

Allgemeiner Studierenden-Ausschuss (AStA)
Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg
Uhlhornsweg 49–55 26111 Oldenburg
E-Mail: vorstand@asta-oldenburg.de



25th AStA meeting in the Legislature 2020/2021, protocol from the AStA-meeting of february 1st 2021

date, time: 1st of february 2021, 10.15 am

place: Big Blue Button <https://studconf.uol.de/b/ast-foq-vly>

Attendance:

Thore (executive), Holger (finances, executive), Katharina (social affairs and internal university, executive), Kai (executive), Arne (sustainability), Felix (anti discrimination and political education), Finja (anti discrimination and political education), Hannah (project funding), Janine (public relations), Johanna B. (public relations), Jonas (sustainability), Jules (equal opportunity officer), Kim (sustainability), Lisa (Be-Ref), Mathias (AStA-paper), Maximilian L. (culture and sports), Max W. (external university policy), Miriam (semester ticket refund), Siggie (bicycle works), Woyzeck (hardship social officer), Diajeng (protocol)

Dada Gvantsa Khutsishvili (Kulturfest), Tarek Probst (Kulturfest), Keno Rott (AStA IT)

17 of 22 persons entitled to vote

Voting: X – X – X (Yes – No – Abstention)

- 1. Welcome**
- 2. Introductions**
- 3. Approval protocol**

Voting of the protocol from the 25th of january 2021: **14 – 0 – 3 accepted**

- 4. Finances (external)**

None.

5. Applications/Current

5.1 Press release education strike

- Press release is brief because we only want to give a short input. We will publish detailed statements on individual topics.

Voting press release education strike: **16 – 0 – 1 accepted**

5.2. We are all Antifa

- Lower Saxony Statement: <https://wirsindalleantifa.wordpress.com/>
- Statement on solidarity criticism: <https://wirsindalleantifa.wordpress.com/aktuelles/>

Hilko's statement

"The first paragraph of the statement reports on the examination of the ban on of antifascist groups by the Minister of the Interior of Lower Minister of the Interior. Accordingly, the statement is directed against this. It is of "unproven assertion(s) and wrong(s) ideas".

are spoken. In an argumentatively conclusive explanation would now follow examples for these assertions and conceptions, which are argumentatively argumentatively invalidated. Unfortunately, one looks for this in vain...

The complete further part of the explanation deals only with it, why it is important to engage against fascism. This would probably nearly everyone (normal humans) support. It is 100% correct that it needs civil courage and a great commitment against

fascist and right-wing ideologies is needed. But this has also nobody disputed. After all, there is no ban being tested against fascism to engage. However, this is what the statement suggests.

Here I come to my last and perhaps most important point.

point. The authors do not differentiate between antifa as an organization and antifa as an attitude in the sense of "against fascism." The whole text argues for the second case thus an antifascist action, i.e. an action against fascism.

I see this as absolutely necessary and is lived by us as AStA in different various statements and events. A

discussion with structural groupings under the label of

Antifa is unfortunately only addressed in the introduction. The

Minister of the Interior of the SPD who is certainly also against fascism, can

can only pronounce bans, which are also judicially valid, therefore

there must be good reasons, if this happens. Unfortunately

these in no word in the explanation mentions or invalidates.

Instead, it is at least accepted, I suspect even

consciously used, that the Antifa as an organization and the

antifascist action are used synonymously and thus can not be

can be clearly separated from each other. This leads to the headline

and message of the statements "We are all Antifa". This can be read in

two ways:

We are all against fascism. This one I as AStA would completely

sign

We are all Antifa, in the sense of the organization,

The second I would personally and certainly also parts of the students

students would not sign. The sentence "We stand together in solidarity

together and demand: No ban on antifascist groups in

Lower Saxony!" leads me to believe that rather the second reading is meant

is meant, whereas the text for the most part argues only for the first.

Argues. Not the goals of Antifa, which presumably everyone shares,

but the structure and the actions to achieve them.

examined. The statement, however, conveys the opposite. I

personally do not fully support Antifa as an organizational structure.

unrestrictedly opposite. This can be used quasi freely without access barriers

can be used. Every grouping can call itself Antifa

regardless of its actual goals and the measures it takes to

achievement. Personally, I see this as problematic, because there is no

examination and differentiation takes place, who uses this "label". This

is not the main reason why the AStA should not sign the label.

should not take place.

Due to this lack of consistency in the argumentation and very

dubious use and mixing of terms, the AStA should not sign.

AStA should not sign.

