustice anywhere in the world just because the tables have turned.

To me, this is not an attack on Jews, not even an attack on Israel, but a demand that our money not fund violence and injustice committed by the Israeli government against Palestinian peoples. To me, this is a fight against specific unjust and violent actions, one that many Jews and Israelis have joined us in, such as Jews for Justice in Palestine, and Rabbis for Human Rights, a group of Israeli rabbis who help protect Palestinians farmers from attack.

To me, references to other human rights abuses around the world are not arguments against this divestment, but arguments to continue this fight after this resolution is passed. If we want to ask where to put blame for these injustices, we cannot fail to consider the funders. My name is Sarah Wolley, I am a Jewish undergraduate UCLA student, and I refuse to be one of those funders.

I honestly think the majority of people here are well intentioned. Everyone is fighting for what they think is right, for human rights. And I admire you for doing so. The issue is that there is no concrete good side and bad side. This is obvious by the mere fact that the Palestinian/Israeli conflict has not been solved after so many years and even here our students are extremely split between both sides. Yes, I acknowledge Israel does not treat all Palestinians as they should. But ease down on the borders and Israeli human rights are violated too, not by the Palestinian people as a whole, but by those radicals who ruin it for everyone. Yes, we should fight for Palestinian rights, but not at the expense of the Israelis and for all the reasons youve heard today. This BDS resolution is not an effective way to fight for peace and human rights for all. USAC is supposed to represent a public

university and the opinions of an entire student body. The majority of students are unaware that this resolution and meeting even occurred. And the rest are split. USAC should not be the venue for such a controversial topic and should not take a one sided stance in the name of the entire student body. Instead we should listen to each other and be a model for peace. We all have something to learn from the other side. I am a proponent of peace and a bruin against BDS!

Mashal Ali

Pakistani Students Association stands in solidarity with SJP and this proposed bill. We believe this bill should go through because we will not allow any more of our money to go towards human rights violations.

We can't stop our tax dollars from drone attacks in our motherland, Pakistan. The money I pay to fund the government funds the death of my fellow country men and women much like how funding these companies take my tuition to ruin the lives of many Palestinians. It's a different type of human rights violations because instead of funding their deaths, were funding the agony of our fellow human beings, our brothers and sisters. They have to continue their lives, taking care of their families and wondering where else they can go after living in their homes for so many years.

But if we can stop human rights violators from using our tuition money, no matter where that is, we will put in our greatest efforts to end it. As an Asian, specifically South Asian representative I have personally been attacked by racists. Directly and indirectly. On campus and off campus. Last year at a campus event, Bruin Day, as I waited with the rest if PSA to perform for incoming students, a student's father came up to me as I was holding the Pakistani flag. He then told me along with the rest of PSA members to go "back". To leave a country that I am legally living in. A country where my family lives and where I study. I was shocked by this person's ignorance and hatred. But thankfully legally, he could not just kick me out this country. I was protected by my UCLA community and by my legal rights.

More recently a racist, sexist and misogynistic flyer was sent to the Asian American studies department. The Asian and Pacific Islander community came together to end discrimination on campus. Most minority students have indirectly or directly faced a sort of discrimination. That is why, then and now, we have been able to collaborate cross-campus with student groups representing all types of interests to show support for this bill. Just like we did for the API community. They know how it feels. I know how it feels. I would never wish that type of negativity upon anyone. If I believed that this would negatively affect or allow any discrimination towards anyone I would not stand for it.

As president of the Pakistani Students Association, as a South Asian and Muslim woman and most importantly as a True Bruin I stand for respect. Respect of human rights. This bill delivers respect.

Jaimeson Cortez
Hello Everyone,

My name is Jaimeson Cortez, I am a 2nd year Poli Sci undergrad and a board member of Samahang Pilipino.

To my Jewish friends and peers who feel demonized, ostracized, and unwelcome at UCLA because of this proposal- I am truly saddened by this reality and although I do not fully understand, I truly sympathize with you. As a student of color, and a Pilipino American, I also feel unwelcome at UCLA at times, so I hope you can sympathize with me too. But I ask you to recognize this fact, a fact that other marginalized communities on this campus, like mine, know all too well:

Promoting a safe campus climate does NOT entail conceding to neutrality, deferring to the decisions of the UC Regents, or shying away from things that make us uncomfortable, things that hurt our feelings. Rather, a campus climate is improved by being proactive, being progressive, and working for equity against the injustices that affect us as bruins and as human beings. Which is precisely what my Palestinian brothers and sisters have done in bringing this bill to the table tonight.

Let's be clear. While this bill is NOT a part of the BDS movement, its opponents concerns are valid- nothing on this scale exists in a vacuum. The Jewish people have legitimate concerns, yes. Self determination. A Jewish homeland. These are contentious issues and you have a right, an obligation, to advocate for your community. So please, it is your prerogative: continue to bring your community's concerns to Usac council in the future, as I will do for mine.

But recognize that this 5-company divestment bill ALONE, this plea from Palestinian students and their unified allies to end our funding of gross human rights violations- this is what Usac council is to vote on tonight. NOT whether or not to support the BDS movement, NOT a solution for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, NOT anything beyond the scope of what we, as the undergraduate students at UCLA, have the right to decide.

USAC council members. Your Palestinian constituents and we, their diverse allies, stand in solidarity tonight with a simple ask: to stop our tuition from harming our own

communities. Please reconsider your role as an elected official and a representative of UCLA if you think for one minute that you have the power to deny us this right. Yes, when viewed in the tragic context that has led to misunderstanding on this scope and scale- passing this bill would be a "win" for the BDS movement as a whole. But it is a necessary step if UCLA is ever to approach this issue from a "neutral" perspective. I'm not a Bruin for or against BDS. I'm a Bruin for divestment from corporations that are complicit in human rights violations. I'm a Bruin for human rights. Please, show that we value human lives over hurt feelings. No justice, no peace. Thank you

My name is Talia, I am a 3rd year communication studies major at Ucla and I believe we should all be moving forward towards peace. However a campaign of boycott, divestment and sanctions against Israel DOES NOT encourage peace rather the ANTI-SEMATIC, ANTI-ISRAEL act moves us BACKWARDS by attempting to directly ostracize Israel. BDS is fueled by a one-sided historical narrative whose goal it is to demonize, delegitimize and ultimately lead to the demise of the Jewish State, Israel. In what ways does this sound like a peaceful, nonviolent punitive measure as the opposing side claims the BDS is? Personally I believe the boycott is an act of violence that will affect many UCLA students in a negative light. Instituting the divestment will make many students on campus feel attacked by the proposition. Therefore, I DO NOT support the divestment.

My name is Jacob. I am a transfer applicant. I attended tonight's discussion and listened to many speak for hours. During that time I did not hear one reasonable argument as to why we should accept the BDS. Rather, I believe that engaging in a divestment would only promote harms for the University because many would feel attacked by the divestment. Furthermore, accepting the divestment will not benefit the University in any way. The harms outweigh the benefits. SAY NO TO BDS!

Rudy Rochman

Good evening fellow students, teachers and staff. My name is Rudy Rochman and I am a former Israeli paratrooper. I was born in France and grew up in Miami, yet at the age of 17, I volunteered my services to the IDF. But I am not here to talk about me. I am here standing in the same combat boots I wore in the military to shine a light on the darkness. What is BDS and why am I here today to stand up against it. BDS in theory is looking for the prosperity of the Palestinian people but in reality, preventing a solution and complete peace. Let's not forget that Palestinians who live in Israel are treated way better than in any Arab country and with it being the only democratic country in the whole region, are given women rights, rights to vote, rights to serve in the army and in the government; in which they do. Israel and it's people do not want conflict, they want peace. The fathers are tired of going to war and the mothers are tired of having to deploy their children. But until the "elite" or source of power in the Palestinian community realizes they want peace more then they want the destruction of Israel then we are bound by their hatred. Do not support BDS and let's reverse this bullet they are firing at a real chance for peace.

"Boycott Israel if you think that's just, but unless you have a double standard you must. Also boycott the rest of the nations, with allegations and human rights violations. We are not perfect but if you think were the worst, first take a look at the test of the watch. Don't pick and choose to pick on the Jews, pick up the paper and read the news. (Ari Lesser))Ladies and gentlemen, long live the nation of Israel. Am Israel chai.

