RESPONSE TO SENIOR MANAGEMENT:

RE: LETTER CORRESPONDENCE ON MONDAY 1ST APRIL

1. Opening hours and access to Deptford Town Hall

We did not formally respond to your requests because we will not protest at your convenience. That would be giving the Senior Management Team permission to continue ignoring us.

As addressed in our open email sent on **Sunday 31st March at 8:55am**, on your website, it states the building is open during normal opening hours, which is until 10pm.[1] We would also like to add, if the Senior Management Team is to care about our learning experiences as is claimed, why have requests to open up Room 110 as a study space been ignored?

This denial of space to study will inevitably contribute to the BAME attainment gap, and we refuse to choose between protest and education.

It is difficult for us to believe that the Senior Management Team are interested in our safety. Had this been the case, the Senior Management Team would not have allowed externally hired security and members of estates staff to assault protesters during the first week of the occupation. We have been keeping a log of physical and verbal assaults committed against protesters throughout the occupation.

Not to mention, the orders for security staff to check in on the protesters and enter Council Chambers unannounced, has endangered the well-being of particularly women protesters who have been fearful of being seen changing.

Fire exits are not fully accessible if they are chained shut and there are no members of security staff present; we have both video and photographic evidence of this being the case.

As of **Friday 5th April**, **at 2:24PM,** students were distressed to learn that builders were being hired to **drill doors shut**, cutting off access to working toilets and key fire escapes in Deptford Town Hall. These are not the orders of a Senior Management Team who cares for the welfare of their students; students who are in the midst of their studies with many upcoming deadlines and exams.

2. The In-Housing of Security and Cleaners:

If the Senior Management Team fail to meet the target deadline of bringing cleaners in-house by

[1] https://www.gold.ac.uk/students/dth-protest-college-response/

May 1st as agreed by both Goldsmiths and Unison, there will be further escalation.

More than 50% of security staff are members of IWGB. **Goldsmiths and CIS are choosing to ignore the agency and will of the majority BAME workforce and this is fundamentally racist.** It is not for the employers to dictate which unions their staff are members of. Despite upholding values of freedom of expression and democratic process, this is a prime example where Goldsmiths is choosing not to respect the democratic will of security staff. As point four of the official recognition agreement between Goldsmiths, UCU and Unison states, “The College will not refuse staff representation by any trade union representative an individual may choose, (whether or not that representative is from UCU or Unison)”[2]

To say that the Senior Management Team will "review options" when the contract comes to an end is inadequate. The inhousing of security staff is the only acceptable resolution. The contracts the College chose to sign with exploitative privatised companies are a problem of its own making, the problem must be addressed directly and immediately. The idea you would even consider extending the contract beyond January 2020 is unacceptable. Both GUCU and Goldsmiths SU have issued their explicit support and political mandate for the in-housing of security.

In the latest update on the in-housing of cleaners, the College admits that in-housing the cleaners will bring them better material conditions. “This includes improved holiday allowance, improved sickness benefits, improved family leave and membership of the LPFA pension scheme,”[3] which Ian Pleace confirmed to be true for security workers, too, also, during the meeting with SMT on the first day of the GARA occupation of Deptford Town Hall. Security and cleaning staff should **both** be able to access the same benefits and opportunities as staff directly employed by Goldsmiths. This was witnessed by a representative from the protesters and two sabbatical officers from the Students’ Union.

To act as if we are acting autonomously of the will of Goldsmiths’ outsourced workers is not only incorrect but willfully ignorant. GARA are already in dialogue with IWGB, (who have a track record of bringing security in-house at other universities) and Justice for Cleaners (who saw the cleaners brought in house at Goldsmiths). In addition, we’re in contact with representatives from Unison (who represent the cleaning staff). It is simply up to the Senior Management Team to mitigate the damages done to Goldsmiths’ reputation. (The sooner in-housing goes ahead the less damage there will be.)

3. Removal of Statues

---

[2] http://goldsmithsucu.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/union-recognition-agreement1.pdf?fbclid=IwAR3XATDywFsaWE32HUrjiiwx72w_NxGG4zVEGms2ALJ8E_DO7g2JsfoNUAM

[3] https://www.gold.ac.uk/about/statements/goldsmiths-cleaning-provision/

This response is not good enough. The process might be difficult, it might take time, but there has been no attempt made over the past 10 days to contact the local authorities about what renovations can be made to the building, or even contact made to members of local council to gain an understanding of what the consultation process requires, despite having discussed this already in our last face-to-face meeting which we have recorded.

