I. Opening
   
   a. Call to Order
   
   b. Attendance
      
      i. Zack Clark.2753 for Maria Vargo
      
      ii. Max Littman.127 for Curtis Pierson
      
      iii. Lei Guo.1141 for Rebecca Slavik
      
      iv. Ezequiel Herrera.105 for Grant Tyson
      
      v. Basel Anani.2 for Maddie Smith
      
      vi. Jacob Spiegel.66 for Chris Weller after 8:17 pm
      
      vii. Haley Reedy.88 for Vikas Munjal after 7:51 pm
   
   c. Swearing in of Alternates
   
   d. Approval of Minutes

   Enter executive session for appeal at 6:37pm

   Exited executive session at 7:02pm

II. Open Forum for the Public

   i. Abdinajib Liban.5: Hello My name is Abdinajib Liban. I heard about
      
      this resolution recently and fell in love with it immediate, and ask
the senators to support it. This resolution looks to create a committee that looks into where we put out investments and human rights, and that is something that definitely fits in with the spirit of USG.

Looking at these human rights issues does not make someone anti-muslim or anti-jewish. This committee will help the university look at what is affect the people from which we come.

ii. Jeremy Croning.4: Hello everyone. My name is Jeremy Croning and I am a second year student. I am here to present our opposition to 50-R-27. There are ideals in this room share. This resolution addresses some of the most complicated issues of the world. Just because they are complicated doesn’t mean we should support them. This compromises the real purpose of our senators and prevents compromise or solutions. Supporters of this bill will tell you they were simply asking for a committee be created. This bill is not that. If this passes, we all know that the headline will be “Ohio State passes BDS”. Some people will say this is not political. But these so called human rights will divide our campus.
Hi everyone, I am Hannah Borow. I am here to speak as opposition to 50-R-27. Ohio State Students have already spoke out against this issue. I hope you will think critically, and think why now. Just last semester, a fossil fuel divestment was passed without a committee. I am eager to work with other students to concern human rights issues, but this is not about that. This is about boycotting Israel and its sanctions.

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. My name is Ahmad Aboukar. As a student of Ohio State, I am heavily invested in this great community. Through service work and tuition, I feel that I am through and through a buckeye. However, I have reason to believe that OSU is invested in companies that are currently profiting from human rights violations around the globe. You and I would never knowingly give our hard-earned money to companies like Lockheed Martin and Raytheon (companies that create weapons of war,) so why should we be okay with Ohio State investing our tuition money into companies with blood on their hands? Just
because the money changes hands a few times, does not mean we should put our humanity and morality on the back burner. The university has already set a precedent for pursuing socially responsible investments with the passage of resolution 50-R-24 to divest from the top 200 Fossil Fuel Companies and Energy Transfer Partners. I do not see any issue with following this trend in parallel with Michael Drake's 20/20 vision of instilling equality and inclusiveness at Ohio State. I also believe we have an inherent right to ask that the university invest ethically, as it is a public institution.

As your constituent, I am asking that you represent me and others in voting in favor of this independent and politically-unbiased committee being formed. Our university should be a shining example of transparency and trust, and I truly believe this would make us one step closer to achieving that goal of financial reassurance. I hope that as students, we can take solace in the fact that our contributions to the university are being used in an ethical and sustainable manner. I urge you to please read the resolution
thoroughly. Human rights issues are not subject to political biases, and this resolution is purely apolitical. Thank you for your time!

v. Hoda Khamis: I’d like to thank everyone for coming here today and listening to this very important issue. My name is Hoda Khamis, and I am 3rd year here at OSU, I am also the secretary of the Arab Student Union. Senators, as a representative of the Arab Student Union, I speak for hundreds of OSU students who, like myself, have been directly impacted by human rights violations perpetrated and encouraged by corporations that we may be investing in. There’s no doubt in my mind, or the minds of hundreds of your constituents, that the right thing to do today is to take a stand against injustice. I understand that we can’t just take a vote against human rights violations, wave our hand and make them disappear. But as one of the largest universities in the nation, this USG can make a difference. By voting ‘yes’ on today’s resolution, we’re taking a step in the right direction - we’re making sure that our current investments are made in an ethical manner. Beyond that, we can be
sure that with the passage of this bill, the next generation of Buckeyes can enroll assured that their money is not being used to perpetrate injustices around the world. I’m not suggesting that the people affected by our unethical investments are limited to a single demographic or small in number; to do so would stand contrary to the very reason we’re in support of this bill. The fact of the matter is when our money goes to companies that perpetuate human rights violations at home and abroad, and we knowingly do nothing to change that, we find ourselves complicit. More than that, we force thousands of other Buckeyes just like us to perpetuate human rights violations against people everywhere, just like us. Thank you for your time.

vi. Paul B. Ellis.692: Senators, Madam Speaker, I’m Paul B. Ellis, I’m a senior Evolution and Ecology major, and I’m Jewish, and I’m here today to support greater transparency of university investments, but to oppose the resolution in its current form singling out Israel. I’m here because I care about Palestinians and Israelis equally. I have
relatives and good friends who are Israeli, and some of my most engaged friends and classmates are Palestinian. This bill is a symbolic measure that doesn’t advance Palestinian statehood, and this is the wrong approach and venue to make meaningful change on the ground in Gaza and the West Bank. Its introduction was a failure of dialogue on the subject. BDS strengthens demagogues of the Israeli right wing like Netanyahu by reinforcing their narrative justifying their policies to Israelis, and doesn’t encourage a lasting peace. But the American Jewish community’s path doesn’t bring a solution closer either. If we ignore the occupation, stifle any criticism of Netanyahu’s actions, and conflate opposing current policy with opposing Israel’s existence, we aren’t moving toward peace. The way to progress on this issue is to come forward to listen to each other, to compromise, and to work to forge a shared destiny for Israelis and Palestinians. A two-state solution is the way towards peace, and if we really want to improve conditions on the ground, we should support
organizations advocating ending the occupation. The way to move toward resolving the conflict isn’t in this room. The way to make investments available to the public and a committee may be in this room. I am ready to come to the table on this conflict to listen, learn, and compromise. I hope to see you there. In an era of peak public demand for transparency, it is all of our duty to call upon the Board of Trustees to make all university investments public for examination by a committee. Ohio taxpayers and students paying tuition have a right to know what companies the University invests their money in. If we invest in companies engaged in unethical behavior as determined by the committee, we are failing to live up to the university’s mission: Education for Citizenship. To be a citizen is to engage in the democratic process, to give a voice to the voiceless, and to critically examine our communities’ actions.

vii. Sam Weiss.568: My name is Sam Weiss. As per the proposed resolution, I too believe that, “all students have the right to critically review and examine the ethics of the University’s financial
investments”. This resolution is immensely broad, targeting and accusing companies of human rights issues across political spectrums, parts of the world, and backgrounds. In developing an ad hoc committee, we are overlooking the deep complexity and thus lacking the due diligence each particular situation deserves. These companies are not analogous and must be evaluated individually. By developing a committee, we would be inadvertently depriving “all students”, of their aforementioned right to review the ethics of the financial investments. A small committee is absolutely not representative of the student population. In fact, in March 2017, the student population voted against a referendum opting to boycott the very companies that this resolution wishes to divest from. If we want to respect the views of “all students”, then listen to the student voice of less than one year ago. This resolution, though it states it, “is not an attack on any particular identity or a sweeping criticism of any nation” seemingly targets companies with a particular connection to Israel. For example, Raytheon is the developer of the Iron Dome, a
rocket protection system intended to knock rockets launched by Hamas, Hezbollah, and other terrorist organizations from Gaza, the West Bank, and other surrounding countries. It seems that this resolution is attempting to specifically divest from companies with ties to Israel, though it disguises the fact. Towards the end of the resolution, it proclaims that campuses across the nation have passed similar resolutions. As a Jew and member of a minority population, I care about inclusivity on campus. A report from the Huffington Post found that on the 64 campuses with a large presence or passing of BDS, 287 anti-Semitic incidents were reported, compared to 198 occurrences that took place during the same time last year, reflecting a 45 percent increase. This legislation seems to use the campuses across the nation as an example to follow, yet this evidence shows the negative consequences that follow comparable actions. So today, I ask you to follow what is right, and vote against resolution 50-R-27.
viii.Hannah Frayman.2: Hello! My name is Hannah Frayman and I am strongly against this resolution for the following reasons:

“Throughout the process of debating this resolution, authors and proponents of A.R. 7-019 stated that their advocacy for divestment from the specified companies is completely distinct from the Boycott, Divest, and Sanction (BDS) Movement — I do not believe this.” This is a quote from the President of the Central Student Government at the University of Michigan about a resolution that is explicitly cited in the text of tonight’s resolution, and we’d like to provide some context. In the days leading up to the vote, members of UMDivest, the group which sponsored the BDS bill, handed out flyers which clearly stated that their campaign was an answer to the call for BDS from the Global BDS Movement. The vote at Michigan took place on Tuesday, November 14. The authors of the resolution consistently claimed the bill was not tied to BDS. However, students pointed out that the first version of the resolution, introduced a week earlier, included citations from the official BDS Movement website.
When this was brought to the attention of the CSG, the authors deleted the citation. A day after the resolution was passed, the official BDS Movement celebrated it on their Facebook page, calling it a victory for BDS. Tonight’s resolution mirrors the one passed at Michigan almost word for word. The authors of this resolution are not telling you the truth. They’re not telling you that Jewish students who did not support the UM resolution were called “white supremacists” in the student newspaper. They’re not telling you that a well-respected, Jewish professor was silenced and not permitted to speak out. They’re not telling you that a swastika was drawn in the very building where this resolution was passed only 24 hours early. They aren’t telling you it’s BDS, and they aren’t telling you the truth.

ix. Nomi Poprish: Hello! My name is Hannah Frayman and I am strongly against this resolution for the following reasons:

“Throughout the process of debating this resolution, authors and proponents of A.R. 7-019 stated that their advocacy for divestment
from the specified companies is completely distinct from the Boycott, Divest, and Sanction (BDS) Movement — I do not believe this.” This is a quote from the President of the Central Student Government at the University of Michigan about a resolution that is explicitly cited in the text of tonight’s resolution, and we’d like to provide some context. In the days leading up to the vote, members of UMDivest, the group which sponsored the BDS bill, handed out flyers which clearly stated that their campaign was an answer to the call for BDS from the Global BDS Movement. The vote at Michigan took place on Tuesday, November 14. The authors of the resolution consistently claimed the bill was not tied to BDS. However, students pointed out that the first version of the resolution, introduced a week earlier, included citations from the official BDS Movement website. When this was brought to the attention of the CSG, the authors deleted the citation. A day after the resolution was passed, the official BDS Movement celebrated it on their Facebook page, calling it a victory for BDS. Tonight’s resolution mirrors the one passed at
Michigan almost word for word. The authors of this resolution are not telling you the truth. They’re not telling you that Jewish students who did not support the UM resolution were called “white supremacists” in the student newspaper. They’re not telling you that a well-respected, Jewish professor was silenced and not permitted to speak out. They’re not telling you that a swastika was drawn in the very building where this resolution was passed only 24 hours early. They aren’t telling you it’s BDS, and they aren’t telling you the truth.

x. Wesam Jallaq.28: I think I can confidently echo the sentiments of a number of the speakers before me: people who know where their money might be going, and understand the extent to which the blatant human rights violations occur in America and abroad want to do something to change the status quo. By standing together, we can do that today by passing this resolution, which tells the world on behalf of The Ohio State University that we won’t stand for injustice at home or abroad. As one of the largest and most diverse
universities in the world, many of our own students are inevitably affected by the immoral and unethical choices made by many corporations, whether it be to arm states with weapons to kill innocent Yemeni citizens or intentionally profit off of the mass incarceration of people of color. This only goes to show that when we contribute to social injustice and human rights violations worldwide, we end up being negatively impacted too. Among the undergrad student organizations who support this bill, they represent students from nearly 100 countries. Their message is loud is clear: We will not contribute to injustice worldwide at the expense of our own integrity and ethical fibre. There are people here today who oppose this bill for political reasons. I recall a similar day two years ago when those same people called for a broader, apolitical human rights bill and even offered to help write it. The fact of the matter is that this bill fits the criteria. Let’s be perfectly clear: we are calling for the formation of a Senate Committee that will investigate ALL of our investments and decide which ones contribute to human rights
violations across the world. Whether or not a certain company in a certain nation is committing human rights violations with the tuition money we contribute is at the discretion of the Senate. I have full faith that with the passage of this bill, they will remain impartial - as they do when evaluating ethical decisions regarding athletics and academics. In the end, to say that this bill threatens certain groups on campus is a misinterpretation of what the bill calls for. Please read the bill one last time, we are NOT asking for anyone to solve international conflict, nor are we asking you to take sides in any. This is NOT targeting any group or people. We are simply asking for a committee to be formed.

