Veida XIII 2004 Fingal, Ontario
Emergency Veida to Amend the Constitution

Tekkes Pticha: Candle Lighting Ceremony
WS 46: Naomi Azar
WS 48: Jenni Tonti
49: Rachel Profeta
50: Jamie Beran
51: Safi
52: Ruth Stevens
53: Noam Yaillen
54: Robin
55: Ariel
56: George Stevens

Movement Reports

Alex Sharone:
Welcome to Veida 13
Special Veida to amend our constitution
It’s been very exciting and we’ve been working to make sure the movt is strong and
growing. Exciting to see the young spirit and ruach, we have strong kvutzot, feel good
about the direction we are going in and the leadership in this room. Would like to thank
the Shlichim for working really hard with all of us to run this seminar. Also want to
thank the 3 Racazim and the Mazkirut as a whole

Following the seminar we’re going to Israel for our Mifgash trip for Ma’apilim. 5th
winter in a row. Gets better every year, tochnit keeps getting fine tuned we’ll be there
with 15 mapilim from HD and reps from UPZ and Hashomer.

UPZ – New campus based initiative – birthed by 4 movements: HDNA, HH, Meretz and
LZA: These groups came together in response to a need for another voice on college
campuses. Nothing for people who wanted a third way – campuses were very polarized.
As a way to connect ma'apilim to the movement year round and to voice their political
beliefs regarding progressive Zionism. We had a very successful inaugural conference in
Oct; we brought in great speakers and had reps from HD as well as from various non-
affiliated universities. UPZ has been added to the Mifgash program and they are coming
so they can get involved and identify with what we are doing and join us in the good
causes that we fight for.

ZYC: Habo came together with all the other Zionist youth movements in N. America. It
was only created last year with Josh and Aaron Wolfe from HH, but it shows there is
something that unites us as Zionist youth movements. Although we disagree a lot on
Politics, there is some common ground and the belief in the power of youth to change the
world. Keep the activity of the youth movements strong. Together we feel we can keep
each other strong. Last year there was a conference in which we brought together
participants from all of these youth movements for a seminar. We’ll be inviting you to come represent Habo if we do another such conference this year.

Kvutzat Zeeq. Read letter from Zeeq to the movement.

Naomi Azar
MBI, wksp and parent trip. 2nd parent trip. MBI yud gimmel – just returned. Huge success. Traveling, living on kibbutz. Full program all n Israel. 121 participants. 140 expected for this coming summer. Workshop 54 having an awesome time. 29 participants right now, jump from 7 last year. Wksp54 just returned from Poland. On chofesh right now. Soon chavot seminar and then kaveret seminar. Will be in carmel. Living and doing volunteer work. Will be at machanot this summer.

For wksp55. new part of wksp tochnit. Called chalutz. Happens during kibbutz portion of the program. More of an educational portion for the kibbutz part. Have ulpan 3 days a week and courses run for them by Habonim alumni. Cultural Judaism, Zionism, nkm, leadership, etc. don’t know where located yet, which kibbutz. Prepare workshoppers to go through it and what kibbutzim are going through. Not going to Poland next year b/c they went on mb.

Both wksp and mbi will include more history on mizrachi Jews. And give educational background when we look at Israel today.

Parent trip. Create parent community. Learn more about Habonim and understand that we’re part of a worldwide movement and not just little individual machanot.

Alex again
Special thank you to Maya and Miryam from NOAL that made it out here from Israel. They worked with us on Tzevet to prepare this seminar for you. We value our relationship with NOAL are looking for ways to strengthen it.
Project that Habo wants to get involved with – project started by two artists – one Palestinian one Israeli – to fly kites on both sides of the barrier in symbol of hope and recognition that the other side exists and that people from both sides advocate for peace. We’ll be meeting with the artists on Mifgash in the coming week, and we’re looking into how we can get the Kenim involved as a national ken project. Use the process of kit making to think about what we can do to achieve peace in the region and to keep the hope alive for a peaceful resolution to the conflict. Purpose is also to further learn about this organization and to possibly join with HH in Israel to create and fly these kites with their kenim.

Rachel Profeta:
I’m Merakezet Habo U and Kenim - new position.
Kenim: We just had fall Mercaz in November which many of you were at. It was a really fabulous seminar – came up with long and short term goals and people really got a lot out of it. Other ideas about the vision of Kenim that came out of that weekend: creating a resource book that would include role definition and a tochnit chinuch for all the kenim.
I hope to have it finished by summer 2005. That will be coming to machaneh near you soon. Creating the Roshei eizor structure for all the kenim – we would like to create for next year the Rosh Eizor to be the main organizer for all of the kenim. Will help kenim function.