We would be happy to have a re-evaluation of the situation if there are

valid arguments are available as to why the consideration of a ban is
is unlawful. However, I do not find these in the statement."

Felix: Comment. 1. next time I would find it good if the applicant can express himself first and then the comments/criticism follow, as it is always handled. 2. in Hilko's statement it is taken for granted that every person would have an antifascist attitude, but this is not the case, otherwise Antifa would not exist. 3. antifa is an attitude, an attitude, a community of solidarity, etc., antifa is not an organization.

Lisa: Comment. Regarding Hilko's comment: 1. the "Unproven allegation(s) and misconception(s)" do not refer to the organizational structures of Antifa, but to those of the right-wing scene, or the idea that the right-wing scene is not organized. 2. he is right that hardly any of the criticisms against Antifa are addressed. However, it would not be a reason for me not to sign it. 3. Hilko sees it problematic that there is no differentiation and examination of who uses the label Antifa and therefore we should not sign, because it is not clear who we would support with it. I see this differently, because Antifa is not an organization, but an attitude under which many different groups gather. For me it is strange if one wants to ban this "overlabel" instead of taking action against single groups and individuals who carry out problematic actions or hold problematic views. Not everything can be brought under one hat. It would be wrong to claim that everything that calls itself Antifa wants the same thing and acts in the same way and therefore everything is criticized across the board.

Mathias: Comment. 1. Pistorius is trying to create further possibilities and ways of criminalizing Antifa through the arbitrary determination on the part of the state and the police, who have to implement this ban. In the past, it came to the point that, for example, people could not be civil servants, who are attributed to Antifa and appeared at certain events. Such general bans/criminalization attempts are not harmless. You don't have to approve of the label - I don't either - but if such a ban is to be decided by the state, I would be very skeptical. 2. as far as I know, in the course of this there has been a motion to decide on measures against left-wing extremism, while at the same time there is no proper state funding for e.g. mobile counseling against right-wing extremism, these are funded by the federal government (half-

knowledge). These are already very alarming developments, which is why I would agree with this text, even if you have justified criticisms.

Finja: To Matthias: <https://taz.de/Landesinnenminister-Pistorius-prueft-Verbot/!5743680/>

Thore: Comment. I agree with Hilko more than 100%. I think the text and the explanations are really bad. I think we agree that Antifa should be considered heterogeneous. In any case, part of Antifa does not distance itself against violence. If you don't distance yourself against violence, I definitely can't support something like that and I can't show solidarity with it. I would never present myself as Antifa in any way and I think a lot of students see it the same way.

Tarek: Comment. 1. a minister of the interior of Lower Saxony wants to ban Antifa, which is similar to a populist action like Trump, who also wanted to ban Antifa. The Office for the Protection of the Constitution in Lower Saxony sees that there is a high danger from right-wing extremism. In Lower Saxony, funding for projects against right-wing extremism is being cut. In Germany, there have been 200 deaths from right-wing extremism since 1990; I know of none from Antifa. Of course, not all antifa groups distance themselves from violence, which can be seen as problematic. But in the current situation as Lower Saxony's Minister of the Interior to want to ban Antifa, instead of taking stronger action against right-wing extremism, I think it's pretty crazy. Hilko's statement is more inconsistent than the Lower Saxony Declaration, which also has points of criticism. However, the AStA should still sign it, considering the danger of right-wing extremism in our society. One should not arbitrarily ban Antifa without having suspects.

Woyzeck: Comment. 1. I do not find the Lower Saxony Declaration successful, the criticism of Hilko is understandable for me. I even find it distasteful in some places, e.g. in the identification with concentration camp prisoners. 2. on the matter itself, I would partially agree with Mathias, Finja and Tarek and would still support the statement.

Holger: Comment. I feel that the action of Pistorius is not comprehensible. To consider/examine a ban needs legal points. To take the arson attacks as a reason is slanted. Considering how many far-right chats exist just in police groups, this thing is being used as a red herring to straighten out the rule of law for the police. I would agree with the statement, although

there are some gaps. To call for a ban on an organization because there is no organizational structure is slanted.

Katharina: Comment. 1. you should have worded the open letter differently. Many students would support us. In the past, many students who have registered for demos have already been very strongly screened by the Office for the Protection of the Constitution and had to face many rounds of questions. Many photos, pictures and contributions of clearly right-wing grouped people were allowed to be published in the last years. It was tolerated that these right-wing grouped people could put students on campus under pressure under the guise of "freedom of speech". Nothing happened there, it can't be proven. Here I wonder how you want to prove it in this case and how you justify the ban. I think there is a very strong double standard. That is why I am in favor of signing it as AStA. 2. In addition, we can formulate our own statement on this issue.