xi. Hazem Jallaq.22: Hi Everyone. I am a senior and finance. I stand before you in support of this resolution. I stand before you to ask each and everyone of you on this committee to seriously consider the magnitude of this issue, and how much of an impact it can make in the world. We ask that our tuition dollars are not use to support the mass incarceration of our fellow human beings. In the name of
justice, they are feeding off of poor people to make money. This issue continues when the US supplies other countries with weapons. I think I can confidently echo the sentiments of a number of the speakers before me: people who know where their money might be going, and understand the extent to which the blatant human rights violations occur in America and abroad want to do something to change the status quo. By standing together, we can do that today by passing this resolution, which tells the world on behalf of The Ohio State University that we won’t stand for injustice at home or abroad. As one of the largest and most diverse universities in the world, many of our own students are inevitably affected by the immoral and unethical choices made by many corporations, whether it be to arm states with weapons to kill innocent Yemeni citizens or intentionally profit off of the mass incarceration of people of color. This only goes to show that when we contribute to social injustice and human rights violations worldwide, we end up being negatively impacted too. Among the undergrad student organizations
who support this bill, they represent students from nearly 100
countries. Their message is loud and clear: We will not contribute to
injustice worldwide at the expense of our own integrity and ethical
fibre. There are people here today who oppose this bill for political
reasons. I recall a similar day two years ago when those same people
called for a broader, apolitical human rights bill and even offered to
help write it. The fact of the matter is that this bill fits the
criteria. Let’s be perfectly clear: we are calling for the formation of a
Senate Committee that will investigate ALL of our investments and
decide which ones contribute to human rights violations across the
world. Whether or not a certain company in a certain nation is
committing human rights violations with the tuition money we
contribute is at the discretion of the Senate. I have full faith that with
the passage of this bill, they will remain impartial - as they do when
evaluating ethical decisions regarding athletics and academics. In the
end, to say that this bill threatens certain groups on campus is a
misinterpretation of what the bill calls for. Please read the bill one
last time, we are NOT asking for anyone to solve international
conflict, nor are we asking you to take sides in any. This is NOT
targeting any group or people. We are simply asking for a committee
to be formed.

xii. Maya Rosenburg. 1200: Senators, Madam Speaker, I’m Paul B. 

Ellis, I’m a senior Evolution and Ecology major, and I’m Jewish, and
I’m here today to support greater transparency of
university investments, but to oppose the resolution in its current
form singling out Israel. I’m here because I care about Palestinians
and Israelis equally. I have relatives and good friends who are
Israeli, and some of my most engaged friends and classmates are
Palestinian. This bill is a symbolic measure that doesn’t advance
Palestinian statehood, and this is the wrong approach and venue to
make meaningful change on the ground in Gaza and the West
Bank. Its introduction was a failure of dialogue on the subject. BDS
strengthens demagogues of the Israeli right wing like Netanyahu
by reinforcing their narrative justifying their policies to
Israelis, and doesn’t encourage a lasting peace. But the American Jewish community’s path doesn’t bring a solution closer either. If we ignore the occupation, stifle any criticism of Netanyahu’s actions, and conflate opposing current policy with opposing Israel’s existence, we aren’t moving toward peace. The way to progress on this issue is to come forward to listen to each other, to compromise, and to work to forge a shared destiny for Israelis and Palestinians. A two-state solution is the way towards peace, and if we really want to improve conditions on the ground, we should support organizations advocating ending the occupation. The way to move toward resolving the conflict isn’t in this room. The way to make investments available to the public and a committee may be in this room. I am ready to come to the table on this conflict to listen, learn, and compromise. I hope to see you there. In an era of peak public demand for transparency, it is all of our duty to call upon the Board of Trustees to make all university investments public for examination by a committee. Ohio taxpayers and students paying
tuition have a right to know what companies the University invests their money in. If we invest in companies engaged in unethical behavior as determined by the committee, we are failing to live up to the university’s mission: Education for Citizenship. To be a citizen is to engage in the democratic process, to give a voice to the voiceless, and to critically examine our communities’ actions.

Sasha Zborovsky.2: My name is Sam Weiss. As per the proposed resolution, I too believe that, “all students have the right to critically review and examine the ethics of the University’s financial investments”. This resolution is immensely broad, targeting and accusing companies of human rights issues across political spectrums, parts of the world, and backgrounds. In developing an ad hoc committee, we are overlooking the deep complexity and thus lacking the due diligence each particular situation deserves. These companies are not analogous and must be evaluated individually. By developing a committee, we would be inadvertently depriving “all students”, of their aforementioned right to review the ethics of the
financial investments. A small committee is absolutely not representative of the student population. In fact, in March 2017, the student population voted against a referendum opting to boycott the very companies that this resolution wishes to divest from. If we want to respect the views of “all students”, then listen to the student voice of less than one year ago. This resolution, though it states it, “is not an attack on any particular identity or a sweeping criticism of any nation” seemingly targets companies with a particular connection to Israel. For example, Raytheon is the developer of the Iron Dome, a rocket protection system intended to knock rockets launched by Hamas, Hezbollah, and other terrorist organizations from Gaza, the West Bank, and other surrounding countries. It seems that this resolution is attempting to specifically divest from companies with ties to Israel, though it disguises the fact. Towards the end of the resolution, it proclaims that campuses across the nation have passed similar resolutions. As a Jew and member of a minority population, I care about inclusivity on campus. A report from the Huffington Post
found that on the 64 campuses with a large presence or passing of BDS, 287 anti-Semitic incidents were reported, compared to 198 occurrences that took place during the same time last year, reflecting a 45 percent increase. This legislation seems to use the campuses across the nation as an example to follow, yet this evidence shows the negative consequences that follow comparable actions. So today, I ask you to follow what is right, and vote against resolution 50-R-27.

Isaac Bensignor. As an engineering student, I rely on many different technologies to succeed. If you vote to contribute to the global BDS movement against Israel, I ask one thing of you -- take it upon yourself to live day to day without any technologies or products Israelis have created. Here are just a few example of what you would have to live without: Most of our computers, because they use technology from Intel that was created in Israel. If you find a computer that doesn't run on Israeli technology, you’ll still have to delete the firewall that protects you from viruses, along with any
Microsoft products like Word, Powerpoint, Excel, and your buckeyemail account, since Israelis were involved in developing all of that. You’ll have to stop texting your friends and family, because sms messaging was developed in Israel. In fact, if you have an iPhone you’ll need to get rid of it because it runs on technology developed by an Israeli company. Also, if you drove over here and used Waze to avoid traffic, uninstall it too! We would have to set any research we do to find cures for cancer, aids, and hiv back by decades, to avoid using all of the groundbreaking studies published by Israeli scientists. And last but not least, you’ll have to stop using the internet, because our devices would not be able to connect to the web without components developed by an Israeli company. Those few examples are just the tip of the iceberg of what Israelis have done to solve the toughest global challenges and make the world a better place. I challenge you - I truly do -- if you’re really serious about boycotting Israel, to do it right and boycott all of it. But let’s be real, none of us are going to get rid of our phones, our computers,
our internet, cures for the worst diseases, or any of the other groundbreaking innovations that Israelis have created. And just like we’re not going to do that, we should reject a movement that seeks to cut off the world from Israelis and everything they bring to the table. Please vote against resolution 50-R-28. Thank you.

xv. Yoni Wechsler.20: As per the proposed resolution, I too believe that, “all students have the right to critically review and examine the ethics of the University’s financial investments”. This resolution is immensely broad, targeting and accusing companies of human rights issues across political spectrums, parts of the world, and backgrounds. In developing an ad hoc committee, we are overlooking the deep complexity and thus lacking the due diligence each particular situation deserves. These companies are not analogous and must be evaluated individually. By developing a committee, we would be inadvertantly depriving “all students”, of their aforementioned right to review the ethics of the financial investments. A small committee is absolutely not representative of
the student population. In fact, in March 2017, the student population voted against a referendum opting to boycott the very companies that this resolution wishes to divest from. If we want to respect the views of “all students”, then listen to the student voice of less than one year ago. This resolution, though it states it, “is not an attack on any particular identity or a sweeping criticism of any nation” seemingly targets companies with a particular connection to Israel. For example, Raytheon is the developer of the Iron Dome, a rocket protection system intended to knock rockets launched by Hamas, Hezbollah, and other terrorist organizations from Gaza, the West Bank, and other surrounding countries. It seems that this resolution is attempting to specifically divest from companies with ties to Israel, though it disguises the fact. Towards the end of the resolution, it proclaims that campuses across the nation have passed similar resolutions. As a Jew and member of a minority population, I care about inclusivity on campus. A report from the Huffington Post found that on the 64 campuses with a large presence or passing of
BDS, 287 anti-Semitic incidents were reported, compared to 198 occurrences that took place during the same time last year, reflecting a 45 percent increase. This legislation seems to use the campuses across the nation as an example to follow, yet this evidence shows the negative consequences that follow comparable actions. So today, I ask you to follow what is right, and vote against resolution 50-R-27.

xvi. Hannah Blumenfield.14: Senators, Madam Speaker, I’m Paul B. Ellis, I’m a senior Evolution and Ecology major, and I’m Jewish, and I’m here today to support greater transparency of university investments, but to oppose the resolution in its current form singling out Israel. I’m here because I care about Palestinians and Israelis equally. I have relatives and good friends who are Israeli, and some of my most engaged friends and classmates are Palestinian. This bill is a symbolic measure that doesn’t advance Palestinian statehood, and this is the wrong approach and venue to make meaningful change on the ground in Gaza and the West
Bank. Its introduction was a failure of dialogue on the subject. BDS strengthens demagogues of the Israeli right wing like Netanyahu by reinforcing their narrative justifying their policies to Israelis, and doesn’t encourage a lasting peace. But the American Jewish community’s path doesn’t bring a solution closer either. If we ignore the occupation, stifle any criticism of Netanyahu’s actions, and conflate opposing current policy with opposing Israel’s existence, we aren’t moving toward peace. The way to progress on this issue is to come forward to listen to each other, to compromise, and to work to forge a shared destiny for Israelis and Palestinians. A two-state solution is the way towards peace, and if we really want to improve conditions on the ground, we should support organizations advocating ending the occupation. The way to move toward resolving the conflict isn’t in this room. The way to make investments available to the public and a committee may be in this room. I am ready to come to the table on this conflict to listen, learn, and compromise. I hope to see you there. In an era of peak public
demand for transparency, it is all of our duty to call upon the Board of Trustees to make all university investments public for examination by a committee. Ohio taxpayers and students paying tuition have a right to know what companies the University invests their money in. If we invest in companies engaged in unethical behavior as determined by the committee, we are failing to live up to the university’s mission: Education for Citizenship. To be a citizen is to engage in the democratic process, to give a voice to the voiceless, and to critically examine our communities’ actions.

xvii. Yazan Anani.4 As a lifelong Ohio State Buckeye, I can tell you that I stand adamantly in favor of this resolution. Since I learned that a portion of our tuition is used for investment, one of the biggest things on my mind is where my tuition dollars are going. And as it stands, my tuition dollars may be going to fund the ruthless bombing of Yemeni civilians, the displacement of millions of people from their homes and even the racist mass incarceration policies that private prisons profit from here in America. I’m speaking to you on
behalf of countless OSU students who share my sentiments. We do not want our tuition going towards companies that in many cases displace our own families. It’s the sad truth that when an institution as great as Ohio State puts resources towards the violation of human rights, it only deepens divisions on campus and rather than creating a welcoming atmosphere, it creates a threatening one. How do Yemeni Buckeyes feel when every semester they know that a portion of their tuition may be contributing to the bombing of their homeland? To answer that question, I could ask: How did African-American buckeyes feel when OSU was one of the last universities to denounce apartheid? In all, investments (and thereby endorsements) of human rights violations only serve as a detriment to our beautifully diverse campus. And though I’ve cited the sentiments of Yemenis and African-Americans, the truth is that human rights issues should be relevant to us all as humans. Fortunately, there is something you can do today. I wouldn’t ask the USG to pass judgement on what investments constitute a human rights violation.
That’s why our only course of action is to create a senate committee to re-evaluate our investments, which is exactly what this bill calls for. I understand that people are opposed to this bill because they misunderstand its contents: we will not call on the University to pull investments on account of race, religion or nationality. The bottom line is this: if a company is funding injustices, no one wants their tuition going towards it. It does not make sense to be in favor of some human rights reform and not others simply because of political ideology. To make it perfectly clear, the formation of a committee and civil political discourse are not mutually exclusive events. Let’s reassure the student body that their money is going to an ethically valid place. Let’s pass this resolution today and take a leap towards progress. Thank you.

