

Motion B Amendment 1

Submitted by: Ben Towse

ADD:

Resolves 4. To refer in public campaigning to the "Higher Education reforms" (or, where appropriate, any "Bill" being put to Parliament) rather than the "White Paper", as this is less jargon-y.

Motion B Amendment 2

Submitted by: Josh Berlyne

ADD Resolves:

- NCAFC should consistently and clearly portray the White Paper as tantamount to "selling off" public universities, linking it to the privatisation of the NHS and the academisation of schools.

Motion B Amendment 3

Submitted by: Hope Worsdale

1) REPLACE Resolves (3) with:

- NCAFC should aim to pull off a series of creative stunts and/or more spiky direct action between now and the NUS demo in Autumn in order to create excitement, awareness and press attention around the key issues. These could be done both independently or together with NUS, depending on the action.

2) ADD Resolves:

- NCAFC should do a Freshers' week call-out to campus activists groups across the country for local action in opposition to the White Paper, which we should talk about and gain momentum for at Summer Training 2016. We should also push NUS to produce key materials on the White Paper to be mailed out to activists and SUs for use during this Autumn period.

Motion C Amendment 1

Submitted by: Ben Towse

ADD:

Believes 2: To make sure we don't get tunnel vision about a particular tactic that we are using, or risk putting cart before horse, we should always think in terms of political priorities, which dictate strategies, which dictate tactics.

Further Believes 4: As far as possible, we should press NUS to take up a leadership and coordinating role in the NSS sabotage and the other actions it is mandated to organise against the HE reforms. Ideally, NCAFC's main roles in that struggle should be: to pressure the NUS leadership to implement the sabotage in the ways we believe will be most effective and to fully commit the necessary resources; to agitate within the struggle against the HE reforms for our more radical positive vision of education; to help build on the ground for grassroots participation in the NSS sabotage and other actions.

DELETE AND REPLACE:

Resolves 1. The principal priority of the NCAFC's work until the next NCAFC Conference should be fighting the HE reforms, including education about the reforms, political agitation, and building participation in the NSS sabotage, national demonstrations and local action. We should do our best to roll a continued fight against the maintenance grant cuts into this struggle, and to link the higher education pay dispute into and we should do our best to build the fight against cuts in FE whilst acknowledging that our capacity there is currently smaller than in HE.

Motion C Amendment 2

Submitted by: Hattie Craig

ADD Resolves: NCAFC should look at how to generate excitement around the NSS sabotage on campuses. This could include getting supportive bands/artists to play at campuses who get the highest proportion of their students to pledge to sabotage the NSS.

Motion C Amendment 3

Submitted by: Hattie Craig

ADD Resolves: NCAFC should work with NUS and SU officers to ensure that the NSS sabotage is incredibly prominent at NUS summer training events

Motion C Amendment 4

Submitted by: Hope Worsdale

1) ADD Resolves:

- NCAFC should run a speaker tour throughout Autumn to raise awareness of the NSS sabotage and support grassroots activists in building the campaign on campuses across the country. This speaker tour could also cover other key issues regarding attacks to education.

2) ADD Resolves:

- NCAFC should look to work with NUS officers to ensure the creation of a high-quality NSS sabotage "Pledge Website", where people can sign up to register their commitment to sabotage but also to stay informed with the ongoing campaign. This website should be up and running by the Autumn term.

Motion C Amendment 5

Submitted by: Sahaya James

Add resolves

"Mandate NCAFC's NEC members to over the summer personally contact all sabbatical officer teams about the sabotage with the aim of ensuring they are all aware of the strategy, answering questions,

encouraging them to pass a motion in support of the strategy and to offer any individual support and advice they may need"

"Over the summer write and produce a series of short films to explain and promote the strategy."

Motion E Amendment 1

Submitted by: Zac Muddle

Delete Resolves 1. "formal structure" and replace with "clear process".

Motion E Amendment 2

Submitted by: Hannah Sketchley

ADD

Resolves

v. That advertising to the membership should not just be on Facebook, but also Loomio or other platforms used by members of the NCAFC to communicate internally.