Natalie Bakhshi

Hi my name is Natalie Bakhshi and I am a second year Psychobiology Major. I want to bring our attention to what this resolution really is. It is NOT a neutral attempt to end alleged human rights violations in Israel, IT IS A STEPPING STONE TO END ISRAEL AND THE RIGHT OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE'S SELF DETERMINATION ALL TOGETHER.

This resolution stems from a larger global movement known as BDS: Boycott Divestment and Sanctions. I've listened to the founder of the movement, Omar Barghouti speak at UCLA. Aside from all the propagandist and blatant lies he said about Israel, his one truth was in exposing the BDS movement for its true Intentions. Barghouti confirmed that "the call for BDS will not end with the occupation or with a peace agreement, only with the end of Zionism, the national movement of self-determination of the Jews"

Furthermore, Barghouti stated ""most definitely does BDS oppose a Jewish state. No rational, not-sell-out Palestinian will ever accept a Jewish state in any part of Palestine."

It is evident that this resolution stems from a deeper sentiment- the de-legitimization of an entire country, a people, and a nation.

Moreover this resolution specifically, as evident through the sentiment in the room divides our campus allowing for a significantly hostile campus climate. Jessica Trumple, in the fall, You said that the creation of Avi Oved's resolution divided the room, and didn't leave a space for dialogue. You stated that a resolution that divides sides in a conflict that is convoluted undermines the entire resolution.

Yes, I agree. This resolution takes sides on a conflict that world leaders are grappling with! Which further proves that things are not as black and white as this resolution would like them to be. I am a proponent for peace and a Bruin against BDS

Heather Hourdequin

I am a member of Pi Beta Phi, GlobeMed, a Gates Millenium Scholar, and a Director in GenRep2. But I speak here today as an individual student. This resolution quite frankly saddens me. It saddens me because it has pitted people against each other and has created a campus environment full of animosity. The bottom line is that USAC resolutions speak on behalf of the ENTIRE undergrad student body and the council members sitting here today have NO RIGHT to take a stance on behalf of all undergrads when clearly the entire undergrad student body is not accurately represented. I do not support a resolution that tears this campus apart, or one that makes fellow bruins feel uncomfortable on their own campus. We must remember that at the end of the day, we are all Bruins. I

believe in the positive changes that USAC has the capacity to bring and I believe in a better UCLA.

Edwin Eshaghzadeh

For those that don't know me, my name is Edwin Eshaghzadeh--I am co-founder and external president of ImpactLA. I like to smile and make others smile; I like to laugh and make others laugh; and if you've ever met me, you know I like to talk about feelings. We've heard a lot of talking points tonight..am I right? Talking points From BOTH sides. I'm not here with talking points. I can't speak for anyone but myself. I'm here to talk about feelings--I'm here to talk about MY feelings.

And as MY Undergraduate Students Association Council, I don't believe that it's your place to decide on a resolution concerning this conflict in the Middle East--however, I do believe it is your DUTY to know how it makes ME--an undergraduate--feel.

I feel targeted. I feel stigmatized. I feel hurt.

As an immigrant to the US, I have gone most of my life in America stereotyped and stigmatized in public. Let me tell you--that fricken hurt. And now at one of the most prime undergraduate institutions, those feelings have been stirred up again.

Since hearing hurtful comments when a resolution supporting dialogue was brought up last fall, I have felt uncomfortable wearing a kippa or yamukah, uncomfortable wearing apparel that represents anything Jewish or Israeli ON THIS CAMPUS.

WAIT.. WHAT?? that is NOT how a resolution should make me feel.

Feelings.. Some have warned that feelings would be shared tonight, but that's it's okay to have hurt feelings in this case? When a veil of human rights is put up, that stamp excuses my feelings?

DOUBLE STANDARDS.

As it was the case in the previous resolution--LIZZIE--it is NOT simply about the language of this resolution--it is its PERCEPTION that is deligitizing my feelings. EVERYONE in this room can continue with their talking points again once I'm done--I'm just here to let you know that ~personally~ I am HURT by this resolution.

English is not my first language (and I still struggle speaking it sometimes), but I do know that this word ~resolution~ should not hurt.

Some of you are general representatives. Think of WHO you are actually representing and where your true place is as council members.

I can only speak for myself. I'm an undergraduate--YOUR UNDERGRADUATE--the one that you are actually SUPPOSED to represent, and I hope you're cognizant of my hurt feelings.

I'm a proponent for peace, and a Bruin AGAINST BDS.

Joseph Hassine; 4th year transfer; Sociology & Public Affairs; Past President of Saddleback Community College

Over the past couple of weeks, I have heard compelling arguments both for and against the divestment resolution that is here tonight. I have heard students talk about what this means for their communities and for them personally. I have heard lectures and discussions on the conflict itself. I'm sure that you've done the same.

Most of the commenters that have come before me have talked about the conflict, not the resolution. You are not voting to divest or not divest. You don't have the power to do that. You are voting to place the stamp of approval of the entire undergraduate student body on a statement that the entire undergraduate student body is clearly not aligned with.

Resolutions speak on behalf of all undergrads. That fact alone is reason enough to not pass this resolution.

There are other methods of lobbying for a cause. I agree that students should not feel like they are invested in unethical companies, but USAC is not the forum for this discussion. I encourage those council members, organizations, and individuals that support this resolution to lobby the regents on their own with the voices of those that have consented to being spoken for.

I urge you to vote NO on this resolution. I have not given you the right to speak on my behalf.

I am a Bruin for peace and a Bruin against THIS RESOLUTION.

Nicole Rudolph

One of the goals of the BDS movement is to make Israelis seem evil. In Omar Barghouti's visit to campus hosted by SJP, he "hurled blood libels" claiming that Israeli soldiers shoot Palestinian children "for sport." He said, they "provoke" the children, "entice them like mice, and then shoot them" for no reason. It is just because the soldiers are "bored." How is it acceptable that we are even considering a movement led by such an anti-semitic leader? He demonizes an entire people and accuses all Israelis of murdering children for entertainment purposes. During the Middle Ages in Europe, similar tactics were used to isolate and demonize the Jewish people, leading eventually to mass murders of Jews throughout the continent. It was said that Jews slaughtered Christian babies to make religious foods. If such outlandish arguments are still used to demonize Jews abroad, then it could be argued that the same tactics could be used in our own community. The sheer fact that this movement and resolution are even being considered tarnishes our academic status as a progressive and inclusive institution. How can I be part of a community that follows a movement that slanders my people and my home? I am a proponent of peace and a Bruin against BDS.

Tammy Rubin

I want to start off by pointing out that I have a personal relationship, albeit in many different capacities, with each and every one of you. You know who I am, you know what I stand for, and you know the community I am a part of.

If you pass this resolution, the reality is that our money stays where it is, yet my community and hundreds of other Bruins are silenced and hurt. And DO NOT condescendingly negate my hurt feelings because they're more than that. I feel marginalized, silenced, and attacked. If ANY other community utters those words on

campus, we pride ourselves on mobilizing to stand by their side in support. Why would you EVER question or delegitimize a fellow bruins perception of an attack?

Now let's talk about the resolution brought forth last fall that was voted down by 7 of you in this room, criticizing not the language as it stood after the hours of amending the document, but because the pro-Palestinian community and their supporters were not consulted. Do not hold my community to a different standard. This resolution makes the exact same mistake. How do you expect ME to talk about a resolution I wasn't even a part of creating? No one in this room can argue that SJP wasn't forthcoming with their campaign to divest. But it was just that: transparency for the sake of transparency. I don't even know why we're having this conversation when just a quarter ago, we left this same room with the understanding that a resolution CANNOT move forward until all stakeholders have had a hand in writing the language TOGETHER. Let the record show that I was "respectfully declined" when I asked to help write this. Do not speak on my behalf when I can do it for myself.

I'm not expecting you to solve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but I do expect you to represent my voice on campus. But passing this resolution, you are setting a precedent for other student groups that they can spew lies and label others in whichever way they want. What do I have to gain WHEN this resolution doesn't pass? Nothing. But I have EVERYTHING to lose if it does.

My name is Tammy Rubin, I am a proponent of peace, and I am a bruin against BDS.

Wali Kamal

First of all, I don't appreciate my support for this resolution as being conflated to be anti-semitic. We shouldn't be throwing such labels around lightly, and I am shocked that my support for divestment is conflated as being hateful towards Jews, and I take personal offense to such a notice.