It is clear that Senior Management are not familiar with the works of their own, such as the late academic Paul Henrich, who writes clearly on the history of the people commemorated by these statues. Negligence is not an excuse. Undoing centuries of institutional racism is not an overnight process, it will require energy and commitment. Goldsmiths, as a so-called progressive institution, needs to take concrete action to prove itself worthy of these associations.

We demand you instigate an immediate investigation into the modifications able to be made to the building and make contact with local community leaders to start the consultation process. Contacting the local council alone is inadequate.

4. Opening Deptford Town Hall to the community

As stated before, our campaign has the support of the Students' Union, which represents over 10,000 students at Goldsmiths and their sabbatical officers elected by the student body, so do not deflect responsibility by claiming you will consult "the wider student community". Consult the union, they will give you the same answer.

The Senior Management Team has deliberately misinterpreted our comment regarding accessibility. We are aware the building is physically inaccessible to many people; this is a problem you have consistently failed to address. This does not mean the building should not be opened to the local community in the meantime.

According to Michael Keith (2006), head of the Centre for Urban and Community Research at Goldsmiths, who was involved in evaluating the Deptford City Challenge urban regeneration programme: "*To the compromise is that you do a long term lease to the College, but you maintain public access ...you've got these community bases within the Town Hall, but with the College having a tenancy of it. That was the way it was pitched to City Challenge. The College would have custodianship of the building, but it would still have public access. Now exactly what that has become is more interesting.* (Michael Keith, interview, 16 August 2006)"[4].

The College has failed to fulfill its contractual obligation to the local community, as pledged in its initial proposal for Deptford City Challenge. It has been 20 years since Deptford Town Hall was re-acquisitioned by Goldsmiths and yet there has not even been the smallest step taken to make the building open to staff and students, let alone the local community.

[4] https://www.anthropologymatters.com/index.php/anth_matters/article/view/45/84

It is disgraceful that Goldsmiths would acquire the building under false pretenses, locked away from the residents of New Cross, already infringed upon by Goldsmiths' rampant complicity in gentrification of the area. As testified by local residents[5], the area needs more spaces for youth groups to meet; faith groups to congregate; children to play; ESOL lessons to take place; refugee and asylum seeker advice services; homeless shelters--a space that Deptford Town Hall could and should provide. This is research already undertaken by Paul Hendrich and Les Back but needs the resources to expand and encompass the current local community.

5. Palestinian Scholarships

Upon meeting with members of the Senior Management Team on Friday 22nd March, representative protesters from GARA were told that it was illegal or unlawful to reserve scholarship places for Palestinian students. This has since been proven untrue. It is a shame that the SMT would rather make up false claims than look into the retraction of humanitarian assistance the College prizes itself on.

The Students Union of 2009 may have agreed to a 10 year contract, but it is 2019. The Students Union of 2019 believes it should be extended, and so do we. This is an especially significant commitment that the College must make, given the wide staff and student support for Palestine and the Palestinian cause across the campus, including the policies passed by GUCU[6], UNISON[7], and Goldsmiths Students' Union[8] in solidarity with Palestine and/or calling for the College to implement BDS (Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions) in the fight against apartheid. It is the democratic mandate of these respective unions to uphold these policies, and so it is essential the College recognises the democratic process. The College must follow in the example of Oxford Brookes University[9], Durham University, University of Oxford[10], and University of Birmingham[11] which all allocate specific places for Palestinian students.

---

[5] http://www.eastlondonlines.co.uk/2016/11/residents-of-new-cross-dont-want-to-be-next-shoreditch/;

[6] https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/3425/Academic-Freedom-International-Study-Palestine-chapter/pdf/acdemic_freedom_palestine.pdf; https://goldsmithsucu.org/2018/06/18/in-solidarity-with-palestine/

[7] https://conferences.unison.org.uk/motions/2017/national-delegate-conference/67-palestine-50-years-occupation/;
https://conferences.unison.org.uk/motions/2017/national-delegate-conference/68-palestine-time-new-debate/

[8] https://www.goldsmithssu.org/pageassets/yourunion/governance/policies/Palestine-motion(1).pdf

