



1. WELCOME AND OPENING

Meeting opened at 1:02 pm.

The Chair acknowledged that the meeting is taking place on Whadjuk Noongar land and paid respects to elders past and present.

Ground rules were outlined by the chair as follows:

- Conduct under UWA bylaws.
- Unauthorized filming strictly prohibited (Guild recording only for minutes).
- Discriminatory or hateful remarks result in removal.
- Debate must remain respectful, with warnings and removals for breaches.
- Wellbeing staff present in the room for support.

Speaking times limited to 2 minutes, with a 20-second warning.

Meeting limited to 55 minutes due to class at 2 pm.

Debate structure: 25 minutes per motion (10 minutes for questions, 15 for debate)

2. DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

3. MOTIONS ON NOTICE (REPRESENTATION)

3.1.1 UWA Students censure the Australian government for its complicity in the genocide in Gaza. We demand an end to all weapons sales to Israel by Australia and Australian companies, and call for sanctions on Israel.

Proposed by: Danica Scott

Seconded by: Alevine Magila

Proposer: Condemned Israel's recent attack on Nasser Hospital, killing 21 including journalists and medics, calling it genocide. Cited Amnesty International and Israeli human rights groups and accused Australia of complicity by supplying F-35 jet parts. Called for Australia to end military trade with Israel, formally recognise the genocide, and act morally.

Seconder: Supported the motion, asserting that genocide against Palestinians is undeniable. Criticised the Albanese government for supplying Israel with essential jet parts and repressing the Palestine movement. Urged students to support sanctions and an immediate end to the weapons trade.



QUESTIONS

No questions for this motion.

DEBATE

First speaker for the motion: Highlighted strong public resistance, including large protests across Australia. Criticised the government for refusing sanctions or stopping weapons sales, despite producing key F-35 parts. Emphasised that recognition of Palestine without action is meaningless and called for continued nationwide activism.

First speaker against the motion: Argued Australia provides aid to Palestine through food, medical relief, and refugees, contradicting claims of complicity. Downplayed the significance of F-35 parts and denied direct weapons supply to Israel. Concluded the motion is unfounded and would vote against it.

Second speaker for the motion: Rejected the previous argument, citing Australia's poor refugee record and Gaza's blockade preventing aid delivery. Accused Australia of complicity via contracts with Israeli weapons companies and support for the Israeli Defence Force. Called for sanctions and severing all ties.

Second speaker against the motion: Focused on Hamas's attacks and atrocities, claiming Israel has a right to defend itself. Argued the conflict is not one-sided and that Hamas must be removed for peace. Suggested if Israel stopped fighting, it would be destroyed overnight.

Third speaker for the motion: Highlighted systematic destruction of Gaza by Israel, including universities and hospitals, calling it intentional genocide. Argued the conflict is unequal in power and the devastation is deliberate.

Third speaker against the motion: Raised that Hamas withholds aid and embeds fighters in civilian areas, making targeting unavoidable. Warned that ending weapons sales could expose Israeli civilians to risk and questioned some Palestinian protesters' attitudes.

Fourth speaker for the motion: Criticised the focus on Hamas as a distraction from Australian government complicity. Framed the debate around genocide, not Hamas, and urged students to hold Australia accountable for enabling violence against Palestinians.



Final speaker against the motion: Reiterated that Hamas started the war, continues to hold hostages, and must be removed. Emphasised personal defence motives and the political role of Hamas.

Final speaker for the motion: Countered that starvation and civilian suffering in Gaza result from Israeli policy, not Hamas. Highlighted deliberate destruction of aid distribution and estimated the true toll closer to 500,000. Argued the issue is genocide, not neutralising Hamas.

The motion was put to a vote and passed with a majority in favour.

Motion passed.

3.2.1 UWA Students call on all Australian universities to end their complicity with Israel's genocide by ceasing all partnerships with weapons companies.

Proposed by: Alevine Magila

Proposed by: Danica Scott

Proposer: Highlighted UWA's partnership with L3Harris, which produces components for F-35 jets used by Israel in Gaza. Argued universities should not contribute to violence and that such partnerships reflect long-standing integration with the military-industrial complex. Referenced historical oppression of Palestinians since 1948 to contextualize ongoing suffering.

Seconder: Supported the motion, stating weapons company involvement conflicts with university missions. Emphasized student agency over research and advocated redirecting funding toward medical, environmental, and humanitarian work. Framed the motion as aligning university values with humanitarian principles.

QUESTIONS

Attendees sought clarification on university ties with weapons manufacturers and alleged suppression of pro-Palestine voices. The Chair ruled some questions out of order. The proposer clarified UWA's opaque partnership with L3Harris and noted similar ties across other universities with companies like Lockheed Martin producing lethal weapons.

DEBATE



First speaker for the motion: Shared personal and community experiences of ongoing oppression since 1948. Urged attendees to consider civilian suffering and moral responsibility rather than focusing on Palestinian resistance. Encouraged open dialogue and reflection on university complicity.

First speaker against the motion: Acknowledged Palestinian suffering but questioned Australia's direct role. Argued that ending partnerships ignores broader regional security concerns and military realities. Suggested opposition to militarism requires consistency, including critiquing groups like Hamas.

Second speaker for the motion: Emphasized UWA's direct role in supplying F-35 components used in Gaza. Rejected claims of Australia as a stabilizing force, framing the country as promoting militarized intervention. Invoked student tradition of opposing wars and militarization.

Third speaker for the motion: Argued universities have a responsibility to improve the world rather than support global militarization. Called for opposition to companies contributing to violence in Gaza and the Pacific. Framed education as a tool for problem-solving, not perpetuating conflict.

Second speaker against the motion: Criticized the motion for lacking nuance, defending university-industry defence collaborations as essential for national security and sovereignty. Cited regional threats, particularly from China, to justify military involvement.

Fourth speaker for the motion: Highlighted the immorality of funding harmful technologies through tuition. Drew parallels to global patterns of state violence, such as in West Papua.

Third speaker against the motion: Reiterated the need for university involvement in defence projects to maintain sovereignty and address real regional threats. Criticized one-sided criticisms that ignore other militarized actors like China.

Fifth speaker for the motion: Condemned using university resources to support weapons and framed the situation in Gaza as genocide. Connected Australia-Israel ties to shared settler-colonial histories. Warned that debates about militarism distract from urgent humanitarian issues.



Sixth speaker for the motion: Rejected narratives condemning Palestinian resistance while ignoring civilian deaths. Emphasized solidarity with Palestinians and condemned framing the conflict purely through militarism. Highlighted university suppression of pro-Palestine voices and disciplinary actions against students. Criticized inconsistent treatment of geopolitical issues and alignment with state narratives. Framed this as a betrayal of academic freedom and moral responsibility.

Final speaker against the motion: Defended discussion of Hamas as a legitimate aspect of the conflict. Argued allegations of censorship are overblown if proper university procedures are followed.

Final speaker for the motion: Challenged repeated focus on Hamas, noting many Palestinians are affected outside Hamas-controlled areas. Shared personal experiences of threats, suspension, and family deaths. Emphasized that large-scale civilian suffering cannot be justified by militant actions.

Following this, the chair called the motion to a vote. A clear majority voted in favour.

Motion passes.

4. CLOSE

Meeting closed at 1:56pm.