Indeed, this resolution is relevant to every one of us here, as we profit from the dividends of these investments made by the Regents. It's highly problematic that Palestinian students are unable to consent to these investments that violate their own rights.

There are no doubts that we are invested in human rights violations, and there is no doubt that these violations take place. Some are trying to make the case that these rights violations are OK due to security concerns. However, In 2004, an advisory opinion by the International Court of Justice concluded that international law was breached by settlements in the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and that Israel cannot rely on a right of self-defence or on a state of necessity in order to preclude the wrongfulness of imposing a régime, which is contrary to international law.

Regarding the so many other rights violations that are taking place: The **fallacy of relative privation** suggests that the opponent's argument should be ignored because there are other relevant problems in the world. We should be clear that we should denounce all rights violations as they take place. If we are invested in companies that are complicit in any rights violations, we should certainly consider drafting resolutions to condemn them. But that shouldn't preclude us from addressing the specific rights violations presented to us right now. This issue is on the table because it is talking about Palestinian rights, so let's address what's at hand.

This resolution is not an affront to Israeli sovereignty. We are not divesting from Israel, but rather 5 specific American companies. Nobody here is trying to deny Israel's right to self-determination nor its right to exist, at least that's not my intention by speaking right now. But rather, we are looking to recognize Palestinians' rights to self-determination and freedom from occupation.

Regarding connections of this resolution to the greater BDS movement: just because the resolution shares a tactic with the BDS movement, it does not mean that every single opinion that has ever been held by a BDS support will somehow be thrust upon USAC. I urge you to consider the fact of the matter at hand. Yes the context of this resolution is important, and it is often referenced that context of the greater BDS movement. Yet we are continually ignoring the intended context of this resolution, those of the very real human rights violations taking place. People have died at the hands of our investments, and countless more individuals' rights have been violated.

If this were a resolution that could seamlessly orchestrate a land swap, end the occupation and blockade, trade prisoners, stop rocket attacks by Hamas and friends, and everything else tomorrow, USAC would win the Nobel Peace Prize.

This resolution obviously won't result in overnight end to the occupation. But that is not reason enough to advocate against divestment. The goal of this resolution is to call the regents to action, and to make it clear that we aren't giving our consent to being invested in these companies that violate human rights, and to continue to petition the Regents to remove these non-consensual investments.

Let me use an analogy: if it looks like a duck, walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, then it is a duck! But this duck violates human rights, and we're invested in this duck, then we should divest from this duck.

Estee Chandler

Jewish Voice for Peace (JVP) supports Students for Justice in Palestine at UCLA in their campaign for divestment of university funds from human rights violations in Israel and Palestine. Since 2005, Palestinians, Israeli allies and hundreds of thousands of supporters worldwide have been mobilized in response to the Palestinian civil society call for boycott, divestment and sanctions campaigns.

SJP at UCLA has joined this call by asking its university to call upon the UC Regents to divest holdings in American companies which profit from the occupation of the West Bank, East Jerusalem, and the blockade of the Gaza Strip. JVP supports students' rights to democratically call for their tuition funds to be divested from companies which profit from human rights abuses, and in fact, to call for a broader program of ethical investments to be implemented at their universities. Calling for companies to cease engagement in the occupation of the West Bank, East Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip blockade is a matter of following international law and upholding principles of human rights agreed to by the entire community of nations. This call unites us all in a campaign for equality, for social justice, and for accountability. Jewish Voice for Peace strongly believes that divestment from occupation demonstrates Jewish values of justice and healing the world. Advocating for justice in a non-violent manner is not anti-Semitic." We salute the diverse and principled coalition of students at the UCLA, who have united

in support of this resolution. We wish you the best of luck and consider this yet another step towards a more just and equitable future for us all.

Avinoam Baral

Hi Council

If you pass this bill, let me tell you what the headlines are not going to say tomorrow morning: "Isolated Divestment Resolution at UCLA" - they are going to read what the "non BDS" Divestment bills at Berkeley read namely - "BDS Passes at UCLA" And if you don't see that, if you think you can just consider this resolution in a vacuum you're either incredibly naive because you don't understand the consequences of this bill or you're lying to yourself because you don't want to think through your actions. And by extension you're lying to your constituents - to ME. Make no mistake - a yes on BDS is a yes to BDS. And to us that's unacceptable. The founder of BDS Omar Barghouti said it best at his talk a month ago that he's not sure if my people are really a people. But he is sure that they're not indigenous and he's sure that there should be no such thing as a Jewish state. So in case this council needs clarification on this issue let me be unequivocal: 1. I am a Jew. We are a people.

2. 2000 years of oppression, persecution and exile have not made me any less indigenous to my national homeland.

3. Do not expect me, a descendant of Jewish refugees from 5 different countries just in the past 75 years, to sit idly by and watch my student government, the people who are supposed to represent ME, even discuss this BDS resolution.

I pray for peace for Israelis and Palestinians every day, but this is not a step in the right direction.

Vote no on BDS.

Omer Hit

Today I come to you not as a member of all these communities I'm in because I can only speak on behalf of myself as a UCLA Bruin against BDS. For those of you saying this is not a part of the larger bds movement, this is ridiculous. If you have any questions ask one of the authors a graduate student bringing this to undergraduate student council that calls herself the BDS Chair at UCLA. She additionally dares to publicly write that this is not part of the bds movement, as the Bds chair at Ucla I am sorry but I don't believe you. Additionally I want to yield that the situation in Israel is one that is difficult for both the Israelis and Palestinians. This is why I hope and pray that the peace talks will be successful so societies can positively move forward from this in peace. With that being said this whole issue does not live in a vacuum and the points this resolution argues for stand to protect the lives of Israelis from terrorism, because no matter what you say they face it day by day. This protects my family and my home, how the heck do you expect me to be against it?

Additionally last time we were all here council voted down a resolution brought forth by Avi. I spoke to most of you who voted this down and you reasoned that you could not vote for something where students felt divided, unrepresented, and uncomfortable. That was a resolution trying to promote a positive environment for respectful dialogue, this is

drastically different as it is literally part of the bds movement, a movement meaning to destroy and delegitimize Israel, the place I was born, the place my family lives in and the place I call my home. To say I feel uncomfortable is a massive understatement. I feel demonized, misrepresented, unwelcome, and above all incredibly uncomfortable. So I ask you not only be consistent but to give me a right to exist in my homeland? Can we take a moment to think about how ridiculous this is?! Me asking my own government to recognize me as a person. Don't get be wrong I love this community more than I can even describe to you, but make no mistake if you pass this resolution you are putting UCLAs name on bds. This is unacceptable and would make me question my perception as an Israeli every single day and would make me feel uncomfortable. My job here as a campus tourguide is to make prospective students and their families welcome on this campus. How the heck am I supposed to do this when I myself am questioning my welcome on a campus that doesn't recognize my existence?

I urge you to think critically and realistically about what you are doing and not pass this resolution as you have absolutely no right to take away from anyone's experience of UCLA. My name is Omer Hit and I am a bruin for peace and avidly against BDS.

Benjamin Formaker-Olivas.

I am a UCLA graduate, staff member, and gay, Mexican, Jewish Bruin.

I would love to look around the room and say that everyone here wants peace and for this conflict in the middle east to end. But then I remember, peace means something different TO everyone here. You cannot separate SJP from the BDS movement- I invite you all to go to sjpb Bruins.com/BDS. To quote Omar Barghouti, one of the founders of the BDS movement: "If the occupation ends, let's say, would that end your call for BDS? No, it wouldn't." Do you know he said this? It is because the driving force behind SJP AND BDS aren't to end the occupation or to have peace, but rather to end Israel. Ahmed Moor, a prominent pro-BDS author stated "Ending occupation doesn't mean anything if it doesn't mean upending the Jewish state itself...BDS does mean the end of the Jewish state."

SJP tries to use the cry for human rights to blind others to the reality of the situation. And yet, they never seem to address the human rights violations of their own citizens on the basis of sexual orientation, gender, and more.

Do not let SJP and BDS supporters make you forget your critical thinking skills. If this was about peace or an end to the conflict and occupation, then a founding member wouldn't be calling for the end of Israel, one of the US's staunchest allies. It would be calling for international discussion and humanitarian aid, not boycotts and divestment. BDS is not a path to peace, only more conflict.

I am a Bruin for peace, and I am against BDS.

Trumble moves for a 15 minute recess. 3:58.