[9] https://www.britishcouncil.ps/en/study-uk/scholarship/gaza-oxford-brookes

[10] https://www.britishcouncil.ps/en/study-uk/scholarships/rhodes-scholarships-university-oxford

[11] **https://www.saidfoundation.org/pages/10-about-our-scholarships**

As stated in the response letter: “During the last ten years, the world has become a more complex, and arguably more dangerous, place.” Therefore, Goldsmiths College must lead by example to enshrine a legacy of solidarity with Palestinians--and students from war and conflict zones across the University of London as a whole. Is it not Goldsmiths’ core responsibility to ensure a safe teaching and learning environment? Thus, what better way to facilitate this than to enable those from war and conflict zones to receive a safe, fully funded education at Goldsmiths.

If Goldsmiths really means what they say about caring about all the “dangers around the world”, then there should be a new scholarship scheme introduced that is for students from different places around the world, **in addition to the already existing Palestinians’ scholarships and not instead of. (So no, we expect the Palestinians only scholarships to continue as they are, and if anything, there should be more scholarships.)**

If Goldsmiths is to boast its new human rights focussed law degree[12] and continue its **MA Human Rights, Culture and Social Justice** course, then it must be able to uphold its own commitment to human rights in the material sense. Anything but a substantial application of human rights in its own practises would be deeply hypocritical.

GARA calls for the College’s explicit support for Palestinians and against Israeli apartheid. The bottom line is that Goldsmiths should implement BDS to “cease all ties with institutions, companies and corporations complicit in internationally recognised human rights violations perpetrated by the Israeli Apartheid state”[13].

Thus, as a **real** gesture of goodwill, Goldsmiths must commit to **at least 10 humanitarian scholarships** which include “full tuition fees and living costs for one year”[14] that reflect the cost of living in London, “as well as airfares to and from the UK”[15] as is already offered **with** places allocated for Palestinian students. This must have a catchment area of war and conflict zones, aside from Palestine, including but not limited to Yemen, Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan and Somalia.

Individuals arriving in the UK after living in a war or conflict zone must be cared for, according to their needs and traumas, in order for them to make the most of their scholarship and enable them to adjust to an entirely new living environment. Included in this scholarship must also be structures in place to ensure the wellbeing and support of students when they arrive in the UK, such as **free** supplementary English classes, regular pastoral meetings with course or academic tutors, and a counsellor with whom they meet regularly.

[12] https://www.gold.ac.uk/news/law-visiting-professors/
[13] https://www.goldsmithssu.org/pageassets/yourunion/governance/policies/Palestine-motion(1).pdf
[14]https://www.gold.ac.uk/international/fees-funding/international-scholarships/goldsmiths-humanitarian-scholarship/
[15] ibid

6. Goldsmiths should follow in the footsteps of Glasgow University's efforts to make colonial reparations. Goldsmiths should conduct an independently verifiable study and analysis acknowledging the benefits the university received from colonialism and slavery. From the results, Goldsmiths must commit to a programme of reparative justice. [16]

SMT in their response have mentioned that colonialism has ended. We are embarrassed that the Senior Management Team would make such a claim. Colonialism has not ended. It is not an event but a live process and structure[17] of oppression in which Britain is still complicit, to this day[18] , whether it be the financial benefits of colonialism enjoyed by Goldsmiths or the Eurocentric version of history taught in our curricula.

It is undeniable that, as areas, New Cross and Deptford were prominent areas connected to the slave trade. The **Royal Dockyard at Deptford**, south east London, played a significant role in the slave trade[19]. In fact, John Hawkins--one of the statues on Deptford Town Hall--based many of his operations here. Hawkins was a known slave trader or, in today's terms, human trafficker of 400 to 500 West Africans abducted to the West Indies. "Merchants based in Blackheath, Deptford and Greenwich handled some 75% of sugar imports,"[20] and local iron merchants produced manacles and irons for restraining enslaved peoples on ships. It was also here Olaudah Equiano, the enslaved man who freed himself and became a prominent figure in the slavery abolitionist movement, was trafficked and sold from one naval captain to another in around 1760[21].