xviii.Harrison Roth.500: Hello. My name is Harrison Roth, and I am an undergraduate student at Ohio State. I am a strong believer in open and inclusive dialogue, which this resolution does not support. This past fall, I worked to create an open dialogue group of pro-Israel and
pro-Palestinian students. This group originally met with an Israeli and Palestinian visiting the United States who work with the UNESCO award winning group Givat Haviva, the Center for a Shared Society. This discussion was supposed to be the first of numerous talks we would have about our concerns here on campus, our personal ideals and hopes, and our dreams for the future of our nations. I think ideas like this are how we can help bridge gaps between different communities. Ohio State officially lists “Diversity in people and of ideas,” and “Inclusion” as part of our values. This bill does not support these shared values. Instead it seeks to censor valuable voices on all sides, and unfairly combines 3 different important issues, private prisons, the Saudi Arabia - Yemen conflict, and the Israel - Palestine issues under the Boycott, Divest, and Sanctions agenda. Each of these issues deserve their own conversations, and this resolution does not allow for these nuanced conversations to occur with everyone’s voices. I implore you to vote against resolution 50-R-28 to give each of these pressing issues their
due diligence independent of a prejudice agenda, and to stand with me for the sake of preserving our shared values of inclusiveness and diversity. Thank you for your time.

xix. Ben Sack.24: Good evening, my name is Ben Sack, I’m a junior majoring in political science and Arabic here at The Ohio State University and I urge you to vote against resolution 50-R-28. First off, I would like to thank you all for serving in the General Assembly, and for listening to everyone’s testimonies tonight. I am against this resolution because its conflates multiple, broad issues, one of which is extremely political in nature. This resolution talks about topics from private prison reform to Israel and then Saudi Arabia. These topics are completely different and should be separately addressed. They are also extremely political in nature. One of the reasons that I pride myself of being an Israeli member of the Undergraduate Student Government is that USG is in itself a non-political organization. USG prides itself on accepting anyone from any background, from anywhere on the political spectrum. By
getting involved with these topics, the Undergraduate student government would be blatantly involving itself in political issues, and as a result they would be making a political statement. Overall USG would make a name for itself as an organization that puts politics before students. I believe that USG should be staying out of political issues, for the sake of keeping true to its ideal of not being a political organization.

xx. Alyssa Karfinkel.1: Hi, my name is Alyssa and I am a second year undergraduate student here at The Ohio State University. Last spring, there was a USG vote in which I, like thousands of other students, voiced my opinion. I voted for the Andrew and Sophie campaign, which in turn elected the rest of the impressive slate. As someone who identifies as a constituent of yours, I look to you to represent my views, and the views outlined by your campaign. Resolution 50-R-27 is almost identical to the legislation voted against last spring, at which the same moment, we voted you all into office. We believed, as you and your campaign advertised, that you
would stand against the legislation inspired by a Boycott Divestment and Sanctions agenda. This legislation is deceiving, though embodies the movement entirely. The passage of this resolution does not reflect the views of this senate’s constituents, nor the views of the undergraduate student body. As I stand here today, I ask you to follow through with the very promises that you made to those who voted you into office. I implore this body to stand by their platform and vote against Resolution 50-R-27.

xxi.Aaron Dobres.3: Hello, my name is Aaron Dobres, and I am a second-year studying accounting and history. I am speaking out tonight against this resolution because I am concerned about the economic impact it will have, both on the university and on citizens of other countries. Companies such as HP have been consistent partners with Ohio State in providing necessary electronics and equipment, and Caterpillar Inc. has helped sponsor events about data analytics so that students can learn more about their field of study, but those partnerships could vanish if the university denounces them.
Their absence would restrain Ohio State from fulfilling its mission of giving every student an education inside and outside of the classroom. Additionally, past boycotts and divestments from Israel have been detrimental to both Israelis and Palestinians alike. Many Palestinians are employed by Israeli companies, and if these companies suffer because of boycotts from abroad, they may be forced to lay off workers, without respect to their religion or nationality. Boycotts against the Israeli company SodaStream led to the closing of a factory in the West Bank, where many Palestinians had been employed. It would be irresponsible for the university to actively put the wellbeings of thousands of people on the other side of the world at stake, and I urge the senators to vote no on resolution 50-R-27. The issues raised here deserve a better path forward than the dangerous one being presented here tonight. Thank you.

xxii.Jack Spero.19: Hello, my name is Jack Spero, and I am a 1st year biology student and proud Buckeye. Since September, I helped jumpstart an initiative to bring Kosher Food to campus to foster a
more inclusive community for Jewish students of all levels of observances and practices. I am very proud of our efforts and after constant communication with Dining Services and other students, as well as support from Max Littman and the Undergraduate Student Government, we were able to accomplish our goals. Our priority was to make OSU a place in which everyone’s religious practice is open and accessible to them. This is a core tenant of my values, actively working to ensure that everyone around me has the ability to, and is comfortable, being themselves, whether that is through their religious or cultural practices, exposure to diverse languages, styles, and foods, and most importantly, the freedom to express their true opinions on the issues they care about most, and hear the perspectives of others. This resolution goes against that core value. It deliberately ignores the opinions thousands of students shared last spring, resoundingly defeating a referendum to boycott from some of the very companies this resolution again asks to take action against. It also restricts this conversation to a small group of unelected
students and faculty, entrusted to make a decision for the entire
student body. This is clearly not the open and free civil dialogue that
is so plainly necessary in a situation so nuanced and complicated.
We have the unique opportunity as engaged citizens and members of
the Ohio State community to make our voices heard on these
incredibly complicated issues but that opportunity is only
worthwhile if every perspective and opinion is given fair and equal
consideration. I encourage our Student Senate to vote against
resolution 50-R-28 to foster cooperation and dialogue between OSU
students of all backgrounds and provide a framework to promote
peace, mutual understanding, and acceptance here on our campus.
Thank you.

xxiii.Ryan Smith.10130: Throughout my time attending The Ohio State
University, I have been blessed with the opportunity to be a Morrill
Scholar, which is a select cohort that shares a passion for Diversity
and Inclusion on our campus. It has shaped my college career, and
has allowed me to participate in several unique and enriching
experiences. This has lead me to become involved with several amazing organizations including: Mount Leadership Society, the Fisher College of Business, Adopt-a-School, OSU Hillel, Chabad, and the historically Jewish fraternity, Zeta Beta Tau. Personally, I am greatly disheartened by the resolution being presented today. As a minority on our campus, I believe that this resolution invalidates my worldly experiences and closes off opportunities for dialogue and progress. Rather, this resolution perpetuates Anti-Semitic ideologies and alienates the Jewish Minority on our campus. I personally do not want to be associated with a student body that is tolerant with it’s Jewish and Zionist populations being wrongly targeted to a point of feeling unsafe. Through my undergraduate experience as a Leadership Studies minor, I have been able to personally learn and see the merits of participating in a discussion with students from diverse backgrounds, as it allows others to gain perspective and understand of their fellow Buckeyes in a safe and controlled environment. I highly advise that Undergraduate Student
Government vote against resolution 50-R-28, as to allow the
concerned parties to have a dialogue in order to potentially come
together.

xxiv.Ethan Lerman.21: My name is Ethan Lerman and I am an
undergraduate biology student. Two years ago, I had the opportunity
to volunteer at Save a Child’s Heart in Israel. This organization
provides life saving heart surgery to African, Asian, Middle Eastern,
Easter European and South American children completely free of
charge. It was an incredibly inspiring and motivating experience,
engaging with patients from every corner of the earth. Together, we
bridged religious, ethnic and cultural barriers as well as playing and
laughing together despite how scary this time in their lives were.
Today, Israeli and Palestinian people alike face a scary, uncertain
time in their own lives, living under threat of violence every day.
While it is tempting to retreat into our own corners and point fingers
at each other in anger and contempt, it is far more powerful for us to
work together civil and positively. I learned this lesson acutely
through my time at Save a Child’s Heart, that even through frightening times, coming together across national and cultural divides is the most powerful force for good. This resolution, not only attempts to divide the student body bitterly, but would also result in more negativity on our campus. We should take the example set by the children facing the scariest moments in their lives and decide to connect with one another instead, and therefore I urge you to vote against resolution 50-R-27.

xxv.Evan Plotkin.13: Hi, my name is Evan Plotkin. I am an undergraduate Student majoring in Business and living on campus. Each time that a resolution is brought to the table on Divestment, inevitably testimony is brought up about how the UN has continually condemned Israel for human rights violations. A side of the story that is not often mentioned, however, is the makeup of the UN body and how they approach business. Let’s start by discussion the UN Human Right Council. One might think that a world council dedication to Human Rights would be made up of only countries
with a pristine record on Human Rights. However, this is not the case. The year, among the countries sitting on the council are gross human rights abusers Saudi Arabia, Qatar, The Democratic Republic of Congo, Nigeria, Pakistan, Chile, Egypt, Rwanda, Tunisia, China, Iraq, and Brazil. Additionally the Council has been criticized by Secretaries General Kofi Annan, and Ban-ki Moon, as well Council President Dona Costea, and the EU, Canada, and the United States on being overtly focused on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Moving further from just the HRC itself, the UN General Assembly too focuses on Israel too critically. This year, the General Assembly brought forward 0 resolutions on the following countries: China, Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, Belarus, Cuba, Turkey, Pakistan, Vietnam, Algeria, Iraq, and Zimbabwe, as well as 175 other countries. The Council passed one resolution concerning the following countries or territories: Crimea, Iran, Myanmar, North Korea, Syria, USA. The only country that more than one resolution was passes against was Israel, pulling a notable 20 resolutions. This treatment is not only
unbalance, but it is misleading. The United Nations is not a credible organization when concerned with the issue of human rights. I urge the USG to look past the evidence of the UN, and not close the book on this issue. Please vote against resolution 50-R-27. Thank you for your time.

xxvi.Patrick Disman: Hello. My name is Patrick Disman. I recently traveled with a group of non-Jewish OSU students to Israel over winter break to be educated on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as well as the politics of modern Israel. From the experiences that I had, the variety of people I conversed with, and the places I visited, I have come back to the United States with a stance on the conflict similar to that with which I left: I do not have a side. The situation proved itself to be too complex for a black and white hero vs villain narrative to be established. Not only was this the deeper perspective I gained, but it was also that of multiple natives of both Palestinian and Israeli descent. A movement such as divestment can do nothing to solve the problems in Israel. Instead, it brings problems to us.
Divestment directly divides our campus. In a situation where peace and adherence to human rights are the goals, putting a veiled step towards anti-Semitic policies in place as a statement against a developing country without a clear right or wrong faction is not only unnecessary, but detrimental to the accepting and diverse culture we strive for at Ohio State. I urge USG to stay out of a situation where it does not belong in the interest of the people of every race and religion that it represents. Instead, allow the governing bodies of Israel sort out a complex situation that the students at Ohio State that would be negatively affected by the passing of such policies have no say in or direct ties to. Henceforth, I urge USG to vote against resolution 50-R-47.

Adam Braff: Hello everyone, my name is Adam Braff. I am a third year studying welding engineering and I’m here to share my experience with Israel. This past summer I went on an internship program where for 8 weeks I stayed in Tel Aviv and had the position of prototype engineer at H2 Energy Now, a renewable energy
company. Living in Israel for an entire summer has truly been eye opening. Traveling throughout Israel independently, I have seen people from different cultures, rich and poor, young and old, Jewish and Arab, come together – despite their differences – to develop this amazing country. I have been to Jerusalem where people of different faith coexist peacefully. I have seen fruits and vegetables grow in the desert. I have heard stories of near death experiences from soldiers no older than you and I. I have connected with pious men not only of Jewish faith, but of Muslim, Druid, Baha’i, Christian, and Greek Orthodox. And they all find safety in living within the borders of Israel together. Some people see the land of Israel as just a piece of land to be claimed, but for everyone else, it is a home. It has a booming economy, it’s rich in culture, and it’s incredibly accepting of people from different backgrounds, including race, faith, gender, disabilities, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status. Never have I been in such an inclusive community that I found in Israel and
I hope to one day be able to celebrate peace in the Middle East.