Joanino calls the meeting back to order at 4:13 am.

IV. Special Presentations

A. Bruins For Israel

-Avinoam Baral introduced himself and to say the random old dude that said extremely islamophobic comments is disgusting and has no place at this university and is not representative of any bruins in this room. He's not an emotional person, but he didn't sleep last night and a lot of people are on the same boat and it's pretty incredible. This resolution is BDS and just wanted to show you that regardless of whats written in the resolution it will be considered BDS. As you can see theres a UC Berekely Resolution and it was very similar and it clearly distanced itself from the BDS movement but nonetheless the next day even with amendments and said that the public is not a divestment but a whole different resolution. The president at the time made an accompanying letter and how the bill is not related to the BDS movement. The BDS movement put it on it's website as a victory and Rahim Kurwa talks about how it swept UC campuses. Regardless of what's in this reoslution, what you're voting on tonight that if you vote yes it's going to be viewed as an extension of the BDS movement. There's no need to play semantics, because at the end of the day this will be considered BDS whether we like it or not. He doesn't want to beat around the bush.

B. Students for Justice in Palestine

Denna, President of SJP and Palestinian students at UCLA. She wants to remind them why it came about. The status quo right now is that Palestinian students are being forced to invest in violence against their own families. This makes Palestinian students unequal on this campus. Who else on campus is made to invest in the suffering of their community? Everyone should have the empowerment we don't want that anymore. All they are really asking for is equal treatment on campus. While they are a small number on this campus and it is easy to use stereotypes to promote fear about us, that does not mean that it is okay to deny us equality simply to preserve the status quo. Voting to release us form a situation in which we are forced to invest in our oppression is voting to affirm that we are equal to every other student and community at UCLA. On Monday morning, 40 Palestinian homes in the West Bank were given demolition orders. Someone in those homes could be one of our family members, someone could be a future UCLA student. If we are talking about comfort, there is nothing comfortable about this. This is a fact that we note. They are not asking for a BDS movement. They met with Hillel and BFI. They cannot control if UCLA ends up on at a site somewhere, if that is ultimately the fear that it would be marked as BDS. Are you really going to choose to invest in these companies because of the fear it might end up on a site somewhere? We are not asking for the full set of rights or the right of refugees, they are asking for the right to not live under occupation. You don't need to endorse boycotting, we are just asking for divestment we used weeks ago for private prisons. We don't want to do violence against our community or any community. SJP does endorse BDS but they aren't asking anyone to support BDS. SJP supports jewish self determination and determination of all people. We can't be on the assumption that giving Palestinian human rights takes out human rights from any one else. She is mind blown that the perception of the intentions is more important than

protecting her family that lives in the occupation. Like Dennea said, we can negotiate on a lot but not on our basic human rights. If you are support of human rights please extend that to Palestinians. The Pro-Israel made it clear that they don't want to invest. We are sad that many have framed their comfort and safety on this campus as only possible so long as we are made to keep suffering, but we are so proud and happy to see the groundswell of solidarity. Judge us by who we are and what we say, not stereotypes. We have been subject to extremely hateful language and our people are called terrorists as an excuse to keep us behind checkpoints. You claim these communities are naturally violent and must be kept in prison. Omar Barghouti, who is not a student here, has been pointed out as the subject of slander and misrepresentation when he is not here to respond to these claims on his own behalf. We deserve for you to listen to us and judge us by our own words and our own positions, not someone completely unaffiliated with SJP. In the end, this is a question of basic equality for stuents on this campus. Are you forced to invest in violence against your community? If no, then extend us this right so we can enjoy peace. No one has said they want to invest in violence against us. No one has said that we don't deserve basic equality and human rights. Now the question is to make these feelings into a reality. They want to thank the beautiful community of all the student groups that supported them.

X. New Business

A. A Resolution to Divest from Companies that Violate Palestinian Human Rights
-Hadjimanoukian wants to have it on record the main reason for the sponsorship was giving the chance to have a conversation about this issue. Started 6th week and got fillibusted and came in with an independent official, elected Bruins United and elected Let's Act member. Now we can start with the reading.

A. A Resolution to Divest from Companies that Violate Palestinian Human Rights

A Resolution to Divest from Companies that Violate Palestinian Human Rights

Sponsored by: Lizzy Naameh, Armen Hadjimanoukian, and Omar Arce

WHEREAS, it is the University of California, Los Angeles' duty to uphold the True Bruin

values of integrity, excellence, accountability and ethicality, respect for the rights and dignity of

others, and promote public service that makes a positive impact in our global community¹

includes the promotion of human rights, equality, and dignity for all people without distinction;

WHEREAS, UCLA students have historically fought against investments in companies that

demonstrate a lack of accountability, ethicality, and respect for the rights and dignity of others;

WHEREAS, voluntary investment in a company shows implicit support for the decisions and

actions of said company;

WHEREAS, voluntary investment in companies engaged in violence against others is harmful to

students at UCLA who are affected by such violence;

WHEREAS, UCLA has a history of using divestment as a non-violent strategy, having used it to

selectively and publicly divest from companies engaged in unethical acts, most notably in the

context of South Africa²

Complex⁴

;

WHEREAS, the following illustrative and non-exhaustive list of companies in which the

University of California invests⁵

WHEREAS, Caterpillar, Cement Roadstone Holdings, Cemex, General Electric, and Hewlett-Packard have violated the universal right “to life, liberty, and security of person;” “to education;”

to “privacy, family [and] home;” “to own property, and ...[not to] be arbitrarily deprived of

property”⁶

;WHEREAS, Caterpillar has violated these rights by continually providing engineering tools and

bulldozers routinely used in the demolition of Palestinian homes, refugee camps, water cisterns,

and agricultural fields in the West Bank and Gaza⁷⁻

expand settlements and construct the Separation Wall and checkpoints throughout the West

Bank⁷

, which have been ruled to be in violation of international law in the International Court of

Justice's 2004 Advisory Opinion⁹

WHEREAS, by providing cement and other building materials, Cement Roadstone Holdings

(CRH) has contributed to the construction of military checkpoints, the Separation Wall, and

settlements within the occupied Palestinian territory 10-

WHEREAS, Cemex also owns and operates manufacturing plants in West Bank settlements,

exploiting Palestinian natural resources in violation of international law¹²;

WHEREAS, CRH and Cemex have supplied building materials used to build illegal settlements,

the Separation Wall, and checkpoints within the occupied Palestinian territory

WHEREAS, General Electric (GE) manufactures and supplies engines for A64 Apache

Helicopters, which are systematically used in attacks on Palestinian civilians, and whereas these

attacks constitute severe human rights violations and war crimes as documented by Amnesty

International

14;

WHEREAS, Hewlett-Packard Company (HP) provides biometric identification systems used at

Israeli military checkpoints, which restricted the freedom of movement of Palestinians, facilitate

discrimination against Palestinians, and reinforce a stratification of citizenship¹⁵;

WHEREAS, HP profits from global mass incarceration and provides prisoner data systems for

the Department of Homeland Security's Immigration and Customs (ICE) Law Enforcement

Support Center

WHEREAS, these five companies have been directly engaged by various public campaigns and

concerned investors about their complicit involvement in the previously mentioned human rights

violations to no avail

WHEREAS, Caterpillar, Cemex, CRH, GE, and HP directly profit from the ongoing violations

of international law and human rights and have an economic stake in the continuation of these

violations;

LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council of the University

of California, Los Angeles calls upon the University of California to withdraw investments in

securities, endowments, mutual funds, and other monetary instruments with holdings in the

aforementioned companies, until these companies are no longer engaged in the violation of

human rights and other behavior deemed unethical by the UCLA community, and at such time

and in such manner as fund trustees may determine;

LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED, that if it is found that UCLA funds are being invested in

any of the above mentioned companies, the Undergraduate Students Association Council of the

University of California, Los Angeles calls upon UCLA to divest all stocks and securities of such

companies, at such time and in such manner as fund trustees may determine, with the goal of

maintaining the divestment, in the case of said companies, until they cease these specific practices;

LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council of

the University of California, Los Angeles calls upon UCLA and the UCLA Foundation to refrain

from making further investments, and to advocate that the UC system not make further investments, in any companies engaged in the violation of human rights or other behavior deemed unethical by the UCLA community;

16;

17;
LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED, that this resolution should be understood and interpreted

on its own merits, rationales, and ends, regardless of how external parties in a larger "Boycott,

Divestment, and Sanctions movement" or in the Israeli government characterize it, and should

not be seen as an endorsement of any external party or views other than those expressed within

the text itself;

LET IT FINALLY BE RESOLVED, that we, the students, call upon our university to dissociate

itself from companies that engage or aid in systematic prejudiced oppression, whether this

system targets people based on their religion, nationality, gender, race or orientation, by

divesting from companies that participate in or profit from human rights violations.