Goldsmiths was founded by the **Worshipful Company of Goldsmiths [22]** which directly reaped its benefits from colonialism. Goldsmiths' own Chancellor is HRH The Princess Royal, whose very family, dating back to Queen Victoria[23], instigated and propagated colonisation. Further still, referring to recent history, anthropologists funded by the Worshipful Company of Goldsmiths "studied" the Lugbara of colonised Uganda [24].

Contrary to the claims made by the Senior Management Team, colonialism didn't end in 1904 and the impact of slavery is still felt today. It is felt through the unequal distribution of wealth and insidious gentrification of an area with one of the largest Black populations in the country; Lewisham is the 15th most ethnically diverse local authority in England[25]. It is these populations who are likely descendants of the enslaved peoples brought to the ports of Deptford and Greenwich. This is just touching the surface of Goldsmiths' complicity with colonialism, racism and gentrification in the local area and beyond.

---

[16] **https://www.theguardian.com/education/2018/sep/17/glasgow- university-to-make-amends-over-slavery-profits-of-past**
[17] http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2332649214560440
[18] https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/brexit/2017/05/11/brexit-is-not-only-an-expression-of-nostalgia-for-empire-it-is-also-the-fruit-of-empire/
[19] https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/media-new/pdfs/killingray.pdf
[20] http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/pathways/blackhistory/africa_caribbean/britain_trade.htm
[21] *The Interesting Narrative Of The Life Of Olaudah Equiano Or Gustavus Vassa, The African, Written By Himself, Volume 1*, Olaudah Equiano, Kessinger Publishing, 2004, ISBN 1419167499
[22] https://www.thegoldsmiths.co.uk/company/history/history-of-the-company/
[23] https://www.manchesteropenhive.com/view/9781526123848/9781526123848.00008.xml;
[24] Gann, Lewis H., Peter Duignan, and Victor Witter Turner, eds. *Colonialism in Africa 1870-1960*. Vol. 4. CUP Archive, 1969.
[25] http://www.lewishamjsna.org.uk/a-profile-of-lewisham/social-and-environmental-context/ethnicity

It is the duty of Goldsmiths College to investigate its own history i.e. to learn from how Glasgow University researched and implemented their reparative justice programme. This is not to say that Goldsmiths should copy it in its entirety; Goldsmiths should aim to improve upon it and advance the work already done. This needs to be led by and conducted in dialogue with the local community, as decolonisation cannot be done with a top-down approach. It must come from the peoples and communities that have experienced--and continue to experience--the violence of British colonialism.

No curricula can be decolonised unless the University itself is able to acknowledge and make reparations for its own colonial history. This is tied to our demand for an institution wide strategy, including the audit and overhaul of the current curricula at Goldsmiths.

7. Institution wide plan of tackling racism at Goldsmiths

We have received full support from both Dr Nicola Rollock and Sofia Akel from Goldsmiths' SU, including our demands to hire a full time staff team to work with Dr Nicola Rollock on the BME Attainment Gap research. As the lead of the project, Dr Nicola Rollock has fully engaged with this demand and has made her own recommendations. As you mention, "Goldsmiths is fortunate to be home to a number of researchers whose work is in race equality", which means that Goldsmiths is in the perfect position to offer financial stability to its own researchers -- many of whom are students.

The Senior Management Team have overlooked the calls for (a) paid BAME Department Representatives across the College and (b) an annual fund designated for Black History events for the Students' Union that are held throughout the year, not just during Black History Month. An evidence base is not required to do either of these. It simply requires the funding.

No evidence base is needed to justify why BAME students should be paid the London Living Wage for the hours of labour put into carrying forward the traumas and concerns of other BAME students within departments. Work is work. In the same light. BAME students should be able to enjoy their university experience and make memories that are not solely based on racial traumas they experienced. Funding must be set aside to do this. BAME communities should be able to experience extra-curricular events that cater to specific cultural needs; BAME students--particularly Black students--should be able to celebrate themselves and their cultures in a safe, accommodating environment.

"We have already committed to the delivery of mandatory training for all student-facing staff, to begin from the next academic year." The Senior Management Team must confirm that this training will be organised in a democratic, transparent process that directly involves multiple liberation groups **as well as** representatives for each of the College's respective unions. In addition to this, it is not enough to commit mandatory training to **student-facing** staff when all staff should receive mandatory training, as these staff will also interact with BAME and otherwise

marginalised people in their day-to-day lives. Does Goldsmiths not **want** 100% of its staff to be racially conscious and competent in all areas of life, with all people they interact with?