Motion G Amendment 1

Submitted by: Ben Towse

DELETE

Within believes 4: "For example, choosing not to speak at an event alongside a certain speaker is not no platforming, although the decision might stem from similar political ideas."

DELETE AND REPLACE:

Resolves 1: 1. We shall define no platforming as a tactic of refusing, as a general blanket rule, to permit someone any platform to organise, promote their ideas, or act on them, e.g. an SU cancelling a society event, overthrowing a street stall, asking a council to stop a demonstration from taking place.

No-platforming also includes refusing, as a general blanket rule, to ever have representatives of your organisation or movement share a platform with a specified group or person. Actions such as deciding a particular speaker would not be appropriate for a particular event, or protesting an event, should generally not be considered no platforming, although the reasons behind these actions may sometimes stem from similar political ideas as those who advocate a wider use of no platforming tactics. In these cases, we should aim to challenge these ideas and change people's minds.

ADD

Resolves: The fact that an organisation or person is not no-platformed does not mean individual activists are always obliged to accept every invitation to share a platform with them - personal decisions about what events to attend etc are separate from collectively held, organisational political policies like no-platform.

Motion G Amendment 2

Submitted by: Ben Towse

ADD

Believes 5: We should have zero trust in the state to restrain fascism, and we must recognise that state bans on the right to organise and protest are easily turned from the far right to hit the left too. For instance, in the past, bans on protests in particular areas, supposedly put in place to prevent fascist demonstrations, have been used to block left-wing protests.

Believes 6: No-platform should therefore be advocated as a tactic for the left and workers' and student movements to fight fascists from the grassroots up, but not as a call for the state to step in and ban fascist demonstrations for us from the top down (though in very particular contexts, on a case-by-case basis, we might choose not to oppose specific restrictions)

DELETE

Within resolves 1: "asking a council to stop a demonstration from taking place"

Motion H Amendment 1

Submitted by: Hope Worsdale

1) ADD TEXT AT THE BEGINNING OF POINT 4) IN "PROBLEMS WE FACE" SECTION:

- The ability for liberation groups to organise autonomously is legitimate and important for many reasons, and should be defended. However, ...

Motion I Amendment 1

Submitted by: Edward Maltby

ADD Believes: While recognising the flaws in our current Safer Spaces policy, we don't yet have a fully-thought-through better alternative, so we will have to retain the current policy until we develop a better one.

DELETE Resolves 5

Motion J Amendment 1

Submitted by: Gordon Maloney, Deborah Hermanns, Barnaby Raine

We note recent controversy in the student movement, as well as in the Labour Party, about the left and anti-Semitism – focused on attitudes to Israel-Palestine and Zionism.

Anti-Semitism exists on the left, as it does in the rest of society and across the political spectrum.

We need to take the fight against anti-Semitism, **as against all forms of racism and bigotry, seriously.**

We do not believe the question can be dealt with simply by drawing a distinction between anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism. Criticising Zionism is not necessarily anti-Semitic, of course, but some anti-Zionist politics is. Supporters of the Palestinians like ourselves must keep this in mind.

● ~~Criticism of Israel that exceptionalises it, and treats it as uniquely evil among imperialist states, or that paints the entirety of Jewish Israeli society as homogeneously and fundamentally irredeemable, is wrong.~~

● ~~Most living Jews feel some form of affinity with Israel. To describe any and all such affinity as exceptionally racist is inaccurate; and also places most Jews under suspicion.~~

● ~~Blaming Jewish communities, and the Zionist movements within them, for the persecution, oppression and genocide Jews have faced, is wrong and historically nonsensical.~~

● ~~Arguing that imperial powers such as the USA or UK have been subverted by, and their policy is determined by, powerful "Zionist lobbies" rather than recognising that these imperial powers form their alliances mainly for their own interests is conspiracy theorising with historical roots in conspiracies about secret Jewish cabals running the world.~~

● Forms of anticapitalism that focus disproportionately on the roles, power and collaboration of Jewish or "Zionist" **(when used as a substitute for Jewish)** capitalists are anti-Semitic conspiracy theories.