Maximilian: Comment. 1. I see the criticism of the text as Woyzeck described it. It is too short and does not go into more depth. If necessary, we could address this in an additional statement from us. 2) The decision of the Minister of the Interior to do it this way is quite strange. You would have to investigate/ban other social groups if you were serious about it. Soon we have elections and my guess is that it would not be bad for the SPD to try to win over certain groups of voters by this "political sign".

Kai: Procedural proposal. We vote on the signing and write our own statement in which we further elaborate our position. If needed, we can plan an AK on this.

Hannah: Proposal. We can create a cloud file so that everyone can view the statement and express their wording suggestions.

Voting signature „We are all Antifa“: **14 – 2 – 1 accepted**

5.3.(Co-) signing the petition #zerocovid

- Europe-wide campaign that tries to enable a shutdown in solidarity
- Decide whether we sign the petition as an alliance member or not
- About #zerocovid or #nocovid?

- Incidence number of 0 not realistic?
- Contrast the two concepts is important
- Proposal isn't concrete and the goal is unclear
- GO motion, adjournment to the next meeting -> reason: not enough details for a decision

6. Reports/ Project presentations (voluntary)

Be-Ref

- Elections will take place on 24th of april 2021
- Planning a reading on classism and science: chronic illness

Kulturfest

- 23 people participated in the artwork
- Three films by Moritz Lieberscheidt were published on the AStA page
- 25 people participated in the film workshop by Johannes Bruns
- 35 people attended the event by Kolja Witt
- 12 people attended the event on the representation of the Shoa in film
- 40 people attended the aftershow

Unit for external university policy

- Solidarity semester: the petition was created and Max W. co-wrote it, petition is going well

Unit for anti discrimination and political education

- Two variants to the Critical Whiteness event: 1. A general information event, address the debate itself, invite journalists; 2. Several events, which illuminate both sides
- Max W.: Comment. I would be happy with the second option.
- Lisa: Comment. I would also be in favor of the second variant. To what extent can both event be connected? It would make sense to listen to both sides and perhaps organize a subsequent discussion in the form of a panel discussion.
- Felix: We discarded the idea of a panel discussion because it is difficult to implement online.
- Woyzeck: Comment. What is the basic concept of this event? What do you want to achieve with it? I don't find the journalists from variant 1 critical enough.
- Finja: Comment. I am in favor of the second variant. In addition to that we can organize a workshop for networking.
- Kai: Comment. I think the second variant is better because it goes deeper into the pro and con arguments, but there would be a lack of networking. Either you combine variant 1 and 2, or you do variant 2 and organize a workshop date for networking afterwards.
- Felix: The general goal is to create an overview of what Critical Whiteness is and to live out the debate behind it.

Variant 1: 6%

Variant 2: 31%

Variant 3 (Variant 2 with subsequent networking): 25%

Abstention: 38

- Motion accepted
- Alliance for solidarity intervention: participation in a political meeting to plan a day of remembrance for Hanau on the 19th of february

- IBIS e.V is organizing a clothing donation campaign; share the appeal?

Vote fundraiser IBIS: **10 – 0 – 2 accepted**

7. Finance (internal)

7.1 Setting up mailboxes Election Committee, SeTi refunds, etc. (oral)

- we need mailboxes that have more storage capacity because the application process is digital again and a lot of files are sent to us
- we would look forward to unlimited storage capacity while the special service is up and running, it costs 12,99 Euros per month
- after that we will switch back to normal mailboxes

Voting mailboxes: **13 – 0 – 0 accepted**

7.2.IT: „Cloud server for BBB V2“

- Keno has been tasked with setting up more BBB rooms for AStA
- Renting of a cloud server for one semester?

Voting cloud server: **12 – 0 – 0 accepted**

7.3. Department for political education and anti-discrimination: "Online-lecture for the fzs-campaign never again!" (Speakers: Katrin Henkelmann & Andreas Stahl)

- Finja: Both speakers have agreed to an online reading in the context of the fzs campaign.
- Jonas: Question. How does it work in general in the fzs? Cost sharing?

Finja: Each participant of this campaign plans one/two events for which they carry the costs themselves.

Vote "Online presentation for the fzs campaign never again! (Henkelmann & Stahl):

11 – 0 – 0 accepted

7.4. department for political education and anti-discrimination: "Online-lecture for the fzs-campaign never again! (speaker: Thorsten Mense)

Vote "Online lecture for the fzs campaign never again!" (Mense): **11 - 0 – 0 accepted**

7.5. department for sustainability: "Project position department for sustainability".