Habo U: a new program, this past semester was the first semester that is took place. University of Haifa, you live communally, have peulot and tiyulim run for you, it was a pilot program,. Only 2 people wanted to stay for next semester so it is no At least 7 Ma’apilim here interested in going next year.

**Rakaz A; Gil Browdy.** Nationalize information about Madatz tochnit. Entering brainstorming process. Forming discussion groups to get ideas flowing. Goal is to have it ready this summer.


**Eizor Reports:**

**Gilboa:** LA. Kara Segal: events twice a month  
Bay Area: Rebecca Rozo-Marsh  
Starting one in Tucson. Hagshama seminar for hadracha in February.

Mosh: number represent  
Max: DC 8.  
Rachel, Sam hertz DC 9. small group  
Jon DC 6  
Doing more kef. To get kids coming every month  
Lee, Yochi DC 4-5: 5 or so kids every peula. Lots of chocolate.  
Mattan: each ken has post-mbi helping out. In feb. mifgash with galil and na’aleh,

Miriam: Sara Fralin: sitting the ditch with the ken. Successful seminar in October, reunion. Looking for a rosh ken, for people who are interested in joining. Looking for a new Shaliach.

Na’aleh: ken divided into 4. Brooklyn, long island, Westchester, Successful Hanukah party. most peulot run by pre-Madatz  
Rosh Eizor: miri levi  
Fall seminar biggest seminar ever. Going well, kids are coming, calling them weekly, have pen pals with NOAL in kfar saba. Sent letters and waiting for response. Kids want to make ken video that is going around. Detroit has it currently.

Tavor: Dov, Oren,  
Ken pardess in Ann Arbor: Successful ken, Shabbat dinners, working to build up ken. New tavor video. 2 kens in Chicago. Ken afikim in Detroit. Twice a month, Shabbat
dinner everyone is invited, tikkun olam tu bshvat peula with LZA. Part of Juicy-leaders of various youth groups.

Gesher: Dana Brookman 2 others
30 kids at peula. 50 at the apple picking. Best turnout ever. Ken ottowa: Chanukah sleepover, new kids coming to kenim, ken Montreal: 3-4 chanichim, 15 Ma’apilim, first ski trip since 97. exciting development with Bialik. Going into school every 3 weeks for a week, teaching Zionist curriculum

Galil ; rosh eizor: Evan Chinoy co-rosh with Brian Cohen. 8 rashei ken, 4 different kenim. 2 new bucks county and mainline. Successful chinch implementation into kenim. 1 ken event, 1 eizor event per month. Rejuvenation of ken events. Fall seminar 90 people. Chanukah sleepover 75 kids, volunteered for super Sunday.
Dara co rosh with Rachel Smith
Ilana co-rosh new jersey: few kids coming every time. Getting grilled by Bucks county: 55 kids, hard to get them to come it’s a new ken, hay ride
Mlkj day of service: tikkun olam
Tu bshvat dinner with parents in local community.
Mifgash with mosh, na’aleh, try a purim event, annual spring seminar

Jenni: working with Stephan Acel to improve budget. Warshovsky fund scholarships for MBI. 50000 from HD foundation was granted when we were in financial crisis. Working to be self sufficient so that the endowment can continue to grow. Grant from hagshama 2000 for transportation. Increase in income, means more numbers on programs.

**Approval of Veida Procedure.**
Yoshev Rosh: Noam Yaillen

Motion to allow Tzveet Mitbach to Vote by Ruth Stevens. Seconded George stevens.
Motion to acclaim. Acclaimed

Motion to allow the Shlichim to address the Veida by Ruth Stevens. Seconded by dov. Acclaimed.

Motion to set quorum at 50% plus 1 of the number of people currently in the room. Gil Browdy.
Motion Acclaimed. Total number counted, including Tzveet Mitbach: 125. Quorum set at 63.

Motion to Approve Veida Procedure by Alex Sharone

Motion to acclaim Veida Procedure by Jon Sulman. Acclaimed.
Plenary Session I: Constitution

The Constitution Resolution

Daniel Fridman (Sloth)

Whereas many chaverim are not well versed in the intricacies of the constitution.
Whereas the constitution states “Supreme authority is vested in the membership and
exercised at the Veida”
Whereas Article X of the constitution may compromise the ability of the membership to
exercise supreme authority.