1

UCLA True Bruin Statement: <http://www.truebruin.ucla.edu/statement.htm> 2

UCLA African Studies Center “Remembering Nelson Mandela,” a reflection on divestment:

<http://www.international.ucla.edu/africa/mandela/> and the Student Anti-Apartheid Newsletter: Special Report on

University of California Divestment Action: <http://kora.matrix.msu.edu/files/50/304/32-130-E67-84->

AL.SFF.DOCUMENT.acoa000126.pdf 3

A Resolution In Support of Divestment from Fossil Fuel Companies:

<http://www.usac.ucla.edu/documents/resolutions/UCLAResolutiontoUSACfortheDivestmentofFossilFuels.pdf> 4

A Resolution to Divest Undergraduate Students Association Council and UC Los Angeles Finances from

Corporations Profiting from the Prison Industrial Complex:

<http://usac.ucla.edu/documents/resolutions/USACPrivatePrisonDivestmentResolution.pdf>
5

UC Retirement Portfolio holdings: http://www.ucop.edu/investment-office/_files/invpol/UCRP_Holdings.pdf 5

General Endowment Portfolio holdings: http://www.ucop.edu/investment-office/_files/invpol/GEP_Holdings.pdf 6

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights: <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/>

7

Human Rights Watch report “Razing Rafah: Mass Home Demolitions in the Gaza Strip,” citing Caterpillar’s

activities in the Gaza Strip: <http://www.hrw.org/print/reports/2004/10/17/razing-rafah> 8

Amnesty International report “Israel and the Occupied Territories: Under the Rubble: House Demolition and

Destruction of Land and Property,” citing Caterpillar bulldozers’ role in demolitions of Palestinian homes and

property in the West Bank: <http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/MDE15/033/2004/en;>
9

International Court of Justice: Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian

Territory (9 July 2004) <http://www.icj-cij.org/docket/index.php?pr=71&code=mwp&p1=3&p2=4&p3=6> 10 Project Clean Hands' report on Cement Roadstone Holdings:

<http://projectcleanhands.wordpress.com/2010/04/30/2009-project-clean-hands-report-crh> 11 Who Profits report on Cement Roadstone Holdings:

<http://www.whoprofits.org/company/cement-roadstone-holdings-crh> 12 Who Profits report on Cemex:

http://whoprofits.org/sites/default/files/cemex_corporate_watch_may_2011.pdf 13 See above. Also see New England United Methodist Church reports on said companies:

http://www.neumc.org/console/files/oFiles_Library_XZXLCZ/Companies_Recommended_for_Divestment_HJKK

VNTP.pdf and documentation on said companies:

http://www.neumc.org/console/files/oFiles_Library_XZXLCZ/NEUMC_Divestment_Report_FINAL_060407-

[img_PM2YX4SR.pdf](#) 14 Amnesty International report "Fueling Conflict: Foreign Arms Supplies to Israel/Gaza" citing General Electric

military sales used in conflict:

[http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/MDE15/012/2009/en/278d5cfc-0b39-4409-](http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/MDE15/012/2009/en/278d5cfc-0b39-4409-bd68-4c6f44d99a64/mde150122009en.pdf)

[bd68-4c6f44d99a64/mde150122009en.pdf](#)

15 Who Profits' report on HP's involvement in settlements and occupation infrastructure:

<http://www.whoprofits.org/company/hewlett-packard-hp> 16 Global Exchange's report on HP, which includes a section on its services to the prison and immigration systems

in the United States: <http://www.globalexchange.org/economicactivism/hp/why> 17 The United Methodist Church's record of engagement with Caterpillar:

<http://www.rabbisletter.org/caterpillar->

tells-methodists-it-will-not-change-business-practices-relating-to-palestine/; and record of engagement with

Hewlett-Packard: <http://www.pcusa.org/media/uploads/mrti/pdfs/2012-mrti-report-9-9-11.pdf>

-Joanino states we have been sitting here for over 9 hours debating this issue. He wants to start it very differently with a straw vote and who would oppose the resolution in its current language.

-Oved wants to make a clarification that within the Bruins for Israel presentation they highlighted that amendments were made to the Berkeley and BDS claimed it as a victory and the vice president of SJP claimed it as a BDS victory and can assume its indirectly. We have a snapshot of SJP website and it says BDS at University of California. He wants to recognize the fact that SJP at UCLA last year did claim this at a victory. We cannot look at it just at the language we have to look at it into context. This room in a vacuum you see students united on the resolution and you look over here and you see students united at a certain stance but when you look at the big picture you see its completely divided. You cannot look at this just the language, because the resolution last quarter did not have that same courtesy. I expressed in my op-ed it was a mistake and it was through the public comment that I really learned. USAC is not the forum to take stances on geopolitical issues and we must look at it in its entirety. He put forward this resolution with the best intentions. He doesn't deny that everyone has their own experiences, and nobody can invalidate those on either side. It's really a testament to how personal it is. We need to look at it in context.

-Joanino goes into straw vote and asks them to raise their hand if you oppose the resolution.

-There were 7 hands raised and Joanino wants to dissect it.

-Badalich states Oved's resolution intent behind it was because the intent was dialogue but you didn't dialogue prior. There were four days you had to learn about it and there were four days in which SJP new about the resolution and had to prepare. That's why it's very different in a vacuum because that's what I used, but the context you're talking about is different than what you are talking about. Now its historical and political. In terms at the table and said if divestment came it would cause sides. There is a thing called learning about the issue and being able to change your opinion, and now she has had 2 months since the last resolution and has had different meetings with both sides whether it was leaders, professors, advisors, and talked with many different people. In terms of taking what I said as a promise of how I'm going to vote, no. The vacuum she totally gets it and she understands why he's saying it but she doesn't think these two resolutions are similar because they have different intents. The last one you said the intent was dialogue but you talked about divestment.

-Oved completely respects what he said and refers "as a representative of students this isn't representing all students, she states maybe we can patch it and she doesn't feel comfortable and she sees these faces they were marginalized" and then Oved states you also specifically said "the stakeholders weren't part of the creation of the language." Just like it was fall quarter all the stakeholders were not included. This issue because it says Palestinian does not make it an isolated issue for a specific community to take ownership,

the minute you put it in a resolution it comes a resolution of 28,000. Obviously through public comment there were a lot of students that felt ties. You can see in the public forum we talked about the comment.

-Badalich stated the intent of Oved's was dialogue and the intent of SJP is to divest. If the intention is dialogue and you don't fulfill that, that's hypocritical. SJP talked to the leaders of Hillel and BFI. She feels it is an issue of consent. No matter what we are not representing all of students because either SJP or BFI will get hurt. This is not representing all students and the idea that if we vote against this you are continuing to marginalize PAlestian students. They didn't give consent to give money to occupation in the West Bank to their families. That's why she thinks it's different than the idea of being neutral and keeping a campus climate because it's currently healthy. Somehow healthy thinking in Jewish student perspective is unrealistic.

-Hadjimanoukian states to justify his opposition pretty much comes down to talking about these five companies and the people who are against the resolution say the companies are their for safety and that gets into the value of human life argument. The fact is that terrorism is a thing, and whether or not they are x,y, or z and the fact is that they are in this region and are creating safety threats to state of Israel. The whole point is that he didn't make the choice to invest in these 5 companies and that comes from a higher power, and he doesn't know that from disinvesting in these companies he's potentially creating a threat. He didn't say they were going to invest in these companies and it's that switch. The fact is that these companies are here for security reasons and terrorism is a thing. The whole point is that it's a measure of security measures.

-Joanino invites those who interrupt that they are welcome to leave.

-Hall thanks everyone for sticking it out and she feels passionate about UCLA students. She challenges council to stop speaking about hypotheticals because we are currently living in reality where we ARE invested in these companies that are conducting violence on this planet. Communities are being hurt by these companies. Forgive her for being short tempered, and we are living in this reality she can't find patience to live in a hypothetical. If we vote to consensually no longer be invested in these companies. Right now, my consent was not asked. We keep talking about the regents won't do this and the regent's won't do that, the regents are the one who are trying to increase tuition. The regents are the same people who have continuously taken stances that are not pro-students. Please just know the regents argument is pointless and stop talking about hypotheticals and talk about the reality people are facing right now everyday, today.