- Jonas: For March Johanna Z. would like to reduce her hours from 10 to 5. We would request an assignment for this with an expense allowance to take over Johanna Z.'s tasks and general activities in the unit.

- Kim: Addition. I would also like to reduce my hours starting in April because I won't have enough time for AStA work. I don't know yet if I will reduce to 5 or 0 hours. If the contracted person will continue to work, there would be no additional cost due to my reduction in hours.

- Kai: Comment. Since our legislature ends at the end of March, the new AStA would have to decide on the commissioning again in April.

Vote for the project position in the department for sustainability: **12 - 0 – 0 accepted**

7.6 Unit for external university policy: „Continuation of the commissioning of Tarek Probst“.

- Max W.: I move to extend the assignment of Tarek Probst until 03/31. He would serve in the unit for external university policy. Reasons: I will be on vacation starting next week. The workload can not be absorbed by the other officers. Also there will be a lot to do because of

the semester ticket negotiations. The reason for not putting the job out to tender and for hiring Tarek directly is that he is already familiar with the semester ticket negotiations and a new training would take too long.

- Katharina: Addition. I will take over the normal LAK meetings. Hannah will take over the normal fzs meetings. The VBN remains, so Tarek would follow up on those tasks.

- Jonas: Question. 1. how many hours is planned for the assignment? 2. a general request: next time plan in a way that a job posting can be done to create transparency and equal opportunities for possible applicants. This is also what it says in the rules of procedure.

- Katharina: 1. It is an expense allowance, in which no number of hours is provided. Note the distinction between expense allowance and working time compensation. 2. the board could have planned the assignment better. We didn't see that there would be so much coming up and a lot of extra work in the VBN negotiations.

Jonas: Comment. I wasn't sure if it was an expense fee when I commissioned it.

Voting Continuation of the assignment of Tarek Probst: **10 - 0 – 2 accepted**

7.7. cultural festival: "continuation of the event cultural festival"

- Tarek: The workshop with Johannes Bruns could not be finished, so I request another 100€ for the continuation.

- Hannah: Question. But in the application it says 150€.

- Tarek: It should be 100€.

- Jonas: Question. Do you have numbers on the workshop?

- Tarek: 25 people participated. 23 people have already confirmed their participation in the continuation.

Vote continuation event culture festival: **11 - 0 – 1 accepted**

7.8 Request online panel discussion "Boğaziçi - University"

Mathias: In addition to our statement, we would like to organize an info event on this topic, in which various short contributions from students of the Boğaziçi - University, a research assistant and possibly from a professor will be presented. The info event should provide a brief overview of how this development came about.

Kai: Comment. The livestream via Facebook could be problematic.

Katharina: Question. If the speakers do it themselves, we have nothing to do with data protection, right?

Hannah: Comment. When applying via our platform, I would rather use BBB.

Tarek: Comment. Otherwise, could we stream the event via YouTube?

Jonas: Comment. With YouTube, the advantage is that you don't have to sign up.

Mathias: With Facebook live, you don't have to log in either.

Katharina: Comment. Basically we have spoken out in favor of BBB. If the speakers additionally want to use another platform, they can stream the event via a second camera.

Kim: Comment. Our IT at the university offers streaming, it's pretty quick. During the sustainability weeks it worked well. There was some delay that may have been fixed. The streaming goes through the university server. You have to write to IT for that. Here is the link to it: <https://uol.de/itdienste/services/video-und-webkonferenz>

Katharina: Comment. You can also ask the university for a webex link, it's for large events.

Hannah: Question. Do we vote on the original contract or with the addition of BBB or Webex as the venue? - with addition.

Vote request online panel discussion "Boğaziçi University": **11 - 0 – 0 accepted**

7.9 Internal University Policy and Social Affairs Unit "Education Strike Week"

Katharina: Presentation of the event plan and cost overview. New: classism and academia. (<https://www.bdwi.de/show/10869360.html>)

Holger: Thomas has a lot of desire for the lecture, also exciting for prospective teachers.

Voting motion educational strike weeks: **8 - 0 – 0 accepted**

7.10. Department for Culture and Sports: Increase of hours of Kira Stanek

Kai: Hours of Kira are increased from 10 to 15 hours, Maximilian reduces his hours to 0.

Vote increase of hours of Kira Stanek: **12 - 0 – 0 accepted**

End: 1.59 pm