Please vote no on Resolution 50-R-27.

xxviii. Micha Kerbel.3: Good evening, My name is Micha Kerbel and I serve as the President of Buckeyes for Israel, Ohio State’s premiere undergraduate student organization that advocates for Israel. I want to thank all of you for your attention tonight, and for listening so intently to the testimonies that will be presented here against 50-R-28. I will be presenting a number of pieces of evidence that demonstrate the extent of opposition to this resolution across campus, and of related information vital to our opposition to this legislation. As of now, over 750 current undergraduate students have signed a petition urging USG to vote against any resolution that contains language calling for a Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions from Israel—a movement that marginalizes Jewish and pro-Israel students on campus. The resolution may not say BDS, but BDS is cited in sources in footnotes 16-19. The second piece of evidence is an email directly from the Director of Communications for the
University of Business and Finance. In the email, he explains how University income is divided up and what funds are used to what ends, and expresses definitively that students’ tuition dollars are NOT invested in the University’s Long Term Investment Pool. Also being presented to you this evening is a list of dozens of higher education institutions from across the country whose Student Governments have voted against BDS Resolutions that share the goals of the resolution being presented to you tonight. We urge you to follow the leads of these universities in voting against this legislation. Finally, I would like to remind you of the results of the schoolwide referendum in which our student body, the same constituency that voted the current USG senators into office, voted against divesting from companies that do business in and with Israel. We urge you to listen to the voices of your constituents again this evening and vote against 50-R-28.

xxix. Paul B. Ellis.692: Senators, Madam Speaker, I’m Paul B. Ellis, I’m a senior Evolution and Ecology major, and I’m Jewish, and
I’m here today to support greater transparency of university investments, but to oppose the resolution in its current form singling out Israel. I’m here because I care about Palestinians and Israelis equally. I have relatives and good friends who are Israeli, and some of my most engaged friends and classmates are Palestinian. This bill is a symbolic measure that doesn’t advance Palestinian statehood, and this is the wrong approach and venue to make meaningful change on the ground in Gaza and the West Bank. Its introduction was a failure of dialogue on the subject. BDS strengthens demagogues of the Israeli right wing like Netanyahu by reinforcing their narrative justifying their policies to Israelis, and doesn’t encourage a lasting peace. But the American Jewish community’s path doesn’t bring a solution closer either. If we ignore the occupation, stifle any criticism of Netanyahu’s actions, and conflate opposing current policy with opposing Israel’s existence, we aren’t moving toward peace. The way to progress on this issue is to come forward to listen to each other, to compromise, and
to work to forge a shared destiny for Israelis and Palestinians. A two-state solution is the way towards peace, and if we really want to improve conditions on the ground, we should support organizations advocating ending the occupation. The way to move toward resolving the conflict isn’t in this room. The way to make investments available to the public and a committee may be in this room. I am ready to come to the table on this conflict to listen, learn, and compromise. I hope to see you there. In an era of peak public demand for transparency, it is all of our duty to call upon the Board of Trustees to make all university investments public for examination by a committee. Ohio taxpayers and students paying tuition have a right to know what companies the University invests their money in. If we invest in companies engaged in unethical behavior as determined by the committee, we are failing to live up to the university’s mission: Education for Citizenship. To be a citizen is to engage in the democratic process, to give a voice to the voiceless, and to critically examine our communities’ actions.
xxx. Sam Weiss. 568: My name is Sam Weiss. As per the proposed resolution, I too believe that, “all students have the right to critically review and examine the ethics of the University’s financial investments”. This resolution is immensely broad, targeting and accusing companies of human rights issues across political spectrums, parts of the world, and backgrounds. In developing an ad hoc committee, we are overlooking the deep complexity and thus lacking the due diligence each particular situation deserves. These companies are not analogous and must be evaluated individually. By developing a committee, we would be inadvertently depriving “all students”, of their aforementioned right to review the ethics of the financial investments. A small committee is absolutely not representative of the student population. In fact, in March 2017, the student population voted against a referendum opting to boycott the very companies that this resolution wishes to divest from. If we want to respect the views of “all students”, then listen to the student voice of less than one year ago. This resolution, though it states it, “is not
an attack on any particular identity or a sweeping criticism of any
nation” seemingly targets companies with a particular connection to
Israel. For example, Raytheon is the developer of the Iron Dome, a
rocket protection system intended to knock rockets launched by
Hamas, Hezbollah, and other terrorist organizations from Gaza, the
West Bank, and other surrounding countries. It seems that this
resolution is attempting to specifically divest from companies with
ties to Israel, though it disguises the fact. Towards the end of the
resolution, it proclaims that campuses across the nation have passed
similar resolutions. As a Jew and member of a minority population, I
care about inclusivity on campus. A report from the Huffington Post
found that on the 64 campuses with a large presence or passing of
BDS, 287 anti-Semitic incidents were reported, compared to 198
occurrences that took place during the same time last year, reflecting
a 45 percent increase. This legislation seems to use the campuses
across the nation as an example to follow, yet this evidence shows
the negative consequences that follow comparable actions. So today,
I ask you to follow what is right, and vote against resolution 50-R-27.

Hello! My name is Hannah Frayman and I am strongly against this resolution for the following reasons:

“Throughout the process of debating this resolution, authors and proponents of A.R. 7-019 stated that their advocacy for divestment from the specified companies is completely distinct from the Boycott, Divest, and Sanction (BDS) Movement — I do not believe this.” This is a quote from the President of the Central Student Government at the University of Michigan about a resolution that is explicitly cited in the text of tonight’s resolution, and we’d like to provide some context. In the days leading up to the vote, members of UMDivest, the group which sponsored the BDS bill, handed out flyers which clearly stated that their campaign was an answer to the call for BDS from the Global BDS Movement. The vote at Michigan took place on Tuesday, November 14. The authors of the resolution consistently claimed the bill was not tied to BDS. However, students
pointed out that the first version of the resolution, introduced a week earlier, included citations from the official BDS Movement website. When this was brought to the attention of the CSG, the authors deleted the citation. A day after the resolution was passed, the official BDS Movement celebrated it on their Facebook page, calling it a victory for BDS. Tonight’s resolution mirrors the one passed at Michigan almost word for word. The authors of this resolution are not telling you the truth. They’re not telling you that Jewish students who did not support the UM resolution were called “white supremacists” in the student newspaper. They’re not telling you that a well-respected, Jewish professor was silenced and not permitted to speak out. They’re not telling you that a swastika was drawn in the very building where this resolution was passed only 24 hours early. They aren’t telling you it’s BDS, and they aren’t telling you the truth.

Nomi Poprish: Hello! My name is Hannah Frayman and I am strongly against this resolution for the following reasons:
“Throughout the process of debating this resolution, authors and proponents of A.R. 7-019 stated that their advocacy for divestment from the specified companies is completely distinct from the Boycott, Divest, and Sanction (BDS) Movement — I do not believe this.” This is a quote from the President of the Central Student Government at the University of Michigan about a resolution that is explicitly cited in the text of tonight’s resolution, and we’d like to provide some context. In the days leading up to the vote, members of UMDivest, the group which sponsored the BDS bill, handed out flyers which clearly stated that their campaign was an answer to the call for BDS from the Global BDS Movement. The vote at Michigan took place on Tuesday, November 14. The authors of the resolution consistently claimed the bill was not tied to BDS. However, students pointed out that the first version of the resolution, introduced a week earlier, included citations from the official BDS Movement website. When this was brought to the attention of the CSG, the authors deleted the citation. A day after the resolution was passed, the
official BDS Movement celebrated it on their Facebook page, calling it a victory for BDS. Tonight’s resolution mirrors the one passed at Michigan almost word for word. The authors of this resolution are not telling you the truth. They’re not telling you that Jewish students who did not support the UM resolution were called “white supremacists” in the student newspaper. They’re not telling you that a well-respected, Jewish professor was silenced and not permitted to speak out. They’re not telling you that a swastika was drawn in the very building where this resolution was passed only 24 hours early. They aren’t telling you it’s BDS, and they aren’t telling you the truth.

Wesam Jallaq, 28: I think I can confidently echo the sentiments of a number of the speakers before me: people who know where their money might be going, and understand the extent to which the blatant human rights violations occur in America and abroad want to do something to change the status quo. By standing together, we can do that today by passing this resolution, which tells the world on
behalf of The Ohio State University that we won’t stand for injustice at home or abroad. As one of the largest and most diverse universities in the world, many of our own students are inevitably affected by the immoral and unethical choices made by many corporations, whether it be to arm states with weapons to kill innocent Yemeni citizens or intentionally profit off of the mass incarceration of people of color. This only goes to show that when we contribute to social injustice and human rights violations worldwide, we end up being negatively impacted too. Among the undergrad student organizations who support this bill, they represent students from nearly 100 countries. Their message is loud is clear: We will not contribute to injustice worldwide at the expense of our own integrity and ethical fibre. There are people here today who oppose this bill for political reasons. I recall a similar day two years ago when those same people called for a broader, apolitical human rights bill and even offered to help write it. The fact of the matter is that this bill fits the criteria. Let’s be perfectly clear: we are calling
for the formation of a Senate Committee that will investigate ALL of our investments and decide which ones contribute to human rights violations across the world. Whether or not a certain company in a certain nation is committing human rights violations with the tuition money we contribute is at the discretion of the Senate. I have full faith that with the passage of this bill, they will remain impartial - as they do when evaluating ethical decisions regarding athletics and academics. In the end, to say that this bill threatens certain groups on campus is a misinterpretation of what the bill calls for. Please read the bill one last time, we are NOT asking for anyone to solve international conflict, nor are we asking you to take sides in any. This is NOT targeting any group or people. We are simply asking for a committee to be formed.

xxxiv.Hazem Jallaq.22: Hi Everyone. I am a senior and finance. I stand before you in support of this resolution. I stand before you to ask each and everyone of you on this committee to seriously consider the magnitude of this issue, and how much of an impact it can make in
the world. We ask that our tuition dollars are not use to support the mass incarceration of our fellow human beings. In the name of justice, they are feeding off of poor people to make money. This issue continues when the US supplies other countries with weapons. I think I can confidently echo the sentiments of a number of the speakers before me: people who know where their money might be going, and understand the extent to which the blatant human rights violations occur in America and abroad want to do something to change the status quo. By standing together, we can do that today by passing this resolution, which tells the world on behalf of The Ohio State University that we won’t stand for injustice at home or abroad. As one of the largest and most diverse universities in the world, many of our own students are inevitably affected by the immoral and unethical choices made by many corporations, whether it be to arm states with weapons to kill innocent Yemeni citizens or intentionally profit off of the mass incarceration of people of color. This only goes to show that when we contribute to social
injustice and human rights violations worldwide, we end up being negatively impacted too. Among the undergrad student organizations who support this bill, they represent students from nearly 100 countries. Their message is loud is clear: We will not contribute to injustice worldwide at the expense of our own integrity and ethical fibre. There are people here today who oppose this bill for political reasons. I recall a similar day two years ago when those same people called for a broader, apolitical human rights bill and even offered to help write it. The fact of the matter is that this bill fits the criteria. Let’s be perfectly clear: we are calling for the formation of a Senate Committee that will investigate ALL of our investments and decide which ones contribute to human rights violations across the world. Whether or not a certain company in a certain nation is committing human rights violations with the tuition money we contribute is at the discretion of the Senate. I have full faith that with the passage of this bill, they will remain impartial - as they do when evaluating ethical decisions regarding athletics and academics. In the
end, to say that this bill threatens certain groups on campus is a misinterpretation of what the bill calls for. Please read the bill one last time, we are NOT asking for anyone to solve international conflict, nor are we asking you to take sides in any. This is NOT targeting any group or people. We are simply asking for a committee to be formed.

xxxv.

Maya Rosenberg, 1200: Senators, Madam Speaker, I’m Paul B. Ellis, I’m a senior Evolution and Ecology major, and I’m Jewish, and I’m here today to support greater transparency of university investments, but to oppose the resolution in its current form singling out Israel. I’m here because I care about Palestinians and Israelis equally. I have relatives and good friends who are Israeli, and some of my most engaged friends and classmates are Palestinian. This bill is a symbolic measure that doesn’t advance Palestinian statehood, and this is the wrong approach and venue to make meaningful change on the ground in Gaza and the West Bank. Its introduction was a failure of dialogue on the subject. BDS
strengthens demagogues of the Israeli right wing like Netanyahu by reinforcing their narrative justifying their policies to Israelis, and doesn’t encourage a lasting peace. But the American Jewish community’s path doesn’t bring a solution closer either. If we ignore the occupation, stifle any criticism of Netanyahu’s actions, and conflate opposing current policy with opposing Israel’s existence, we aren’t moving toward peace. The way to progress on this issue is to come forward to listen to each other, to compromise, and to work to forge a shared destiny for Israelis and Palestinians. A two-state solution is the way towards peace, and if we really want to improve conditions on the ground, we should support organizations advocating ending the occupation. The way to move toward resolving the conflict isn’t in this room. The way to make investments available to the public and a committee may be in this room. I am ready to come to the table on this conflict to listen, learn, and compromise. I hope to see you there. In an era of peak public demand for transparency, it is all of our duty to call upon the Board
of Trustees to make all university investments public for examination by a committee. Ohio taxpayers and students paying tuition have a right to know what companies the University invests their money in. If we invest in companies engaged in unethical behavior as determined by the committee, we are failing to live up to the university’s mission: Education for Citizenship. To be a citizen is to engage in the democratic process, to give a voice to the voiceless, and to critically examine our communities’ actions.