Be it resolved that Article X read as followed:

This Constitution, or any part of it, may be amended by a Veida decision according to the
procedures laid out in Section 2, Article III of the Constitution.

Furthermore, let it be resolved that the day before winter seminar before veida be
devoted to discussion of constitutional amendments. (Gil Browdy) Amendments must be
submitted prior to the beginning of the day of discussion. (Jon Sulman)

Furthermore, in the event that this proposal passes, be it resolved that a plenary session
be held after the passing of this resolution that is dedicated to the constitution so as to
allow proposals that may have been disqualified by Article X as it currently stands.

Seconded: Jamie Beran.

Motion to Amend: Unfriendly Amendment (Arik Davidson): Amendments to the
constitution which have not been provided with due notice may be presented at the
Veida, however, in order for the amendment to be considered it must receive a 2/3
majority in an initial vote. (Elliot Shriner-Cahn)

Motion to Vote –Ruth Stevens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B’Ad</th>
<th>Neged</th>
<th>Nimna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amendment fails.

Motion to divide the Question –Josh Rofrano Seconded Moose (between 1 and 2 paragraph)

Motion to Vote –Ruth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B’Ad</th>
<th>Neged</th>
<th>Nimna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion fails.
Motion to Amend: Kara Segal

*Furthermore, let it be resolved that the one day before winter seminar before veida be devoted to discussion of constitutional amendments.* (Gil Browdy)  *Amendments must be submitted prior to the beginning of the day of discussion.* (Jon Sulman)

Motion to Close Debate: Joe Harrow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B’Ad</th>
<th>Neged</th>
<th>Nimna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vote:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B’Ad</th>
<th>Neged</th>
<th>Nimna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amendment Fails

Motion to Vote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B’Ad</th>
<th>Neged</th>
<th>Nimna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal passes.

Quorum check: all good

**Article III: Veida Procedure**

By Gil Browdy and Alex Sharone

Whereas the Veida Procedure as it currently stands does not include all of the motions that we use,
Whereas the Veida Procedure can be difficult to follow and the precedence of motions is not clear,
Whereas there are discrepancies in the language used,

Let it be resolved that **Article III: Veida Procedure** in Procedures for Implementation of the Constitution be amended to read:

**Article III: Veida Procedure**

1. The Yoshev/et Rosh is the chair of the Veida. They oversee the process of introduction and voting on proposals. All questions from the floor must be directed at them. Only they may recognize chaverim from the floor. It is their role to make sure that the person who has the floor is not interrupted by anyone else. The Yoshev/et Rosh has the final decision in any point of procedure.

2. A Chaver/a who has the floor can only be interrupted in the following cases: 1) when there is a point of personal privilege or 2) when there is a point of order.
3. Any chaver/a can submit a proposal which must be seconded. At least one of the proposers must be present to introduce the proposal. In the case of proposals written by Workshoppers and studentim in Israel, these proposals shall be presented on their behalf by the Mazkirut Artzit.

4. Once a proposal is presented, it must be seconded by a member of the Veida. That member’s name should be noted.

5. When a proposal is brought forward and another chaver/a objects to having the Veida consider it, because they feel it would harm the Veida to discuss it, they can motion to object to the consideration of the question. This can only happen when there has been no debate on a proposal. This motion is debatable. It is then put to a vote by the Yoshev/et Rosh: “Will the Veida consider this proposal?” If 2/3 vote no, then the proposal is no longer discussed.

6. Substantive proposals must be presented in writing to the Mazkirut Artzit before the opening ceremonies of the Veida.

7. Additional substantive proposals will not be encouraged during the Veida, but may be accepted by the Mazkirut Artzit before the beginning of the appropriate session.

8. Two proposals, such that if one is passed and one is not, require contradictory actions to be taken, may not both be presented. These proposals can be combined or one can be withdrawn. may not both be presented if the passing of one and rejection of the other requires contradictory actions to be taken. These proposals can be combined or one can be withdrawn. (Sam Kaplan)

9. Two proposals, such that if both are passed, require contradictory actions to be taken, may not both be presented. The contradictory proposal can be presented through a incorporated into a (amendment by Ruth Stevens, seconded George Stevens) motion to amend. may not be presented if their passing requires contradictory actions to be taken. The contradictory proposal can be presented through a motion to amend (Sam Kaplan).