-Ramalho states that for the previous resolution with Oved's is that we created a new precedent that students who had stakes in certain resolutions must be a part of it. SJP has done a great job with workshops and when the Jewish were asked to be involved in the writing, they were told no. It's like telling someone they will get a punch in the face just so they are ready. They were made aware of the fact that it was coming, but there were so many points of unity that SJO just presented and don't believe they should be investing in violation of Palestinian rights. A lot of people said it was impossible for BFI and SJP to get together in a room, but no one even tried. Looking at the context of the resolution, he would have loved to see more collaboration or an attempted collaboratoin. It was a here's what we're doing are there recommendations? It's hard for him to say, "you're right, we aren't going to include them."

-Rogers goes off of Ramalho's point with the Jewish community not being involved in authored. It's about students not being represented and this is a UC Regent policy we currently have. All of us have been lobbied by SJP and BFI and everyone is entitled to own opinions, but not own facts. We are talking about hypothetical but it is very real, that if this resolution will pass they will feel marginalized we aren't representing them but also misrepresenting them.

-Singh echoes what Ramalho said and to add to Roger's point as far as the hypothetical goes we heard how a number of students said safety in Israel is not an abstract concept, it's something they grapple with on a daily basis. He wants to move away from that point and go toward why he's not supporting the resolution. Many of you were asked to hold yourself accountable, and looking back I see that my sponsorship and support for the resolution was misguided and did not represent both sides so it was inappropriate as a general representative whose job is to quite literally generally represent, he was work. With that understanding he holds himself accountable and because of that he cannot support the resolution for exactly the same reason Ramalho said.

- Naameh said that according to Ramalho was really a punch in the face and the illusion to physical violence, this is the most nonviolent and the most peaceful approach to an incredibly violent situation. It is undeniably the D in BDS. BDS was a call by the Palestinians civil society as a nonviolent way to address a way for their voices to be heard. Our council is not asked to support BDS, but we are asked to support divestment. This is the only tie as privileged students in LA. Our money is going to support this violent regime of oppression. It's one of the tactics advocated by the BDS movement. She urges the Pro-Israel and Pro-Jewish students to not allow this speculative anxiety, to justify it with racist and neocolonial violence that is happening. She encourages not to allow hypothetical fear to justify the physical human suffering. If we can't divest because of an external narrative we have no control over, how do you propose we acknowledge the humanity of Palestinians. Divestment is their only ability to address this conflict and the form of dialogue they have. This was an issue of non consent that they are being forced to fund the violence of are own people, then it was a problem of a resolution denouncing any form of divestment, and now a lot of council members because it did support it. It seems like a lot of us flip-flopping, she doesn't support them taking stances with large geopolitical issues. We have no right to say we support a two state. Who the fuck are we to say we represent Palestinian people and the fact that she is seen as the strongest supporter because she doesn't have a direct link. Today what we have is another attempt to silence Palestinian students who already are being marginalized, criminalized, and killed and that is not acceptable. Our campus climate is already a shit show already evident by the racist and misogynist sexual slurs, lack of access retention programs, lack of students of color, disturbing number of students that celebrated the failure of bruin diversity many of whom would celebrate the failure of this resolution. It seems to knowledge the feelings of Pro-Israel to the inexcusable silencing of Palestinian students and of ALL other allies who have been struggling for years to talk about their campus climate. The simple fact there is no positive campus climate when we are invested in violence. The only tie we have to this conflict and the only time we can be accountable, we need to fucking represent our student body. What the hell are we doing here? Someone said they don't support economic warfare, well I don't support military warfare. Someone said earlier how traumatizing it is to hear code red and she agrees, and she

cannot imagine living in an environment. In Ghaza there are no Code Red sirens, you don't get that privilege. Palestinians and civilians are killed. So we are not taking a stance on geopolitical issue, we are not saying we endorse this type of solution of a conflict. We are saying that this is happening, we just don't want to participate. To the Pro-Israel community, Israel has right is the same right ensured to Palestinians. To say that sovereign nation has a right to defend itself, unfortunately Palestinian don't have the right.

-Hall wants to touch upon stances because being in this room is really reminiscent of the little thing called elections. She just continuously remembered how many times she was asked if she will take a stance on pretty much anything. Back then when she was campaigning and now as an elected official she will continue to take the stances. We are complicit in the violence of human beings. For some reason if we attach the identity Palestinian to humans all of a sudden they are no longer humans. She wants to emphasize these are human bodies. Someone mentioned that the divestment of South Africa took 10 years, and yeah it took years. There were people who literally postponed graduations to make sure that movement happened. Every social movement towards progress was started by students, then if not us then who.

-Jasso states a few weeks ago she made some comments regarding campus climate and keeping campus climate at the forefront of any conversation whether it be on emails or divestment and she stresses that the council continues consider the narrative that by voting yes or no, you will create a narrative must defend and a narrative you are willing to defend to the entire campus community. Not only own moral standards but also a personal level on how you feel about the issue and discussing the issue. Previous councils have abused the use of abstentions by saying I'm not going to use their opinion. She wants council to see if they are educated enough to make a decision. If you aren't educated as a council member then what right do you have to make a decision? In addition in Oved's resolution we gave it the process of getting amendments. There has been a lack of engagement on the actual resolution which is she appalled. The people during the straw vote who were so vehemently opposed must consider amendments and the idea of abstention and whether or not you should be using it.

-Kim stated she was not aware of the straw vote and did not know. Clearly there was opposition to the resolution doesn't that mean to amend it instead of going into deliberations.

-Badalich stated that for their understanding with BFI and Oved they don't want it to come through at all.

-Joanino stated he doesn't want to waste time to dissect semantics and the point is to get through the actual problem.

-Oved wants to reiterate that it's not the language he has the biggest issue with it's looking at it in the greater context. When you do relate it in context, you see it's related to the bigger grander movement as the BDS movement. An actor in a conflict cannot define peace, and when one say divestment is the way when the other says its not. It has been admitted over again that this a part of BDS. When you look at the divest hand guide, you do see that theres a process through that. First, if you look through divest hand guide you must go to the board of trustees which SJP did to the Board of Directors. Oved says its unfair to see its not BDS when the people who feel marginalized or attack then you must give them that merit. No one has denounced people's hurt feelings and no one said that to Asian Americans and we must keep that stanrd to the jewish community. Back to the

idea, amendments made in the resolution is not going to be productive because BFI and Hillel need to be part of the creation and not anyone on this council, it's not them. This is an opportunity to go back and reach out to the appropriate stakeholders. After public comment, it makes you see the reality of the situation there is obviously a want to be part of the creation and suggests the authors to consider that.

-Trumble stated the issue last quarter was that SJP had no idea, not only was SJP clear and well advertised, they met with BFI and Hillel and they did collaborate and the clause distancing them from the BDS was put in as a result from that meeting. There were Jewish students involved in the writing. It's clear to all of us and people feel strongly. The thing is that we heard over and over tonight that the passage of this resolution would prevent them from being proud of being a Bruin. How can Palestinian students feel proud of being a Bruin right now? Should they be proud? If people feel so strongly if we are going to take a stance and the best thing we can do is withdraw the stance we've already taken, which is investing in these corporations. No matter what decision we make tonight, the wall will still be there and the checkpoints will be there. We owe it to these students to not be complicit in the communities they come from and identify with. Moving into the texts she wants to make an amendment and one of the things we heard repeatedly that this idea it might deny self-determination and she doesn't want that to happen. She wants to add a clause to acknowledge the right to self-determination to both Palestinians and Israelis.