Sasha Zborovsky.2: My name is Sam Weiss. As per the proposed resolution, I too believe that, “all students have the right to critically review and examine the ethics of the University’s financial investments”. This resolution is immensely broad, targeting and accusing companies of human rights issues across political spectrums, parts of the world, and backgrounds. In developing an ad hoc committee, we are overlooking the deep complexity and thus lacking the due diligence each particular situation deserves. These companies are not analogous and must be evaluated individually. By
developing a committee, we would be inadvertently depriving “all students”, of their aforementioned right to review the ethics of the financial investments. A small committee is absolutely not representative of the student population. In fact, in March 2017, the student population voted against a referendum opting to boycott the very companies that this resolution wishes to divest from. If we want to respect the views of “all students”, then listen to the student voice of less than one year ago. This resolution, though it states it, “is not an attack on any particular identity or a sweeping criticism of any nation” seemingly targets companies with a particular connection to Israel. For example, Raytheon is the developer of the Iron Dome, a rocket protection system intended to knock rockets launched by Hamas, Hezbollah, and other terrorist organizations from Gaza, the West Bank, and other surrounding countries. It seems that this resolution is attempting to specifically divest from companies with ties to Israel, though it disguises the fact. Towards the end of the resolution, it proclaims that campuses across the nation have passed
similar resolutions. As a Jew and member of a minority population, I care about inclusivity on campus. A report from the Huffington Post found that on the 64 campuses with a large presence or passing of BDS, 287 anti-Semitic incidents were reported, compared to 198 occurrences that took place during the same time last year, reflecting a 45 percent increase. This legislation seems to use the campuses across the nation as an example to follow, yet this evidence shows the negative consequences that follow comparable actions. So today, I ask you to follow what is right, and vote against resolution 50-R-27.

xxxvii. Isaac Bensignor.2 As an engineering student, I rely on many different technologies to succeed. If you vote to contribute to the global BDS movement against Israel, I ask one thing of you -- take it upon yourself to live day to day without any technologies or products Israelis have created. Here are just a few example of what you would have to live without: Most of our computers, because they use technology from Intel that was created in Israel. If you find
a computer that doesn't run on Israeli technology, you’ll still have to delete the firewall that protects you from viruses, along with any Microsoft products like Word, Powerpoint, Excel, and your buckeyemail account, since Israelis were involved in developing all of that. You’ll have to stop texting your friends and family, because sms messaging was developed in Israel. In fact, if you have an iPhone you’ll need to get rid of it because it runs on technology developed by an Israeli company. Also, if you drove over here and used Waze to avoid traffic, uninstall it too! We would have to set any research we do to find cures for cancer, aids, and hiv back by decades, to avoid using all of the groundbreaking studies published by Israeli scientists. And last but not least, you’ll have to stop using the internet, because our devices would not be able to connect to the web without components developed by an Israeli company. Those few examples are just the tip of the iceberg of what Israelis have done to solve the toughest global challenges and make the world a better place. I challenge you - I truly do -- if you’re really serious
about boycotting Israel, to do it right and boycott all of it. But let’s be real, none of us are going to get rid of our phones, our computers, our internet, cures for the worst diseases, or any of the other groundbreaking innovations that Israelis have created. And just like we’re not going to do that, we should reject a movement that seeks to cut off the world from Israelis and everything they bring to the table. Please vote against resolution 50-R-28. Thank you.

Yoni Wechsler.20: As per the proposed resolution, I too believe that, “all students have the right to critically review and examine the ethics of the University’s financial investments”. This resolution is immensely broad, targeting and accusing companies of human rights issues across political spectrums, parts of the world, and backgrounds. In developing an ad hoc committee, we are overlooking the deep complexity and thus lacking the due diligence each particular situation deserves. These companies are not analogous and must be evaluated individually. By developing a committee, we would be inadvertently depriving “all students”, of
their aforementioned right to review the ethics of the financial investments. A small committee is absolutely not representative of the student population. In fact, in March 2017, the student population voted against a referendum opting to boycott the very companies that this resolution wishes to divest from. If we want to respect the views of “all students”, then listen to the student voice of less than one year ago. This resolution, though it states it, “is not an attack on any particular identity or a sweeping criticism of any nation” seemingly targets companies with a particular connection to Israel. For example, Raytheon is the developer of the Iron Dome, a rocket protection system intended to knock rockets launched by Hamas, Hezbollah, and other terrorist organizations from Gaza, the West Bank, and other surrounding countries. It seems that this resolution is attempting to specifically divest from companies with ties to Israel, though it disguises the fact. Towards the end of the resolution, it proclaims that campuses across the nation have passed similar resolutions. As a Jew and member of a minority population, I
care about inclusivity on campus. A report from the Huffington Post found that on the 64 campuses with a large presence or passing of BDS, 287 anti-Semitic incidents were reported, compared to 198 occurrences that took place during the same time last year, reflecting a 45 percent increase. This legislation seems to use the campuses across the nation as an example to follow, yet this evidence shows the negative consequences that follow comparable actions. So today, I ask you to follow what is right, and vote against resolution 50-R-27.

xxxix. Hannah Blumenfield.14: Senators, Madam Speaker, I’m Paul B. Ellis, I’m a senior Evolution and Ecology major, and I’m Jewish, and I’m here today to support greater transparency of university investments, but to oppose the resolution in its current form singling out Israel. I’m here because I care about Palestinians and Israelis equally. I have relatives and good friends who are Israeli, and some of my most engaged friends and classmates are Palestinian. This bill is a symbolic measure that doesn’t advance
Palestinian statehood, and this is the wrong approach and venue to make meaningful change on the ground in Gaza and the West Bank. Its introduction was a failure of dialogue on the subject. BDS strengthens demagogues of the Israeli right wing like Netanyahu by reinforcing their narrative justifying their policies to Israelis, and doesn’t encourage a lasting peace. But the American Jewish community’s path doesn’t bring a solution closer either. If we ignore the occupation, stifle any criticism of Netanyahu’s actions, and conflate opposing current policy with opposing Israel’s existence, we aren’t moving toward peace. The way to progress on this issue is to come forward to listen to each other, to compromise, and to work to forge a shared destiny for Israelis and Palestinians. A two-state solution is the way towards peace, and if we really want to improve conditions on the ground, we should support organizations advocating ending the occupation. The way to move toward resolving the conflict isn’t in this room. The way to make investments available to the public and a committee may be in this
room. I am ready to come to the table on this conflict to listen, learn, and compromise. I hope to see you there. In an era of peak public demand for transparency, it is all of our duty to call upon the Board of Trustees to make all university investments public for examination by a committee. Ohio taxpayers and students paying tuition have a right to know what companies the University invests their money in. If we invest in companies engaged in unethical behavior as determined by the committee, we are failing to live up to the university’s mission: Education for Citizenship. To be a citizen is to engage in the democratic process, to give a voice to the voiceless, and to critically examine our communities’ actions.

 xl. Yazan Anani.4 As a lifelong Ohio State Buckeye, I can tell you that I stand adamantly in favor of this resolution. Since I learned that a portion of our tuition is used for investment, one of the biggest things on my mind is where my tuition dollars are going. And as it stands, my tuition dollars may be going to fund the ruthless bombing of Yemeni civilians, the displacement of millions of people from
their homes and even the racist mass incarceration policies that private prisons profit from here in America. I’m speaking to you on behalf of countless OSU students who share my sentiments. We do not want our tuition going towards companies that in many cases displace our own families. It’s the sad truth that when an institution as great as Ohio State puts resources towards the violation of human rights, it only deepens divisions on campus and rather than creating a welcoming atmosphere, it creates a threatening one. How do Yemeni Buckeyes feel when every semester they know that a portion of their tuition may be contributing to the bombing of their homeland? To answer that question, I could ask: How did African-American buckeyes feel when OSU was one of the last universities to denounce apartheid? In all, investments (and thereby endorsements) of human rights violations only serve as a detriment to our beautifully diverse campus. And though I’ve cited the sentiments of Yemenis and African-Americans, the truth is that human rights issues should be relevant to us all as humans. Fortunately, there is
something you can do today. I wouldn’t ask the USG to pass
judgement on what investments constitute a human rights violation.

That’s why our only course of action is to create a senate committee
to re-evaluate our investments, which is exactly what this bill calls
for. I understand that people are opposed to this bill because they
misunderstand its contents: we will not call on the University do pull
investments on account of race, religion or nationality. The bottom
line is this: if a company is funding injustices, no one wants their
tuition going towards it. It does not make sense to be in favor of
some human rights reform and not others simply because of political
ideology. To make it perfectly clear, the formation of a committee
and civil political discourse are not mutually exclusive events. Let’s
reassure the student body that their money is going to an ethically
valid place. Let’s pass this resolution today and take a leap towards
progress. Thank you.

xli.Harrison Roth.500: Hello. My name is Harrison Roth, and I am an
undergraduate student at Ohio State. I am a strong believer in open
and inclusive dialogue, which this resolution does not support. This past fall, I worked to create an open dialogue group of pro-Israel and pro-Palestinian students. This group originally met with an Israeli and Palestinian visiting the United States who work with the UNESCO award winning group Givat Haviva, the Center for a Shared Society. This discussion was supposed to be the first of numerous talks we would have about our concerns here on campus, our personal ideals and hopes, and our dreams for the future of our nations. I think ideas like this are how we can help bridge gaps between different communities. Ohio State officially lists “Diversity in people and of ideas,” and “Inclusion” as part of our values. This bill does not support these shared values. Instead it seeks to censor valuable voices on all sides, and unfairly combines 3 different important issues, private prisons, the Saudi Arabia - Yemen conflict, and the Israel - Palestine issues under the Boycott, Divest, and Sanctions agenda. Each of these issues deserve their own conversations, and this resolution does not allow for these nuanced
conversations to occur with everyone’s voices. I implore you to vote against resolution 50-R-28 to give each of these pressing issues their due diligence independent of a prejudice agenda, and to stand with me for the sake of preserving our shared values of inclusiveness and diversity. Thank you for your time.

Ben Sack.24: Good evening, my name is Ben Sack, I’m a junior majoring in political science and Arabic here at The Ohio State University and I urge you to vote against resolution 50-R-28. First off, I would like to thank you all for serving in the General Assembly, and for listening to everyone’s testimonies tonight. I am against this resolution because its conflates multiple, broad issues, one of which is extremely political in nature. This resolution talks about topics from private prison reform to Israel and then Saudi Arabia. These topics are completely different and should be separately addressed. They are also extremely political in nature. One of the reasons that I pride myself of being an Israeli member of the Undergraduate Student Government is that USG is in itself a
non-political organization. USG prides itself on accepting anyone from any background, from anywhere on the political spectrum. By getting involved with these topics, the Undergraduate student government would be blatantly involving itself in political issues, and as a result they would be making a political statement. Overall USG would make a name for itself as an organization that puts politics before students. I believe that USG should be staying out of political issues, for the sake of keeping true to its ideal of not being a political organization.

Alyssa Karfinkel: Hi, my name is Alyssa and I am a second year undergraduate student here at The Ohio State University. Last spring, there was a USG vote in which I, like thousands of other students, voiced my opinion. I voted for the Andrew and Sophie campaign, which in turn elected the rest of the impressive slate. As someone who identifies as a constituent of yours, I look to you to represent my views, and the views outlined by your campaign. Resolution 50-R-27 is almost identical to the legislation voted
against last spring, at which the same moment, we voted you all into office. We believed, as you and your campaign advertised, that you would stand against the legislation inspired by a Boycott Divestment and Sanctions agenda. This legislation is deceiving, though embodies the movement entirely. The passage of this resolution does not reflect the views of this senate’s constituents, nor the views of the undergraduate student body. As I stand here today, I ask you to follow through with the very promises that you made to those who voted you into office. I implore this body to stand by their platform and vote against Resolution 50-R-27.

xliv.

Aaron Dobres.3: Hello, my name is Aaron Dobres, and I am a second-year studying accounting and history. I am speaking out tonight against this resolution because I am concerned about the economic impact it will have, both on the university and on citizens of other countries. Companies such as HP have been consistent partners with Ohio State in providing necessary electronics and equipment, and Caterpillar Inc. has helped sponsor events about data
analytics so that students can learn more about their field of study, but those partnerships could vanish if the university denounces them. Their absence would restrain Ohio State from fulfilling its mission of giving every student an education inside and outside of the classroom. Additionally, past boycotts and divestments from Israel have been detrimental to both Israelis and Palestinians alike. Many Palestinians are employed by Israeli companies, and if these companies suffer because of boycotts from abroad, they may be forced to lay off workers, without respect to their religion or nationality. Boycotts against the Israeli company SodaStream led to the closing of a factory in the West Bank, where many Palestinians had been employed. It would be irresponsible for the university to actively put the wellbeings of thousands of people on the other side of the world at stake, and I urge the senators to vote no on resolution 50-R-27. The issues raised here deserve a better path forward than the dangerous one being presented here tonight. Thank you.
Hello, my name is Jack Spero, and I am a 1st year biology student and proud Buckeye. Since September, I helped jumpstart an initiative to bring Kosher Food to campus to foster a more inclusive community for Jewish students of all levels of observances and practices. I am very proud of our efforts and after constant communication with Dining Services and other students, as well as support from Max Littman and the Undergraduate Student Government, we were able to accomplish our goals. Our priority was to make OSU a place in which everyone’s religious practice is open and accessible to them. This is a core tenant of my values, actively working to ensure that everyone around me has the ability to, and is comfortable, being themselves, whether that is through their religious or cultural practices, exposure to diverse languages, styles, and foods, and most importantly, the freedom to express their true opinions on the issues they care about most, and hear the perspectives of others. This resolution goes against that core value. It deliberately ignores the opinions thousands of students shared last
spring, resoundingly defeating a referendum to boycott from some of the very companies this resolution again asks to take action against. It also restricts this conversation to a small group of unelected students and faculty, entrusted to make a decision for the entire student body. This is clearly not the open and free civil dialogue that is so plainly necessary in a situation so nuanced and complicated. We have the unique opportunity as engaged citizens and members of the Ohio State community to make our voices heard on these incredibly complicated issues but that opportunity is only worthwhile if every perspective and opinion is given fair and equal consideration. I encourage our Student Senate to vote against resolution 50-R-28 to foster cooperation and dialogue between OSU students of all backgrounds and provide a framework to promote peace, mutual understanding, and acceptance here on our campus.