10. Before the Rosh states that it is open to debate, the presenters are allowed a chance to modify their proposal or to withdraw it. After that, it cannot be withdrawn.

11. After a proposal has been presented, the Yoshev/et Rosh should ask if there are questions of clarification for the proposers. Questions of clarification are questions about the nature of the proposal and not opinion.

12. A tor will be created for debate. The Yoshev/et Rosh will call each person in turn. If a chaver/a wishes to speak, one they should stand up and ask the question to the Yoshev/et Rosh. (amended by Yonah Meiselaman-combined 12 and 13, change all other numbers)

PRIVELEGED POINTS
14. A point of personal privilege can be raised if a pressing situation is affecting a right or privilege of the Veida or of chaver/a (e.g. Noise, inadequate ventilation, feeling disrespected or directly attacked by another chaver/a). This takes precedence over anything else.

15. A point of order is a point regarding proper Veida procedure. This takes precedence over anything else, except personal privilege.

PRIVELEGED MOTIONS

16. A motion to appeal the Yoshev/et Rosh’s decision is a motion a chaver/a can immediately make if they believe (Zach Marsh) that the Yoshev/et Rosh has made a decision that is out of order. This motion must be seconded and requires a 2/3 yes vote. This motion is debatable. This motion takes precedence over all other motions.
A member of the Mazkirut Artzit shall preside over the appeal process.

17. A motion to temporarily suspend the rules is a motion to permit accomplishment of a desired purpose that would be in violation of a parliamentary rule. This motion can be made when there is not a proposal on the floor, or if there is a proposal on the floor, it must pertain to the proposal at hand. This motion must be seconded and requires a 2/3 yes vote. The duration must be specified and shall not exceed the current Veida.

MOTIONS PERTAINING TO THE PROPOSAL

18. A motion to acclaim is a motion to unanimously accept the proposal and takes precedence over any other motion in relation to the proposal. It must be seconded. This motion is not debatable. If there is any objection, it does not pass and the discussion on the proposal continues.

19. A motion to caucus is a motion to have a chance to discuss the proposal within smaller groups, after which the heads of the caucuses will report back what was the nature of the discussion and if there were any proposed amendments. It must be seconded. This motion is not debatable. This takes precedence over a motion to vote and a motion to debate. The Yoshev/et Rosh shall place a time limit on caucusing.

20. A motion to divide the question is a motion to divide the proposal into separate proposals that can stand alone. It must be seconded. This motion is debatable and amendable. This motion requires a majority yes vote.

21. A motion to table is a motion to lay aside the pending proposal such that it will be considered at the following Veida. It must be seconded. This motion is debatable and requires a majority yes vote.
22. A motion to amend is a motion to change something in the proposal. If it is accepted by the proposers, it becomes a friendly amendment and is added to the text of the proposal. If it is not accepted, it must be voted on immediately by the Veida and if passed, becomes an unfriendly amendment to the proposal. A motion to amend must be seconded. A motion to amend can be called at any time except when the proposal is about to be voted on. This motion is debatable and amendable. If an unfriendly amendment is passed and the original presenters no longer want to present the proposal, the proposal goes under the name(s) of the individual(s) who presented the unfriendly amendment. An amendment is out of order if the outcome of the amendment is equivalent to voting no or if the amendment is not in any way related to the amendment of the proposal.

23. A point of misinformation is made when a member believes that what the previous speaker has said is in factual error. This takes precedence over further discussion.

24. A motion to debate is a motion to open up the floor to debate on a proposal. It is not debatable and it takes precedence over a motion to vote.

25. A motion to close debate is a motion on whether or not the Veida should take a vote immediately on the proposal presented and this precedes any other motion in relation to the proposal except for a motion to acclaim and a motion to amend. This also must be seconded. If a 2/3 majority are in favor of voting on the proposal at the time, then a vote shall be taken on the proposal, otherwise the debate shall continue.

26. A motion to vote is a motion to vote on the proposal on the floor. This must be seconded. If it is challenged by a motion to debate or a motion to caucus, those take precedence. The Yoshevet Rosh should ask for a speaker for and against and give them a time limit to say their piece. If someone objects to voting at that time, the debate must continue. But, as stated above, a 2/3 majority yes to close debate means a vote can be taken.