-Badalich stated no one disagreed the human rights violations and secondly we are talking about campus climate as if we are already neutral, when we are already invested. We keep on talking about campus climate as if it's only that right to a campus climate that benefits them on one side because that's currently how the Palestinians feel. They don't feel proud and are complicit in violence against their own people, and the idea that this is representing all Jewish students there were at least a handful of Jewish students who said they were in support. She really wants to throw away the idea generally representing is unfair because it's divisive. This idea of safety, their right to safety is a human right. Their human right to safety does not supersede the right to movement the right to property, not just along the line but within the West Bank itself. When we are talking about this idea of safety, we also have to think about what this means about safety of when the safety of one nation causes the human rights violations documented internationally of others. When it goes back to that, it goes off to value lives more if we value Israelis more than Palestinians. We must think about the implications. We are not neutral, this idea of neutrality is confounded. This idea of campus climate it may seem great and wonderful, but the Palestinian students don't feel. Obviously it's complex and let's not make it one-sided. The absence of no is not a yes. She wants to add a clause of the right to self-determination and the right of both states and wants to make sure that when it comes out.

-Joanino asks if they are proposing specific language.

-Oved states the right to movement doesn't supersede the right to a life is the perspective of Jewish and Palestinian. The accusations of not responding to human rights, checkpoints were in place because in 2000 and 2004 there were intifadas that were lately been defined as uprising, but if you take it in Jewish context it's a campaign to kill. In 2000 and 2004 there were 2 intifadas that killed 1,000 Israeli civilians. These wrongdoings are not the Palestinian people, it's the extremist regimes that Israel needs

too defend itself which is why there are checkpoints there. He would call that a human rights violation, killing another person. 97% of the wall is a fence and it has decreased terrorist attacks. It was mentioned that we are not neutral and divesting would it make neutral, but divesting would take a stance on the issue which said it wouldn't do and say we are divesting on the safety of Israeli citizens and that included Muslims and Jews and that's taking a stance. He wants to challenge the fact that divestment is the only way to make change. As we have seen there are people standing right in front of you are willing to draft language with you and this can be a united front. We really need to invest together in that medium to work towards unity.

-Ramalho doesn't want anyone to think that SJP didn't do a great job, especially considering since they went to Bruin Republicans and Bruin Democrats. These weren't facades or false efforts. He doesn't believe that adding an amendment right now or later doesn't mean the same as giving it a shot. There were so many points of unity and wants to make a resolution with those principles to discuss the occupation of PAlestine.

-Singh states he respects and will interpret his job as general representative as he sees fit. To go to the initial claim, a number of people who stated the alleged human rights and not complicit. He thinks that right there we can flesh out further and he really wants to mark a point Avi made that divesting as not moving towards a neutral stance. When we are talking about the intifadas we know there was violence in the region. Many people who spoke on behalf said they wanted to see peace, these weren't arbitrary measures. They were implemented for a reason and have been relatively effective in protecting their families. He recognizes that they cause immense amount of trouble and pain and he doesn't know how to grapple because on one hand it supports people and on the other hand it disenfranchises. What Ramalho talks about using the points of unity is an elegant solution to the problem we are facing.

-Haws wants to start by addressing that came from the alleged. There are a lot of things we can debate, but he is tired of the word using the word alleged. The human rights violations are real and legitimate. He wants to address the reference to LGBT rights in Israel and that being used in reference to people in Palestine. He celebrates LGBT rights but he wants to keep it as privilege and there are queer people in Palestine being oppressed in other ways. He feels that he is learning something new everytime they have a conversation which makes him wary about taking a stance. The consistency of a group being represented last quarter and this year. A lot of people argue that some people say its taking a stance while it's not. Number four its the narrative he wants it be a narrative he's proud of. He will be interpreting his job as a general representative he sees fit also.

-Rogers states she's confused of neutrality. This is UC policy, and this is the first time we're taking a stance. She is going to have to agree with Singh and Oved by divesting that it is not neutral. There are so many other things out there we can do and she applauds SJP reaching out and meeting with lots of people and hosting teach ins and there are a lot of different options. We must acknowledge that they see it as part of the BDS movement and its very important to note it could be something USAC could consider.

-Hall wants to know essentially what came out of the meeting when SJP spoke to BFI. She was told that BFI would be not in support of any resolution that would do with divestment. She doesn't see this conversation going anywhere circular. Badalich pointed out someone will be going hurt or feel excluded. Hall counters what Rogers said, we as USAC have not taken a stance but by being a student at UCLA we are complicit in the

stance that regents have taken. All year they have been championing about consent and what that means thanks to Badalich and Joanino. We talk about consent that is very real, the fact that we have continuously define clearly makes it known that they don't know what consent means. The fact that a student consented to enroll in one of the best universities in the world doesn't mean they are consenting to perpetuating violence against their community. For us to be complicit in this violence would be us taking a stance. Right now it's been clearly outlined that we are invested in these companies. We are not invested in governments or individuals, we are talking about is calling for the divestment of United States of America owned companies. I too know what's it like to not be proud to be a Bruin and feel unsafe, she has been told that her presence scares people. Why? Because I'm an empowered woman of color? I'm sorry I'm not sorry. Move towards neutrality council, let's divest.

-Jasso urges the council to reconsider the way the conversation was started. She doesn't believe the straw vote in which we could have began a discussion that was conducive to having real progress in terms of amendments but in terms of discussion itself. She urges the council to have an additional straw vote, would you be open to accepting it with amendments. It seems that council members are individually discussing own personal opinions. That can circumvent the circular nature. On the procedural level she hopes they consider it.

-Trumble wants to touch on the idea that we shouldn't be discussing this issue. Universities exist to facilitate discussion and learning. Above that, Nelson mentioned that this issue comes up a lot. It comes up on UC campuses and college campuses across the country and comes up repeatedly through history. She doesn't want anyone to think this issue creeps up on them, she didn't expect two resolutions, but we must be cognizant this is the defining issue of the campus climate. This is a particularly divisive issue because we need to think of what issue is. Anything that is an issue is divisive and debateable. If not's divisive then it's probably not a issue.

-Oved wants to reiterate that this is seen as BDS movement and this is going to be reiterated by SJP and UC Berkeley and wants to address that SJP reached out to the Jewish community and offered to be part of it and it was declined. He reads the email from Rahim to Tammy, "lastly we understand Hillel's wish we want to respectfully decline and these rights are for Palestinians their rights, we know the issue is close we stand--

-Jasso states the action must have been addressed, also this heresy as while he appreciates it that in itself is creating a dialogue outside is not conducive to a positive conversation and refocus it on the action that is presented because of Robert's Rules of Order.

-Joanino asks if you would be willing to approve this resolution with amendments please raise your hand.

-5 people raised their hand.

-Kim states that she doesn't denounce any of the human right violations all over the world but she cannot support a resolution with sense of consistency and reject the resolution of neutral harmless status and decided not to pass it because of opposition to students in that room and across campus. There are some at the table for voting for something there is so much opposition to, this is a personal issue for a lot and an emotional issue for all of us. She can't be swayed to vote when she would like to represent in the most

representative way. Even in the 9.5 hours there was a lot of opposition and took tallies and right now her stance she wants to exercise her right to vote but as representative as much as possible. Some of us vote that way and some of us don't.

-Naameh has a lot of respect for Kim and objectivity but she wants to challenge the notion that being representative of the entire student body equals a no vote. First, there are several articles and painful emails after the drop the i-word resolution and clearly there were some people that felt marginalized and want to represent the humanity of undocumented people. Maybe it was because it happened over summer, but even if there was a strong opposition she would have voted the same even though she didn't think she was representing all of student body. Any issue that is an issue is because there are different opinions. That doesn't mean we cannot take action, that is perpetuation of status quo. That is complicit by omission. She would argue that the amazing solidarity of all colors, religion, nationalities to acknowledge the rights of Palestinian to their lives speaks wonders of the uniting potential of this. The opposition to this has legitimate concerns and fears but that shouldn't stop us from addressing those fears, I personally don't agree with BDS, but she does agree we need to divest from the violation of Palestinian rights. She's not here to take a stance on 2 state solution, luckily we don't have to be an expert on Israeli and Palestinian conflict to know we are funding violence and destruction. She wants to take an active stance against it. You can be complacent in something and if you don't have an opinion on something or an injustice you don't know you don't have a hand in perpetuating that. Once that has been spoken about for 9 hours, you become complicit. This notion about dialogue BFI and Hillel specifically stated they wouldn't support divestment. So first that is the position to see that recognizing Palestinian human rights because they fail to recognize the national security of one place should not enable the collective punishment of 1.5 million. The failure of occupier and occupied and oppressor and oppressed there is no place in dialogue. Dialogue implies there are people on equal footing. Why are human rights debateable? Why is that a conversation needed?

-Joanino does not think we should not yield time to the audience.

-Naameh would like someone on council to complete the sentence "I support the investment on the violation of human rights because..."