Thank you.

Ryan Smith
Scholar, which is a select cohort that shares a passion for Diversity and Inclusion on our campus. It has shaped my college career, and has allowed me to participate in several unique and enriching experiences. This has lead me to become involved with several amazing organizations including: Mount Leadership Society, the Fisher College of Business, Adopt-a-School, OSU Hillel, Chabad, and the historically Jewish fraternity, Zeta Beta Tau. Personally, I am greatly disheartened by the resolution being presented today. As a minority on our campus, I believe that this resolution invalidates my worldly experiences and closes off opportunities for dialogue and progress. Rather, this resolution perpetuates Anti-Semitic ideologies and alienates the Jewish Minority on our campus. I personally do not want to be associated with a student body that is tolerant with it’s Jewish and Zionist populations being wrongly targeted to a point of feeling unsafe. Through my undergraduate experience as a Leadership Studies minor, I have been able to personally learn and see the merits of participating in a discussion with students from
diverse backgrounds, as it allows others to gain perspective and understand of their fellow Buckeyes in a safe and controlled environment. I highly advise that Undergraduate Student Government vote against resolution 50-R-28, as to allow the concerned parties to have a dialogue in order to potentially come together.

Ethan Lerman.21: My name is Ethan Lerman and I am an undergraduate biology student. Two years ago, I had the opportunity to volunteer at Save a Child’s Heart in Israel. This organization provides life saving heart surgery to African, Asian, Middle Eastern, Easter European and South American children completely free of charge. It was an incredibly inspiring and motivating experience, engaging with patients from every corner of the earth. Together, we bridged religious, ethnic and cultural barriers as well as playing and laughing together despite how scary this time in their lives were. Today, Israeli and Palestinian people alike face a scary, uncertain time in their own lives, living under threat of violence every day.
While it is tempting to retreat into our own corners and point fingers at each other in anger and contempt, it is far more powerful for us to work together civil and positively. I learned this lesson acutely through my time at Save a Child’s Heart, that even through frightening times, coming together across national and cultural divides is the most powerful force for good. This resolution, not only attempts to divide the student body bitterly, but would also result in more negativity on our campus. We should take the example set by the children facing the scariest moments in their lives and decide to connect with one another instead, and therefore I urge you to vote against resolution 50-R-27.

Evan Plotkin.13: Hi, my name is Evan Plotkin. I am an undergraduate Student majoring in Business and living on campus. Each time that a resolution is brought to the table on Divestment, inevitably testimony is brought up about how the UN has continually condemned Israel for human rights violations. A side of the story that is not often mentioned, however, is the makeup of the UN body
and how they approach business. Let’s start by discussion the UN Human Right Council. One might think that a world council dedication to Human Rights would be made up of only countries with a pristine record on Human Rights. However, this is not the case. The year, among the countries sitting on the council are gross human rights abusers Saudi Arabia, Qatar, The Democratic Republic of Congo, Nigeria, Pakistan, Chile, Egypt, Rwanda, Tunisia, China, Iraq, and Brazil. Additionally the Council has been criticized by Secretaries General Kofi Annan, and Ban-ki Moon, as well Council President Dona Costea, and the EU, Canada, and the United States on being overtly focused on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Moving further from just the HRC itself, the UN General Assembly too focuses on Israel too critically. This year, the General Assembly brought forward 0 resolutions on the following countries: China, Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, Belarus, Cuba, Turkey, Pakistan, Vietnam, Algeria, Iraq, and Zimbabwe, as well as 175 other countries. The Council passed one resolution concerning the following countries or
territories: Crimea, Iran, Myanmar, North Korea, Syria, USA. The only country that more than one resolution was passes against was Israel, pulling a notable 20 resolutions. This treatment is not only unbalance, but it is misleading. The United Nations is not a credible organization when concerned with the issue of human rights. I urge the USG to look past the evidence of the UN, and not close the book on this issue. Please vote against resolution 50-R-27. Thank you for your time.

Patrick Disman: Hello. My name is Patrick Disman. I recently traveled with a group of non-Jewish OSU students to Israel over winter break to be educated on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as well as the politics of modern Israel. From the experiences that I had, the variety of people I conversed with, and the places I visited, I have come back to the United States with a stance on the conflict similar to that with which I left: I do not have a side. The situation proved itself to be too complex for a black and white hero vs villain narrative to be established. Not only was this the deeper perspective
I gained, but it was also that of multiple natives of both Palestinian and Israeli descent. A movement such as divestment can do nothing to solve the problems in Israel. Instead, it brings problems to us. Divestment directly divides our campus. In a situation where peace and adherence to human rights are the goals, putting a veiled step towards anti-Semitic policies in place as a statement against a developing country without a clear right or wrong faction is not only unnecessary, but detrimental to the accepting and diverse culture we strive for at Ohio State. I urge USG to stay out of a situation where it does not belong in the interest of the people of every race and religion that it represents. Instead, allow the governing bodies of Israel sort out a complex situation that the students at Ohio State that would be negatively affected by the passing of such policies have no say in or direct ties to. Henceforth, I urge USG to vote against resolution 50-R-47.

1. Adam Braff.6: Hello everyone, my name is Adam Braff. I am a third year studying welding engineering and I’m here to share my
experience with Israel. This past summer I went on an internship program where for 8 weeks I stayed in Tel Aviv and had the position of prototype engineer at H2 Energy Now, a renewable energy company. Living in Israel for an entire summer has truly been eye opening. Traveling throughout Israel independently, I have seen people from different cultures, rich and poor, young and old, Jewish and Arab, come together – despite their differences – to develop this amazing country. I have been to Jerusalem where people of different faith coexist peacefully. I have seen fruits and vegetables grow in the desert. I have heard stories of near death experiences from soldiers no older than you and I. I have connected with pious men not only of Jewish faith, but of Muslim, Druid, Baha’i, Christian, and Greek Orthodox. And they all find safety in living within the borders of Israel together. Some people see the land of Israel as just a piece of land to be claimed, but for everyone else, it is a home. It has a booming economy, it’s rich in culture, and it’s incredibly accepting of people from different backgrounds, including race, faith, gender,
disabilities, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status. Never have I been in such an inclusive community that I found in Israel and I hope to one day be able to celebrate peace in the Middle East.

Please vote no on Resolution 50-R-27.

li. Micha Kerbel.

3: Good evening, My name is Micha Kerbel and I serve as the President of Buckeyes for Israel, Ohio State’s premiere undergraduate student organization that advocates for Israel. I want to thank all of you for your attention tonight, and for listening so intently to the testimonies that will be presented here against 50-R-28. I will be presenting a number of pieces of evidence that demonstrate the extent of opposition to this resolution across campus, and of related information vital to our opposition to this legislation. As of now, over 750 current undergraduate students have signed a petition urging USG to vote against any resolution that contains language calling for a Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions from Israel—a movement that marginalizes Jewish and pro-Israel students on campus. The resolution may not say BDS, but BDS is
cited in sources in footnotes 16-19. The second piece of evidence is an email directly from the Director of Communications for the University of Business and Finance. In the email, he explains how University income is divided up and what funds are used to what ends, and expresses definitively that students’ tuition dollars are NOT invested in the University’s Long Term Investment Pool. Also being presented to you this evening is a list of dozens of higher education institutions from across the country whose Student Governments have voted against BDS Resolutions that share the goals of the resolution being presented to you tonight. We urge you to follow the leads of these universities in voting against this legislation. Finally, I would like to remind you of the results of the schoolwide referendum in which our student body, the same constituency that voted the current USG senators into office, voted against divesting from companies that do business in and with Israel. We urge you to listen to the voices of your constituents again this evening and vote against 50-R-28.
III. Updates

a. Sophie Chang

i. Demographics report is out. Please fill that out as soon as you can.

The link will be posted in the GroupMe. Please fill it out within the next week because we want a 95% participation. Next week Andrew and I will not be here. We will give you an update after we get back. Since we don’t have GA next week, the deadline for resolutions is Feb 3rd.

IV. Executive Report

a. Andrew Jackson:

i. Sorry I could be there last week, I had a meeting. Big Ten student association passed a resolution to add Middle Eastern and North African to their list of identification. The Access Code survey is out! Please fill it out so we can get as much data as possible. Also look out for another survey regarding High Street and what you as students would like to see. This is more of what you would like to
see in the university square area. If anyone has any questions please stop by my office hours.

b. Allocations Committee

i. Motion to strike committee reports from the agenda for the sake of time

ii. Motion passed

iii. Committee reports striked from the agenda

   Jacob Catron

c. Oversight Committee

   Michael Swaggerty

d. Deputy Director

   i. Academic Affairs

   ii. Diversity and Inclusion

   iii. Governmental Relations

   iv. Health and Safety

   v. Student Affairs

   vi. Sustainability
V. Old Business

VI. New Business

a. 50-R-27: A Resolution to Decrease the Price of Student Basketball Tickets
   
   i. Motion to table resolution until next week

   ii. Motion passed

   iii. 50-R-27 tabled until next week

   iv. Note: Resolution 50-R-28 will now be referred to as 50-R-27

b. 50-R-28: A Resolution to Establish a Committee to Investigate OSU’s Investments in Companies Complicit in Human Rights Violations

c. Introduction of Resolution

   i. Sockwell: I stand before you today in firm affirmation of this bill. I sponsored this resolution with the full knowledge that it is, in every definition of the word, a human rights bill. Nothing more than that. The truth is that The Ohio State University may be invested in companies perpetuating human rights violations, regardless of where they’re occurring or who the involved parties are. And today, right now, this USG has the power to take the first step in redeeming our
moral efficacy. I acknowledge the opposition to this bill on the grounds that this is not a Boycott, Divest, and Sanction – influenced movement. As sponsor of this resolution, I can tell you with absolute conviction that it’s not. We are not calling for the withdrawal of funds from any country, nationality or political movement. The structure of the bill is simple: A Senate committee will be created. Companies who we invest in who are funding human rights violations should have our investments in them reconsidered. While private prisons in the United States profit off of the incarceration of a disproportionate amount of people of color, American weapons manufacturers sell weapons to Saudi Arabia in blatant disregard of US and International law. Despite this clear and pervasive injustice, I’m not here to suggest that the USG decide what is and isn’t a violation of human rights. That’s why our bill calls for the creation of a senate committee to give a thorough review of our current investments. I have no doubt that the way the senate remains impartial in matters of academic and athletic integrity; they’ll do the
same with regards to investment integrity. I’m hoping that you’ll all take the first step towards an ethical Ohio State that extends a welcoming hand to students of all backgrounds and does not, at the same time, contribute to the displacement of those same demographics. Thank you.

Smith: Injustice is a threat to justice everywhere. If you read this resolution thoroughly you will see that this resolution is meant.

ii. Shire: I’m not going to sit here and pretend like this resolution is not political. It is. But, unfortunately, we live in a world where the existence of black and brown human beings is political. Where a woman choosing what she is able to do with her body is political. We live in a country where education is threatened everyday, where college students struggle to pay for school, where kids born in America are being threatened with deportation, these things are inherently political. Choosing to wear the hijab for me is, whether I want it to be or not, whether I meant it to be or not, political. It is clearer and clearer every day that every decision we make is a
political one in this country. I’m not going to sit here and pretend that like this resolution is not political. But that’s only because living in this country, calling something political isn’t really saying anything at all. As some speakers mentioned, this is NOT an international organization that has to speak on foreign policy. I agree 100%. But this resolution DOES call for a reevaluation of where our money is going. If it is, in fact, going to the propagation of human rights violations across the globe, then yes i’m going to speak on foreign policy. If my university is contributing to spilling or exploiting the blood of people of color here and abroad then yes I am going to speak on domestic and foreign policy. It is shameful and disappointing for me to see that this university’s involvements with human rights violations - which, by the way, if you read this resolution and its references, it is clear this is not speculation; it is fact - are being swept under the rug only and only because of the people committing them. I got many emails regarding this resolution, and I took a lot of time and consideration in my reply: I
replied to my constituents: “After reading through this legislation line by line, I cannot find anything that is worth disputing. The writers of this resolution have done their research thoroughly, and every source checks out. The overall purpose of this resolution is to ask our university to put money only into ethically sound companies and be as transparent as possible in its investments. As such, there are mentions to ICE, Saudi policies, and other human rights violations, not only Israeli policies (which the UN has repeatedly condemned). If President Drake has committed to protecting DREAMers, then we should not be going out of our way to fund companies that directly benefit the Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Critiquing American policy does not make us any less patriotic. Critiquing Saudi policy is not Islamophobic, and similarly, critiquing Israeli policy is not anti-Semitic. Finally, I just want to add that as a visible Muslim at OSU, I more than understand what it feels like to be targeted on our campus due to forces outside our control, and I would never, ever, ever support any measure or resolution that
would make anybody else feel this way.” Human rights issues should not be subject to national allegiances, and this resolution is purely in favor of human rights. Therefore, I urge my fellow senators to vote YES on this resolution tonight. Thank you.

iii. Smith: I come with a very simple quote that I think is very powerful.