Lacking in the Senior Management Team's response is any tangible commitment to facilitating the audit and overhaul of curricula. Again, as expressed by yourselves as well as GARA, Goldsmiths is full of so much talent and skill that it would make sense to **hire** more staff, including Goldsmiths students, to enable this process. This would also support students' studies by reforming the way that students engage and partake in their education. GARA are aware that more discussions need to take place with course convenors, lecturers, and students from all departments, but in order for this to happen, the Senior Management Team has to use its institutional power to enforce the audit and overhaul of the curricula, like it has done so with the pledge for mandatory training.

Moreover, there must be public acknowledgement of Goldsmiths' complicity in increased attacks against marginalised groups on campus over the period of the occupation. This includes the **racist tirade** by personal assistant to Ian Pleace (a member of your Senior Management Team), Christine Ashley, and the homophobia and violence conducted by Facilities Manager, Timothy Paine, towards students. The lack of responsibility taken for the hostile environment at Goldsmiths and the racist attacks has been severely disillusioning.

8. Wellbeing, Chaplaincy and Multi-Faith Prayer Room

> *"SMT today announces significant new investment in student support services, with £100,000 to be spent between now and August on additional specialist mental health and wellbeing staff. This will include the introduction of daytime Campus Support Officer cover over the weekends, and additional faith advisor support, before the end of this academic year."*[26]
>
> *"This commitment SMT made was for additional recurrent spend in this area. The activities supported by the £100k committed to this financial year (the majority of which is for additional permanent staff) will become part of the baseline for 2019/20 onwards."*[27]

To reiterate, our demands for increased funding for the Chaplaincy aren't only for the additional faith leader but also for funding to run student led faith and cultural events. The funding for the Wellbeing team are separate demands and should not be conflated with the Chaplaincy. These demands are ones on which we will not compromise on. Additional funding for the **Chaplaincy is still expected.**

[26] https://www.gold.ac.uk/about/statements/letter190314/

[27] https://www.gold.ac.uk/media/documents-by-section/about-us/statements/SMT-response-to-GARA-010419.pdf; https://trello-attachments.s3.amazonaws.com/59e4a7a73a67aee865bd9f42/5bebfedfffdd29874c403207/6c3f7c110f8eb373654ace010cda95e9/SU_Report_on_Religion_and_Belief_at_Goldsmiths_-_Arunima_Himawan.pdf

Religion and Belief at Goldsmiths

50% of Goldsmiths students follow a faith/belief/religion. 15% of Goldsmiths students are Muslims, which is a lot higher than the national average of 8%. Goldsmiths has one of the highest percentage of students who follow a faith, religion or belief.

Having a bigger prayer room has already been brought up by previous sabbatical officers, and has been dismissed, this isn't new.

The SU has also done a lot of research and released a report on "Religion and Belief" which SMT should have read. In this research, there is talk about a bigger prayer room. It has been mentioned so many times by students that the prayer room isn't big enough to accommodate the number of students of faith that exist. The reason Friday prayers are in another room is because it isn't big enough. Even on other days during term times, it is always packed and there isn't enough space for everyone.

There is no need for "reviewing" or "consulting". A new, bigger prayer room is needed. We will not compromise. The Estates team can find a way over the summer to exchange it with a bigger room in RHB to ensure that the next Academic year has a prayer room that is fit for purpose and accommodates for all.

Students of faith aren't given the basics that they deserve while studying here. On top of a small prayer room that isn't enough for the students, Muslim students in some courses are denied to go to Friday prayers, which happen at the same time every Friday so that they don't miss their classes. If anything, and if Goldsmiths really cared about the progress and wellbeing of its students, Goldsmiths would actually change its timetabling to make sure that no lectures and seminars happen between 1-2 pm on Fridays since 1,650 of Goldsmiths' students are Muslims.

Stop getting more students in if you are not able to accommodate for all.