-Hall said that after sitting through 9.5 hours of essentially people yelling she has never felt as unified as a council. This is something that we are in together. Whatever decision we make tonight we are going to have to live with. She respectfully challenges the idea that by anyone voting no is voting on behalf of all of UCLA students. Other than the plethora of student organizations listed on the powerpoint that support this resolution other than the hours and hours of conversation and people talking which she does not want to diminish at all-- but she wants them to understand that no matter what we do someone is going to get hurt. She doesn't normally say this, if you don't feel comfortable voting yes then she encourages them to abstain. It does not make sense for them to take a stance if neutrality is a stance. The best stance to take is abstention if you think there's a conflict of interest or don't feel educated about it.

-Singh has one comment and one observation. Singh agrees that issues are divisive but solutions do not have to be. He is hoping to find something not divisive. It seems like we are having a conversation between ourselves on behalf of two different communities that's what it seems like.

-Hadjimanoukian ran for USAC as a Facilities Commissioner because he wants to improve the campus for a better quality. The issue has been by far the most polarizing, such like the manner he spent hours talking to both sides and accessible. He is deeply disturbed to have USAC arbitrator between two sides that is clearly far deeper investment. The conflict between Israeli and Palestine is real and sympathizes. What would it do if I had two opposing views for a project? They have to work it out together, he doesn't believe it has to be done here but it can be done. It's a microcosm of what's happening in the middle east. How can we expect the larger problem to be solved. Government should only be an arbitrator after people work together for investment and this isn't the step.

-Oved thinks the conversation is getting circular and wants to move to table the resolution with the recommendation they do meet.

-Hadjimanoukian seconds.

-Hall objects out of respect for all of the people who waited this long for us and respect for everyone who waited, and for student groups who spent months getting it to the table.

-Naameh objects because implying that first of all for them to say that these groups have to work together to draft a language would set a precedent of groups working together with unequal power dynamics. It leads to increasingly watered down versions of what is happening and the normalization of violence with eventual peace process. She went out with Ari Shivy for Hirrets, Liberal Zionist to see what he had to say. One was, "what do you think about current peace process?" He stated to this effect, "it's probably not going to work, it's a cyclical thing that Israel asks for peace in April and have 7,000 new settlers in November." This delay and inaction is part of the perpetuation of violence and expansion of it. No one really addressed the building of settlements in the West Bank, how is that a national security issue? The Israeli state is putting its people in harms way, if you are claiming to take every measure to protect citizens why do you subsidize and build Israeli only settlements and Jewish only roads and direct it to those settlements. How does that make sense to say there's violence against Palestinians against our settlers? An Israeli judge would probably say maybe you should hit them back and it'll stop. A normal rational person would say, give them back their land maybe it'll stop. She was watching this documentary that 75% of suicide bombers had their homes demolished when they were children.

-Badalich stated it would postpone it and must fall through even with the controversial stuff. we must talk about it as a unified council it'll just be postponed and continue this open wound. She would like to offer a secret ballot and use a few examples. The fact that we have people from the press and videotaping when they didn't have media passes, and too many of council members have probably gotten anonymous emails with threats. She feels uncomfortable and she doesn't want that to change without the fear of how that vote would be perceived on that office.

-Badalich puts forward a secret ballot.

-Hall states that point of order that they must object.

-Jasso states procedurally that by tabling a resolution you table it indefinitely comes back at any point by taking it back to the creators, that won't be a table because it'll come back as a new resolution therefore the tabling won't be of current issue but a resurface of a newer resolution. With regards to a secret ballot, it is a majority vote according to Robert's Rule it is through majority vote and typically a sergeant of arms would count the votes.

- Trumble objects because she thinks it should come in a new form if council members want it. It would be better to do a real vote, but threats are something we talk about.
 - Singh rejects unequivocally of a secret ballot this is a public body to 9 hours, the idea that we switch to a private vote makes no sense. He understands its serious things to talk about it if there's threats. It's a disservice to all the people here.
 - Hall states as a direct response, hypothetically if a resolution is passed then every council's name is removed and becomes a council initiative. If a council member's safety is being threatened, and that is serious. If someone doesn't feel comfortable speaking out or saying how they feel that's us silencing them.
 - Ramalho stated he had the idea earlier, we are forgetting accountable. He wants to vote publicly and you will deprive students of being accountable. You'd want your elected officials to be held accountable.
 - Joanino stated the motion hasn't been made.
 - Jasso states four people have objected hence the motion Oved puts forward failed.
 - Badalich moves for a secret ballot.
 - Hall seconds.
 - Jasso states it's not a debatable motion if someone's safety or concerned is involved.
 - Zimmerman states USAC in bylaws follows Robert's Rules and puts it on the projector.
 - Voting by Ballot.* The main object of this form of voting is secrecy, and it is resorted to when the question is of such a nature that some members might hesitate to vote publicly their true sentiments. Its special use is in the reception of members, elections, and trials of members and officers, as well as in the preliminary steps in both cases, and the by-laws should require the vote to be by ballot in such cases. Where the by-laws do not require the vote to be by ballot, it can be so ordered by a majority vote, or by general consent. Such motions are undebatable. Voting by ballot is rarely, if ever, used in legislative bodies, but in ordinary societies, especially secret ones, it is habitually used in connection with elections and trials, and sometimes for the selection of the next place for the meeting of a convention. As the usual object of the ballot is secrecy, where the by-laws require the vote to be taken by ballot any motion is out of order which members cannot oppose without exposing their views on the question to be decided by ballot. Thus, it is out of order to move that one person cast the ballot of the assembly for a certain person when the by-laws require the vote to be by ballot. So, when the ballot is not unanimous it is out of order to move to make the vote unanimous, unless the motion is voted on by ballot so as to allow members to vote against it in secrecy.
 - Zimmerman stated it can be ordered by majority vote then it can be a secret ballot and cannot debate the issue anymore.
 - Jasso asks can the motion be interpreted prior to the vote.
 - 7-6-0 secret ballot.
 - Kim asked if we can talk about it.
 - Joanino said they are not allowed to.
 - Oved stated that voting by secret ballot sets a bad precedent. It's never happened before and in effort of transparency and he can vote in front of that.
 - Jasso states a motion of undebatable and even a comment is a form of debate.
 - Joanino wants to say that council members even though its by secret ballot you have the opportunity to disclose your ballot.
- Joanino passes out the secret ballots.*

-Jasso clarifies it's yes, no, or absention. Write above the line.
7-5-0 the resolution fails.

VI. Officer and Member Reports

A. President – John Joanino

-Joanino has a meeting with executive chances to put rest there being no student input currently and meeting next week with executive searches and equity withh John Sarvey leadership and encourages them to apply and the bruin card redesign competition.

B. Internal Vice President – Avi Oved

C. External Vice President – Maryssa Hall

-Hall has a UCSA voard meeting in UCI and give dtf postcards.

D. Academic Affairs Commissioners -- Daren Ramalho

-Ramalho the online education UC wide is happening Thursday and next week report to everybody the consensus of online obligation. The next transfer workshop series is happening and keep posted for that.

E. Student Wellness Commissioner

-Badalichs tated next week photo series of alcohol is not consent and during Week 10 the zine for 7000 is coming out and UC woman's assembly to put out femmefest. She is talking with the DA on Friday and taking up cases with sexual assault.

F. Gen Rep 2

-Singh states they have panel this Thursday

F. Administrative Representative

VII. Fund Allocations

-Trumble moves to approve contingency. Hall seconds.

-Badalich moves to approve.

11-0-1 contingency is approved.

A. Finance Committee Chair Discretionary

D. ASRF

-Ramalho will email out contingency

E. Student Wellness Programming Fund

-\$200 for icarus

IIX. Old Business

IX. New Business

-Kerkhoff 417 3-5 pm the funding panel would be there since the deadline is coming up on April 25th.

-Joanino stated the communal office space belongs to e-board.

-Arce invites everyone to apply to the scholarship with less than 3000 words.

-Hadjimanoukian stated they are trying to redesign the reusable coffee cup and have it for sale starting Earth day.

-Singh asks if its administered through CSC or SOUL?

-Arce states it's for all students.

X. Announcements

XII. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

The attendance sheet was passed around.

XIII. Adjournment

Arce moves to adjourn. Badalich seconds.

Meeting adjourned 6 am.

XIV. Good and Welfare