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. If you truly read this resolution, it is about supporting human justice and making sure that OSU does not intentionally support injustice.

iv. Mohammad: Hello everyone, first I would like to thank all the guests that came to express themselves at this general assembly. I took the time to take notes and actively listen to your concerns about the bill. Especially those people who personally reached out to me about this issue. I ran for USG senate in order to represent people like myself, people who are easy to ignore, ppl who’s rights have been ignored at every turn, people who rarely have the privilege to attend an elite university like Ohio State. On this campus the message of “Diversity and Inclusion” is advertised time and time again, but rarely do we
see these diverse and inclusive ideas come into fruition. I am cosponsoring this resolution because I believe we should have a committee investigate the eight billion dollars in assets that this university invests in companies that are complicit in human rights violation. It is clear that there is overwhelming empirical evidence that many of the companies this university has been accused of investing in are in fact committing these atrocious acts against people of color. Finally I would like to leave you all with the words of the late civil rights leader Martin Luther King “The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and controversy” We all ran under a platform that pushes for diversity and equity, and in front of us is a resolution that forces us to enforce these ideals outside the classroom. As students we represent our school and our school should represent us. As people who contribute to the funds of these investments we should have the right to know which companies our school is investing in. We cannot stand behind
the guise of diversity if we are not trying to actively implement it in every aspect. That includes on and off campus. With this resolution we are simply asking to be a more informed public in regards to OSU’s investments and make sure we are supporting companies that support our values, as Buckeyes. By investing in these companies OSU has already made it’s stance on the issue, and all we’re simply asking is to remove ourselves from the situation and re-access our alliances. We have the ability to make an ethical decision tonight, and I urge you to do so.

v. Meersman: I understand some individuals may believe this resolution is rooted in politics, but I see it differently. As a university we are neither pro-Israel nor pro-Palestine. We are pro-buckeyes. I think it is easily misconstrued that by supporting divestment from these American companies we are also supporting Palestine in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but this is not the position the resolution is taking. This is not anti-Semitism disguised as a USG resolution, and suggesting that those in support of it or those who wrote it are
part of a global conspiracy to discriminate against Jewish people is insulting. There are American companies that we are assessing, not Israeli ones. All the personal anecdotes are sad and show the depth of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. But these people do not have a monopoly on suffering. Investments in ethically irresponsible companies are NOT a politically neutral stance because it enables these violations. So we are simply proposing to create a committee to assess these investments. If there is evidence of wrongdoing, we propose bringing our investments back into neutral territory that neither hinders nor advances any political agenda. This resolution aims to support our fellow buckeyes whose families may or may not be harmed by the companies with whom our university conducts business. Therefore I do not believe this resolution extends beyond our jurisdiction. I think I can confidently say on the behalf of my fellow co-sponsors and supporters that this resolution is not intended to make anyone feel alienated. In fact, our intentions are quite the opposite and I want to apologize to those who feel attacked, but
encourage you to look at this objectively. Both supporters and
opponents of this resolution have emotional arguments, but only
those in support have the data and evidence to corroborate our
argument. This resolution is designed to protect all buckeyes
regardless of their race/ethnicity, country of origin, immigration
status, or income-level. These protections are in the best interests of
the student body, the same student body we swore to represent
during our inauguration. I want to reiterate that I don't wish to
invalidate or minimize the emotions of opponents feeling verbally
attacked or targeted by this resolution, but I ask you to recognize that
that the livelihoods of your fellow classmates are threatened every
day and refusing to discuss an important topic is not an effective
approach. I also encourage everyone to pay equal attention to all
components of the resolution as they are of equal importance. They
include private prisons that are financially incentivized and profit
from the mass incarceration of racial and ethnic minorities, the mass
killing of Yemeni citizens, the illegal detention and deportation of
young immigrants and individuals still protected under DACA, and
destruction of Palestinian refugee camps. They are all equally
important, because the opinions and wellbeing of all students should
be valued equally.

vi. Sami: I want to preface this by saying that this is my understanding
of the bill. This may not be what everyone thinks but it is my
opinion. I’m not going to sit here and pretend like this resolution is
not political. It is. But, unfortunately, we live in a world where the
existence of black and brown human beings is political. Where a
woman choosing what she is able to do with her body is political.
We live in a country where education is threatened everyday, where
college students struggle to pay for school, where kids born in
America are being threatened with deportation, these things are
inherently political. Choosing to wear the hijab for me is, whether I
want it to be or not, whether I meant it to be or not, political. It is
clearer and clearer every day that every decision we make is a
political one in this country. I’m not going to sit here and pretend
that like this resolution is not political. But that’s only because living in this country, calling something political isn’t really saying anything at all. As some speakers mentioned, this is NOT an international organization that has to speak on foreign policy. I agree 100%. But this resolution DOES call for a reevaluation of where our money is going. If it is, in fact, going to the propagation of human rights violations across the globe, then yes i’m going to speak on foreign policy. If my university is contributing to spilling or exploiting the blood of people of color here and abroad then yes I am going to speak on domestic and foreign policy. It is shameful and disappointing for me to see that this university’s involvements with human rights violations - which, by the way, if you read this resolution and its references, it is clear this is not speculation; it is fact - are being swept under the rug only and only because of the people committing them. I got many emails regarding this resolution, and I took a lot of time and consideration in my reply: I replied to my constituents: “After reading through this legislation
line by line, I cannot find anything that is worth disputing. The writers of this resolution have done their research thoroughly, and every source checks out. The overall purpose of this resolution is to ask our university to put money only into ethically sound companies and be as transparent as possible in its investments. As such, there are mentions to ICE, Saudi policies, and other human rights violations, not only Israeli policies (which the UN has repeatedly condemned). If President Drake has committed to protecting DREAMers, then we should not be going out of our way to fund companies that directly benefit the Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Critiquing American policy does not make us any less patriotic. Critiquing Saudi policy is not Islamophobic, and similarly, critiquing Israeli policy is not anti-Semitic. Finally, I just want to add that as a visible Muslim at OSU, I more than understand what it feels like to be targeted on our campus due to forces outside our control, and I would never, ever, ever support any measure or resolution that would make anybody else feel this way.” Human rights issues should
not be subject to national allegiances, and this resolution is purely in favor of human rights. Therefore, I urge my fellow senators to vote YES on this resolution tonight. Thank you.

vii. Ahmed: I’m not going to sit here and pretend like this resolution is not political. It is. But, unfortunately, we live in a world where the existence of black and brown human beings is political. Where a woman choosing what she is able to do with her body is political. We live in a country where education is threatened everyday, where college students struggle to pay for school, where kids born in America are being threatened with deportation, these things are inherently political. Choosing to wear the hijab for me is, whether I want it to be or not, whether I meant it to be or not, political. It is clearer and clearer every day that every decision we make is a political one in this country. I’m not going to sit here and pretend that like this resolution is not political. But that’s only because living in this country, calling something political isn’t really saying anything at all. As some speakers mentioned, this is NOT an
international organization that has to speak on foreign policy. I agree 100%. But this resolution DOES call for a reevaluation of where our money is going. If it is, in fact, going to the propagation of human rights violations across the globe, then yes I’m going to speak on foreign policy. If my university is contributing to spilling or exploiting the blood of people of color here and abroad then yes I am going to speak on domestic and foreign policy. It is shameful and disappointing for me to see that this university’s involvements with human rights violations - which, by the way, if you read this resolution and its references, it is clear this is not speculation; it is fact - are being swept under the rug only and only because of the people committing them. I got many emails regarding this resolution, and I took a lot of time and consideration in my reply: I replied to my constituents: “After reading through this legislation line by line, I cannot find anything that is worth disputing. The writers of this resolution have done their research thoroughly, and every source checks out. The overall purpose of this resolution is to
ask our university to put money only into ethically sound companies and be as transparent as possible in its investments. As such, there are mentions to ICE, Saudi policies, and other human rights violations, not only Israeli policies (which the UN has repeatedly condemned). If President Drake has committed to protecting DREAMers, then we should not be going out of our way to fund companies that directly benefit the Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Critiquing American policy does not make us any less patriotic. Critiquing Saudi policy is not Islamophobic, and similarly, critiquing Israeli policy is not anti-Semitic. Finally, I just want to add that as a visible Muslim at OSU, I more than understand what it feels like to be targeted on our campus due to forces outside our control, and I would never, ever, ever support any measure or resolution that would make anybody else feel this way.” Human rights issues should not be subject to national allegiances, and this resolution is purely in favor of human rights. Therefore, I urge my fellow senators to vote YES on this resolution tonight. Thank you.
McKenzie: Many of us campaigned with the promise of increasing transparency at the Ohio State. As student we contribute to OSU’s assets, I believe we are justified to ask that the university invests ethically. This resolution is asking that the university investigates any companies that been accused of human rights violations thoroughly and independently. Human rights are an extremely important issue and they require a closer look. This committee allows us to remain impartial and more importantly it places the responsibility of investigating on team a of people equipped to dedicating the right amount of time to collect enough data and proof to make the right decision. All of the companies listed are either American companies or multinational companies based in the us. This is about more than Isreal and Palestine, this about the Yemeni blockade and the black and Latina community which are disportionality affected by by for Profit Prisons, dreamers and any other group which is affected by the violation of human rights. These issues are analogous and they are important regardless of where they
happen. This isn't about creating division, it's about what doing what's right for everyone on this campus. And the only way to do that is to have an independent committee investigate the issue.

d. Moved to Questions:

i. Kanas: You state that this resolution is not. If this resolution is not BDS then why are you using companies that support BDS?

ii. Chang: Would any of the sponsors like to respond?

iii. Sockwell: No, but can I yield my time to Yazan Anani?

iv. Chang: It is up to my discretion and I believe that the people who wrote the resolution should be able to answer the questions. Each senator can yield time to a member of the public in discussion. But for answers to questions, the senators should be able to.

v. Sockwell: Okay, can you repeat the question?

vi. Kanas: You say that this resolution is not BDS, then why does it use citations from organizations that support BDS? If you look at citations 16, 17, 18, and 19 as well, they all specifically reference
BDS. If this resolution is not BDS, then why are you using this as a sources.

vii. Sockwell: The sources that are used may be political but they are fact. This is not political. We can leave that to the committee to decide.

viii. Smith: Real quickly I have looked at the citation, even though they cite it, they do not necessarily support the movement. It just describes what it is.

ix. Kanas: If this is not political then what are you using political sources.

x. Sockwell: Sources may be political but this resolution is not political


xii. Kanas: Why is it political?

xiii. Chang: No cross talk. People may only have a follow up at my discretion.

xiv. Smith: If it affects our students then we should look into it.
Malpass: I want to commend this resolution. As many of the people from the public has said. If this has failed 4 times before, why are you doing this again? Have you talked to any administrators and how it will impact the university?

Sockwell: We asked administration to give us a copy of the budget. We were given a financial report from 2009. Since 2009 was almost 10 year this is not most representative of what they are investing in. This is a whole new bill.

Malpass: University of Michigan just passed this. Will this lead to divestment?

Sockwell: Have you read?

Malpass:

Sockwell: Yeah, then you can tell that this resolution is completely different. Also, if there are human rights, why would you not want to divest from them?