● **There is, and always has been, a broad diversity of opinion amongst Jews and Jewish communities about Israel and Zionism and ascribing a set of opinions to them as a homogenous group is anti-Semitic.**

● **While some people use anti-Zionism as a smokescreen for anti-Semitism, support for the Palestinian liberation struggle, and opposition to Zionism as a political project are coherent with an anti-racist, anti-colonial politics.**

We certainly have differences and disagreements in our ranks about issues about how Zionism and anti-Zionism are related to anti-Semitism. We will encourage a discussion among our supporters and throughout the student movement to draw out these differences, educate ourselves and facilitate productive debate.

Anti-Semitism on the left is generally not based in personalised hostility to Jews; it is, rather rooted in a set of political ideas. The way to wipe out anti-Semitism from our movement is through political discussion, rather than disciplinary measures.

We oppose the cynical use of these issues by some on e.g. the Labour right as a factional weapon against the left, and to undermine the Corbyn leadership. We believe that in the student movement as elsewhere anti-Semitism must be addressed politically, through discussion and education. That requires an atmosphere of free speech and debate, where those raising concerns of anti-Semitism are taken seriously; where criticisms of Israel are not automatically shouted down as anti-Semitic; and where the discussion is not manipulated for factional purposes.

Motion L Amendment 1

Submitted by: Hannah Sketchley

ADD

NCAFC Believes

1. That our vision for NUS has to include strong principles of democracy
2. That we have passed such principles beforehand, including at the last Summer conference, and submitted policy in their spirit to the NUS¹
3. That there is currently a lot of buzz around the concept of OMOV [One member, one vote]

NCAFC Further Believes

1. That OMOV would in fact be a bad thing for the NUS and its democracy
2. That OMOV is commonly understood in NUS to actually mean 'One Student One Vote'
3. That this disbenefits small students' unions, particularly ones in FE or ones which are underdeveloped
4. That this would cost the NUS a vast amount of money
5. That we are not, in principle, opposed to the NUS spending vast amounts of money, but we want them to spend it on more sensible and politically-agreeable things
6. That OMOV used only for national elections would weaken the legitimacy of National Conference as a policy-making body and pave the way for it to be sidelined
7. That OMOV would favour those with the money, time and energy to roll around the country profiling themselves
8. That OMOV would mean that candidates had to do the above, and thus lock out a lot of people who did not have the time, energy or money to do so
9. That any accountability or interaction with the NUS that its proponents claim OMOV gives can actually be done better if unions sort out their delegate elections properly

NCAFC Resolves

1. If OMOV, or any variant thereof, or indeed any other proposal which sees to weaken National Conference as a sovereign democratic event be proposed in seriousness, to organise against it

Motion L Amendment 2

Submitted by: Hattie Craig

REPLACE Resolves 1) with: "The NC should develop a charter of what we believe the NUS should look like and do which we can build support around, including both campaigning priorities and changes to NUS structures."

¹ Motion 1, Amendment B4:

<http://anticuts.com/2015/06/10/summer-conference-motions-and-amendments/>

Motion M Amendment 1

Submitted by: Sahaya James

Add resolves

"In the autumn term NCAFC should organise a speaker tour on the attacks facing education and ensure there are as many events in Further Education colleges as possible. These should focus on what the Area Reviews are and how they threaten to dismantle FE and how to organise in FE and work alongside your local UCU branch"

"NCAFC should work on and produce a range of online and printed materials that break down what the Area Reviews are, how they will dismantle FE and adult education and what this means in the wider context of attacks on education and access"

"NCAFC should work to highlight the liberation perspective on the destruction of Further and adult education and link them to the cuts to the Open University and how together this is a key way access to education is being decimated resulting in many of the poorest and most vulnerable students, including migrants, the disabled, parents, careers and mature students being shut out."

"NCAFC should actively encourage and support local activist groups get in touch with and form links with local FE institutions and their UCU branches to offer students support in setting up activist groups in FE"

"NCAFC should work with FE student unions and education workers to discuss the possibility of a national action or protest in a key location for where an Area Review has or will be taking place"