"If, in discussion with the Students Union, there is an agreement," is not a valid point, as there already is an agreement. The Students' Union has already publicly supported **all** the demands of the occupation. [28]

9. The removal of SEAtS for its racist and xenophobic surveillance

It is important for College administration to understand that, even when a data-based attendance policy is applied equally to all students, it can have unfair adverse impacts for BAME students, particularly those on Home Office visas given the potential for deportation. Simply having the

28

https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:65C5yH-nZi0J:https://www.goldsmithssu.org/news/article/6013/Supporting-the-occupation-of-Deptford-Town-Hall-a-message-from-your-Officers/+&cd=4&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=uk

intention of making bureaucratic processes more efficient is not sufficient to avoid unintended or harmful outcomes from the introduction of new technical systems. This is thoroughly documented in many recent academic studies such as the volume on 'Automating Inequality' by Virginia Eubanks. Being 'colour-blind' is no more an effective policy for college admin systems than it is for the Facebook corporation; without additional efforts to be anti-racist outcomes that are harmful and racist are inevitable.

Ever since this decision was made by the college, an elected SU officer has been opposing the card readers and bluetooth SEAtS system. In addition, the SEAtS system has no mandate passed as policy by the Students' Union. No such mandate was passed by UCU either, as they have not been consulted on this student attendance monitoring software.

While SEAtS may streamline classes, staff, and student experience to the benefit of Goldsmiths' business management model, this comes at the cost of international students. It is a privilege that the Senior Management Team can be oblivious to the harm of the surveillance of vulnerable students, which has been the thesis for many an academic paper.

SEAtS own website says it "identifies students who are not visa compliant"[29]. We demand to know what this system has been used for and the number of students who have been "supported", because international students, who are isolated and threatened enough as it is, have certainly not received sufficient support. This is racist and xenophobic surveillance culture. If this truly does not introduce greater surveillance than previously existed at Goldsmiths, this only raises further questions as to Goldsmiths' collusion with racism and xenophobia. There is a difference between monitoring in-house, and utilising a system of surveillance that is detrimental to international students.

The UK governments' Hostile Environment policy is racist, and UKVI requirements for monitoring students holding Tier 4 visas are part of that racist system. While there is a legal requirement for Goldsmiths to be in compliance with these systems, international human rights principles require minimal cooperation with these kinds of regulations that have the potential to have harmful impacts. The monitoring of student attendance in every class is not an explicit requirement of UKVI compliance and other Higher Education Institutions have less granular approaches.

Compliance does not have to come at the expense of students' visa status. We demand that the College is transparent on its minimum requirements of compliance--what it entails, so that international students are able to publicly access the terms of their own visas. For example, we know that at Brunel University, their way of ensuring compliance is a system that does not rely on digital technology: instead, students must have three "points of contact". This involves genuine human interaction and enables staff to check on a students' progress in a compassionate manner which provides both qualitative and quantitative data. Surely, it would be more logical to track a student's progress in a way that does not rely on an automated system of threatening emails and

[29] https://www.seatssoftware.com/ukvi/

warning systems which SEAtS would bring. SEAtS is not holistic, ignores the individual needs of students, and does not actually track performance.

The contract with SEAtS must be terminated.

Moreover, we propose an alternative system based on these three areas of consideration:

i. Wellness

Registers have never been a tool for pastoral care. More effective means of pastoral care are lower teacher/student ratios, enhanced wellbeing services (reversing the financial cuts), and also looking at the structural sources of distress (high fees, racism, lower senses of community through reduced contact hours, other forms of structural oppression, etc).
Registers are primarily taken by associate lecturers and fractional staff. If there was a crisis that these staff could address, they are only on campus part-time, leaving students open to risk.
A college mechanism for Race Impact Assessment should be created to assess the systemic impacts of new technical systems, starting with attendance systems.
The College should clearly decouple the monitoring requirements of UKVI compliance from monitoring intended to support student wellbeing.
Monitoring for wellbeing should **only** be introduced in conjunction with well resourced measures to address the newly identified needs. College mechanisms for supporting students, in particular around mental health needs, are already overwhelmed. Introducing new mechanisms of surveillance, even when the stated aims are benign, cannot be justified when the capacity to deliver additional support has not been evidenced.

ii. Equality

The Art department is exempt from using SEAtS, and Computing does not have plans to use SEAtS.
Goldsmiths hasn't produced an equalities report on the use of SEAtS, nor have they been transparent about the entire pipeline of how SEAtS will work.
For example, if there is a case where there needs to be a disciplinary proceeding, we demand to know the process. Students are entitled to know the processes that are in place. In the event that there is a glitch or a mistake, which will happen, what resources have they put in place to ensure that such a "mistake" doesn't come at the extreme cost of a student's wellness and safety?

iii. Prevent Duty

We cannot talk about surveillance of students without talking about the Prevent Duty, which has been politically mandated by the members of Goldsmiths Students' Union, UCU, and NUS Black Students' Campaign to be challenged.