Humayun: Are any of the sponsors and writers tied to anyone in the BDS movement?
xxii. Sockwell: No. This resolution is not BDS.

xxiii. Pierson: No here

xxiv. Shire: No.

xxv. Smith: No.

xxvi. Mohamed: No.

xxvii. Meersman: No.

xxviii. Sami: No.

xxix. McKenzie: No

xxx. Long: No.

xxxi. Ahmed: No.

xxxii. Mohamud: No.

xxxiii. Davis: The first one, there seems to be confusion along this is a BDS movement. As senator Stockwell said

xxxiv. Sockwell: My name is Sockwell, not Stockwell.

xxxv. Davis: My apologies.

xxxvi. Sockwell: Okay.

xxxvii. Davis: Anyways, which is it, political or no?
xxxviii. Sockwell: I misspoke

xxxix. Sami: I prefaced it by saying that this is my opinion, and my opinion does not represent anyone else, if you listen to what I said.

xl. Smith: I can follow up on this are political. The resolution that was not passed was directly tied to politics. We can say that this is political, not directly tied to politics.

xli. Chang: Senators please be respectful or you will be removed.

xlii. Spigel: How did you determine the companies to divest from?

xliii. Sockwell: We used the report from 2009. That is where we started.

xliv. Spigel: Were any Israels contacted?

xlv. Sockwell: I did, and I asked for information to used to see if they were targeted. This is simply asking to look through the investments.

xlvi. Spigel: Did you discuss the specific clauses with an Israeli?

xlvii. Chang: I would like there to be no cross talk. Please many questions remaining to the resolution.

xlviii. Bowels: I had a question about the resolution as a whole. The clause specifically related to foreign government seem to be the
reason a lot of us are concerned. I am wondering if the sponsors would be willing to take out the name of the countries? The passage of those resolution will still make a committee. Take out any political discussion.

xlix. Long: I was reached out by a lot of my constituents. I spoke with both side. I guess a major consensus did agree that some wanted it out, and some wanted it out, after I continue to hear more from the chamber, I will be able to give you a move solid answer.

1. Sami: I just want to say that 2 years ago, when it came in the resolution. We would like it to say that it should be more universal. There was no example then it is too vague, and if we are giving example, then it seems like we are pointing fingers. There is no winning. I am open to a more universal document, but we would expect there to be concrete examples.

li. Bowels: I guess then I am curious. Because it talks about HP in some instances where it does not relate to foreign issues.

lii. Smith: If we dont, then the question would be why are we hiding it?
liii. Sami: These companies we know for a fact are infringing on human rights.

liv. Dennen: Amazingly well researched! You said that its Pro-Buckeye, how can you say that when a lot of our students are Jewish?

lv. Meersman: I feel like we need to recognize that we are just trying to create a committee.

lvi. Dennen: I’m saying it’s not pro-buckeye because it will hurt the opportunities of a lot of buckeyes.

lvii. Meersman: There are also businesses that are ethically responsible. I think we can find opportunities from different companies.

lviii. Smith: That brings up a very ethical. Do we value that in. What do we deem appropriate? This would hurt the opportunities for job? When do we draw that line?

lix. Clark: This resolution states that tuition dollars don’t fund the US.

lx. McKenzie: This is. Tuition fund are not.

e. Motion to cap the Speakers list.

f. Motion passed.
g. Capped the speakers list.

i. Donelly: Speak up please!

ii. Kanas: The average student graduates as a $27,400 in student debt.

Why would we intentionally take away the opportunities from students?

iii. Sami: Why are we willing to compromise human rights issues for the sake of money?

iv. Ahmed: Our tuition goes towards this. When we give money to Ohio State our money is used. This is a personal issue for many.

v. Smith: Love if you have a statistic for which one of these is one of our highest employer. It is very interesting that do have investments in from the 2009 report?

vi. Shire: Just because we get money from them doesn’t meant they don’t have to involve.

vii. Meersman: We do not have to sacrifice. We are going to redirect our money.
viii. McKenzie: We should stay on the topic of being on the committee.

It is not saying to divest from anything. I think we should stay on topic.

ix. Kanas: How would these committee’s investigate those human rights if you’re saying they have already committed these acts?

x. Smith: I would hope that the committee would not just take our resolution and go straight based off this.

xi. Meersman: We think. We want a committee to also see that this is true or not. This is from the 2009 report, so the committee would look into more recent.

xii. Sami: This committee would look into more recent. We do not have the violation

xiii. Cromes: About the committee? How would that process go about selecting them? Or is this just a guideline.

xiv. Sami: If you look at the first “Therefore, Let it Be Resolved that the Undergraduate Student Government calls for the formation of an ad hoc committee, consisting of faculty, students and staff within the
University Senate, to investigate the ethical and moral implications of investments including the aforementioned companies which are involved in human rights violations both within the U.S. and abroad.”

xv. Smith: We would have the committee approved.

xvi. Cromes: Who would be selecting?

xvii. Sockwell: Its in the resolution: University senate

xviii. Drezkta: This was originally written by the sponsors of this resolution. I googled the whereas clauses, and they popped up on google.

xix. Smith: Those are facts and not opinions.

xx. Dretzka: If this is resolution not related to Israel, why is it worded so similar?

xxi. Sockwell: Why is it coming into question when it is Palestinian issues?

xxii. Long: Isn’t that just a very factual statement? I guess later on in the discussion to reword.
Sami: Every time it comes to Palestinian rights? Did you google any other whereas classes too or just this one.

Murphy: A lot of them mentioned fear of anti-semitism. As an African American student, I can understand.

Long: I can very easily understand that people might fear targeted. But I trust that the university will take care of it.

Sami: We all condemn anti-semitism on this campus and are willing to add a clause to condemn anti-semitism.

McKenzie: If you are targeted, yes there is BART because. This resolution is not promoting that in any way. Action would be taken your behalf and many other peoples

Donnelly: To which in the aforementioned companies: we are using these just as example. Are these focused? We want to later add a friendly amendment.

Sockwell: We can make a friendly amendment to change the resolution to include all companies.
Clark: Last semester, this chamber passed fossil fuel act. We realized that this one might be more controversial and would require a lot more people.

Clark: Why now?

Smith: What do you mean why now?

Clark: Why does this right now require a divestment from?

Sockwell: All of the students were elected to represent their student body. If anyone asks for a committee for other resolutions I would be more than willing.

Quadri: My question was kinda already answered. Would you be interested in adding a clause for future investments?

Sockwell: Yes.

Kanas: Many co-sponsors and Sockwell admitted this is controversial. Admitted that this is controversial. Isn’t it clear that there is major opposition? Why would would you push this resolution when so many people are against divestment?
xxxviii. Sockwell: The referendum asks for direct divestment. It only won by 250 votes. This is for a committee.

xxxix. McKenzie: Divest from companies that explicitly impact human rights. This is not about BDS in anyway. We are not targeting any students to countries.

xl. Kanas: One I would like to point out that they are the same companies. The referendum did win. It’s the same companies.

xli. Sockwell: Wait, what’s your question?

xlii. Kanas: I’m getting there. How can you say when our students said they do not vote to divest?

xliii. Sockwell: This is not about divestment, this is not. This is a whole new resolution. Thank you.

xliv. Meersman: We need to focus on the committee: We need transparency and we need a committee. We need to stay on line. Let’s focus.

xlv. Speigel: Just wanted to say thank you. I’ve learned a lot. Two of you have quoted, Martin Luther King Jr. I wanted to share one too
and see what your thoughts are on this. “Peace for Israel means security, and we must stand with all our might to protect its right to exist, its territorial integrity. I see Israel as one of the great outposts of democracy in the world, and a marvelous example of what can be done, how desert land can be transformed into an oasis of brotherhood and democracy. Peace for Israel means security and that security must be a reality.”

xlvi. Sami: This is not remaining to the resolution at hand. There is a problem of moral absolutism that we know is a great person. The people that brought it up to a context you have. This has nothing to do with it.

xlvii. Long: I cant tell you what he would think. I am not him, I wish I was. None of us can speak for him, because none of us are him.

xlviii. Speigel: I wasn’t asking to speak about him. How is this a random quote, when it is just about Israel and its security.

xlix. Sockwell: If human rights are not being violated in Israel, then why are we worried?
l. Quadri: This has nothing to do with the resolution.

h. Moved to Discussion

i. Humayun: Motion to cap speakers list

ii. Motion passed.

iii. Speaker list capped.

iv. Malpass: Can we put a limit to how long people can speak so that we can insure we finish voting on this resolution tonight?

v. Motion to limit time to 1 m

vi. Malpass: I am 99.9% in support for this resolution. The part that gets me is that the 2nd Let it be resolved.

vii. Sockwell: “If deemed appropriate”

viii. Davis: National model of inclusiveness and safety and success. You can call it what you want but it is not hard to grasp. I strongly urge a no vote.

ix. Kanas: After hearing so much discussion, it has divided. I moved to table indefinitely.

x. Questions about motion to table indefinitely
1. Smith: Why would you voted to table indefinitely instead of no?

2. Kanas: We have seen we have seen other divisive resolution and they were tabled indefinitely.

3. Kanas: I want to focus on more pertinent issues.

4. Mckenzie: What issues do you think are more pertinent than human rights? Why do you think it is divided? I feel like this resolution has brought us together even more.

5. Chang: I would like to just move into discussion.

xi. Discussion about motion to table indefinitely

1. Morris: I don’t know the resolution is the best way to collectively come up with the solution.

2. Clark: I think it would be best if this cabinet would like to take the week off and start over because this resolution is very controversial.

3. Cromes: Just to clarify this exact resolution cant
4. Litman: I felt continuously insulted. The amount of constituents that voted. I think it is disingenuous to not table.

5. Malpass: Motion to call the question.

6. Motion fails.

7. Quadri: We have sat here for hours. Everyone feels one way to another. What will happen is that it will be here again next week. I think we should take a vote.

8. Smith: I’m good.

9. Sami: Instead of being tabled if you want to change something so bring it up.

xii. Motion to Table Indefinitely fails.

xiii. Humayun: Unfriendly to strike whereas clause 65 to 80 which mentions Israel, and anything outside of the United States.

xiv. Anani: I think we should strongly investigate other countries in the world too.

xv. Sami: It is so disrespectful because peoples rights are not being looked at because they are not in this country.
xvi. Human: I am not trying to be disrespectful at all. A lot of people feel targeted. And this might be a way to compromise.

xvii. Dennen: This doesn’t mean that when the committee is formed they can’t look into these companies correct?

xviii. Humayun: Yes correct. This is nothing against the committee.

xix. Motion passed. Clauses removed.

xx. Moved to different room

xxi. Roll call again. 42 PRESENT

xxii. Chang: I have just been informed that anyone who is currently sitting on the steps will need to stand. That is our compromise with the Union

xxiii. Donnelly: Motion to make language consistent. Motion to say “including” the companies in the let it therefore be resolved clause.

xxiv. Motion to edit let it therefore be resolved clause PASSED.

xxv. Motion to make language consistent PASSED.

xxvi. Greer: I just wanted to say that it is very difficult to form an adhoc committee is very difficult.
xxvii. Herrera: I motion to add a BDS opposition amendment. “Let it be resolved USG, condemns BDS and all that it stands for.”

xxviii. Litman: We keep hearing that this isn’t BDS, so prove it.

xxix. Sami: It was not included because it was nothing to do with it.

xxx. McKenzie: It’s not even relevant anymore.

xxxi. Amendment FAILED

xxxii. Bowels: Propose to change to change “divestment” to “action deemed appropriate by the committee.”

xxxiii. Amendment PASSES


xxxvi. McKenzie: It is very disheartening and disgusting that we have to take out a certain population of people for this human rights resolution to pass is disheartening.

xxxvii. Slavick: I would like to remove any further company.

xxxviii. Motion FAILED.

xl. Clark: Strike whereas clause that lists all of the universities.

xli. Motion FAILED.

xlii.

xliii. Litman: I have heard many semitic students. There is clear anti-semitism in this resolution. This is wrong and disgusting.

xliv. Quadri: Today we have very heard a lot of perspectives from the public and from senators, majority of which are out of the context of what this resolution asks for which is the creation of a committee. We have heard debated on foreign policy, Martin Luther King Jr, and undermining a nation’s security whether it’s Israel or Saudi Arabia. I don’t think any of that was pertinent or relevant to this resolution. I would also like to say that this is not a resolution that is simply focused on Israel. Saying that is disregarding the very real marginalization of black, Arab, and minority students. Regarding the human rights violations that are listed in this resolution, it isn’t just about you or your identity. Just because the Israeli government is committing these actions does not mean you are doing that.
Littman: You can’t tell me what is and isn’t anti-semitism.

Chang: No cross talk. This is Quadri’s time.

Quadri: What I was also going to say is, I, myself, am Muslim American. The Saudi government does many things that don’t represent my religion, or my views as a Muslim American. As a student here, why would I want them to represent me? I would also like to say that Pakistan was also mentioned by some speakers. My parents are from Pakistan, and they’re a corrupt government, and should be help accountable. I would have no problem bringing a resolution two weeks from now to withdraw from companies that help them commit human rights violations against my family members that are in Pakistan right now. I would also like to go into executive session so we can vote by secret ballot.

i. 50-R-27 PASSES

j. FINAL VOTE: 23 (YES) - 18 (NO) - 1 (ABSTAIN)

VII. Adjournment

a. Buss: Please fill out demographic reports!!
b. Adjourned at 12:03am