We demand access to risk assessments the College has done as required by the guidance in relation to SEAtS.
We demand a copy of reviews of policies or procedures including disciplinary, grievance, employment contract and data protection policies SMT have undertaken with respect to the Prevent Duty and any conclusions thereby drawn.
We demand a timetable for how SMT intend to consult with students and staff about the Duty and staff/student response to it.

SEAtS propagates the hostile environment for international students at Goldsmiths. Like the 'Docs Not Cops' campaign[30], where NHS staff have refused to take on the role of UK Border Force, universities should not act like border control. It is not the job of the College to police its students' immigration and visa status. That is the jurisdiction of the Home Office and UK Border Force; this should remain that way. Immigration should not be a barrier to education.

The normalisation of surveillance of students, particularly international students, has received much criticism and concern from across the UK[31] but also from our siblings in the USA[32]. John Hopkins University in Baltimore is currently under occupation due to the militarisation of their campus, which started with digitised attendance records. Surveillance of student attendance sets a precedent for a hostile campus environment, which was highlighted during the Queen's visit to King's College London, where predominantly Muslim students were singled out and barred from campus for being associated with protesting.[33]

Overall, without a rigorous process of assessment based on anti-racist principles, the introduction of systems like SEAtS can only deepen existing problems of systematic racism. Why should the College commit to software from an outsourced company that flags up 'real time alerts' for Tier 4 visa students without accounting for the effects that such a system may have on the deeper questions of racism and justice at Goldsmiths?

10. Hate Crime Reporting Centre (HCRC)

Racism on campus continues to be an issue on campuses across the country, as highlighted in the #MyRacistCampus campaign run by NUS Black Students' Campaign[34]. In response to this, hate crime reporting centres were created across the country, but research has shown this is inadequate. As such we need to urgently address the culture on campus around reporting and supporting students.

---

[30] http://www.docsnotcops.co.uk/

[31] https://cheesegratermagazine.org/2018/09/29/surveillance-tier-4/; https://theboar.org/2018/07/university-college-london-face-criticism-over-enforcement-of-immigration-controls-for-international-students/; https://www.theguardian.com/education/2014/mar/02/universities-border-police-academics

[32] https://truthout.org/articles/the-militarization-of-johns-hopkins-exposes-a-nationwide-trend/

[33] https://www.theguardian.com/education/2014/mar/02/universities-border-police-academics

[34] https://www.facebook.com/nusBSC/photos/a.10151085692488197/10156074404968197/

As stated on the Goldsmiths website: *"The College hosts an official third party hate crime reporting centre which is open to the public and can be used by everyone."*[35] This is incredibly disconcerting, as not even students feel confident using this service, let alone members of the local community. As such, this requires immediate action. Goldsmiths cannot remain open as a hate crime reporting centre if the structures and resources are not already in place, which they clearly are not. There cannot be a protest every time an individual receives inappropriate, unqualified service, when reporting a hate crime.

We demand an end to the processes of mediation that exist in departments across the university which force students into contact with individuals they are submitting grievances against, resulting in unnecessary mental distress. The reporting scheme around incidents of race must include someone with specialist training in race-based trauma therapy being made available to students who are making complaints. We need to, as a matter of urgency, create a new system by which students are able to submit reports with the confidence that staff are competent and action will be taken immediately.

We demand that the College refers to the report of the study undertaken by the Centre for Hate Studies, University of Leicester titled '**Healing the Harms: Identifying How Best to Support Hate Crime Victims'**[36] for further advice on how protocol can be followed whilst still ensuring the HCRC is victim-led and considerate of the needs of victims coming forward to make reports. This is but one avenue that Goldsmiths should explore.

Last but not least, the College must confirm receipt of the following statement in our initial demands:

> *"Any commitments to hate crime prevention and hate crime resolution must acknowledge the non-existence of reverse racism, responding in kind to prioritise students and staff who face structural oppression of multiple axes. It is vital that the University understands how structural oppression functions. Reverse forms of oppression (i.e. reverse racism) do not exist and must be rejected at all costs."*

11. Contact time cuts for BA Applied Social Science, Community Development and Youth work

Goldsmiths Anti Racist Action have worked with students directly on this course, who have made this complaint, multiple times, because nothing has been done to address it. It is thus insulting to refer to our representation of their voices as "third party".

[35] https://www.gold.ac.uk/hate-crime-reporting/

[36] https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/criminology/hate/documents/healing-the-harms-of-hate-report

The Senior Management Team's claim that "colleagues in STaCS have confirmed they will be willing to commit to providing temporary additional resource hours" is not only false, as confirmed by students on the course, but the exact opposite of a "gesture of goodwill". These contact hours are not "additional", as they would be replacing the cut hours. The changes to these courses were not in relation to "the demands of students" hence why they're complaining about contact hours being cut. The College breached the contract students signed when they enrolled on this course; to do anything other than compensate them for lost contact hours would be a disgrace. Such an action cannot be considered a gesture of goodwill, and to suggest otherwise is insulting, as meeting a contract's requirements is merely adhering to a legal requirement put in place to protect consumers, under which students fall.

The students of **BA Applied Social Science, Community Development and Youth Work** were unable to make a fully informed decision when signing the course contract, as the terms of the contract were changed without prior knowledge, unfairly and unreasonably. This makes it a matter of the College not adhering to legislation as stated i**n Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 (CPRS)**. Thus, it is not just a case of intervening on a "live complaint"; it is a case of choosing to enforce legislation or not, law to which the College is bound.

Refusal to address this as a legal problem, as opposed to an internal problem, will result in an escalation of this case to th**e Consumer and Markets Authorities** and the **Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA)**. This could result in "civil proceedings or criminal prosecutions against certain breaches"[37], committed by Goldsmiths College, as appropriate. Neither parties would want to reach this stage, as students of the course have expressed wanting to resolve this internally, but if left with no choice and inaction by the Senior Management Team, this will be the procedure taken. By choosing to minimise the severity of this "live complaint" and prolonging the resolution, the reputation of Goldsmiths College is at further risk from being exposed as breaking the law.

Henceforth, we refer to the Race Relations Act 1968, Part I, Unlawful Discrimination: ***2. Provision of goods, facilities and services[38].*** If the College is unable to commit to ensuring that BAME majority courses, such as **BA Applied Social Science, Community Development and Youth Work** and **MA Culture Industry**, are protected against cuts to funding and contact hours that white majority courses do not experience, then it is acting unlawfully. If the College is unable to provide services that enable international students, particularly those with English as a second language, to have fair and equal **access** the course content, then it is not enforcingequal opportunity and it is acting in contrast to the clauses set out in the Race Relations Act 1968.

[37] https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Documents/2016/consumer-rights-universities.pdf
[38] *http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1968/71/enacted*

By ignoring the needs of BAME students on BAME majority courses, it is knowledgeably refusing the provision of education “of the like quality, in the like manner and on the like terms in and on which the former normally makes them available to other members of the public”[39]. It is the “wider management responsibilities” to ensure that BAME students receive the same quality of education as other students, but it is clear that this is not happening. And the College wonders why the BAME attainment gap exists.

12. Contacting the Israeli Embassy Regarding Hafez Omar

Thank you for sending the letter to the Israeli Embassy in regards to Hafez Omar’s arrest. There is now a public campaign in support of Hafez so we would now expect that Goldsmiths publishes the letter they sent to the embassy publicly on the website and social media as a further proof of commitment.

For a more detailed summary of how the College can provide further support to its students, please refer back to **Section 5** where we outline the support required for Palestinian students.

CONCLUSION

In summary, we have spent great time and effort in doing our own investigation into these demands. We are confident in our demands, and we have full confidence that the College will be able to implement all of these demands with immediate effect, with full consultation of the Student Body and formation of student-led committees.

It would be selfish and irresponsible of us to settle for less, especially when the futures of BAME staff and students at Goldsmiths are at stake. For the College, its reputation as a progressive institution is at stake. We will reiterate: the occupation will not end until **all** the demands are met in a satisfactory, assessable, and transparent manner.

Actions speak louder than words. Let the actions speak, Senior Management Team.

[39] ibid