Let it further be resolved that under the Voting subsection in Article III: Veida Procedure, Section 2 read: When votes are taken, it must be asked in the following order: “for”, “against”, “abstentions.” Voting is according to one person, one vote. In order for a proposal to pass, it must receive anything over 50% of the yes-no votes. Abstentions count towards quorum but not towards calculating the majority necessary to pass or defeat a motion or proposal.

Safi Gerchak seconds.

Proposal acclaimed
We the Grammicians, In Order to Form a More Perfect Preamble
By Ruth Stevens, Dara Silbermann, and Ben Meiselman

Whereas poor editing makes Habonim Dror look needlessly sloppy and unprofessional,
Whereas living in a collective framework and working towards social justice in Israel is a
fulfillment of HDNA aims,
Whereas the current direction of HDNA is towards participation in the New Kibbutz
Movement,
Whereas the latest HDNA Gar’in (Kvutzat Zeeq) made Aliyah within the framework of
the New Kibbutz Movement,
Let it be resolved that the Preamble to the Constitution be amended to read:

“Habonim Dror North America, The Labor Zionist Youth Movement, strives to upbuild a
new social order throughout the world, based on the principles of social justice,
cooperative economics, and political democracy embodied in the vision of the Prophets
and exemplified in the achievements of the Chalutzim. The renaissance of the Jewish
People is directly connected with the evolution of a just world, as is the self-
determination of all peoples.

Aliyah within the framework of the New Kibbutz Movement allows for the most an
avenue to the (Safi Gerchak) complete fulfillment of our ideology. We are constantly in
search of constantly seek (George Stevens) alternative social forms based on the concepts
of collectivism, which are deeply rooted in our Jewish heritage. Developing a positive
Jewish identity is essential (Cressa Perloff) to the fulfillment of our
ideology. We reject those institutions of modern society that repress and exploit the
individual and that mechanize and degrade human relationships. Furthermore (Yonah
Meiselman – the proposers want to note that this is dumb), only active concern and
personal involvement can alleviate the ills of society and bring about this just world.

To these ends, we celebrate the creation of one united Labor Zionist Youth Movement
based on the merger of Ichud Habonim Labor Zionist Youth and Dror Zionist Youth and
adopt this Constitution as a foundation for our continued activism. Moreover (Yonah
Meiselman), we call upon all who hold a progressive vision of Israel, the Jewish
community, and society at large to join in the implementation of these ideals.”

Seconded George Stevens

Notes:
Motion to split – Joe Harrow – seconded by Ilan Brandvain (1 – 1st Whereas clause and
all of the therefore except the first sentence of the 2nd paragraph
2- the rest of the whereas clauses and the first sentence of the 2nd paragraph)

motion to acclaim
motion acclaimed

motion to acclaim grammar – shot down
Motion to vote - Jon Sulman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B’Ad</th>
<th>Neged</th>
<th>Nimna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We the Grammicians, In Order to Form a More Perfect Preamble
By Ruth Stevens, Dara Silbermann, and Ben Meiselman

Whereas living in a collective framework and working towards social justice in Israel is a fulfillment of HDNA aims,
Whereas the current direction of HDNA is towards participation in the New Kibbutz Movement,
Whereas the latest HDNA Gar’in (Garin Blank-Kvutzat Zeeq) made Aliyah within the framework of the New Kibbutz Movement,
Let it be resolved that the Preamble to the Constitution be amended to read:

Aliyah to communal frameworks actively working in pursuit of our ideological aims is an effective path to the actualization of our movement goals (Ilan Brandvain).

Notes:
The following are other incarnations that lead to the final version of the sentence.
Aliyah to urban kvutzot within the framework of the New Kibbutz Movement and Aliyah to kibbutzim are effective but not exclusive ways to fulfill all of our ideology (Lital Shair).
allows for the most an avenue to the (Safi Gerchak) complete fulfillment of our ideology.

• Amendment made by proposal writers as noted with italics in second paragraph (“to urban kvutzot…and aliyah to kibbutzim”).
• Motion to amend by Lital Shair: Taken as a friendly amendment. From “are effective…our ideology”. Would replace the amendment proposed by Safi.
• Motion to amend: Ilan Brandvain. “Aliyah to communal frameworks actively working in pursuit of our ideological aims is an effective path to the actualization of our movement goals.” – Friendly amendment
• Motion to Suspend the Rules: Elliot Shreiner-Kahn (wants to vote on this when we vote on the proposal that deals specifically with aliyah)
  • Seconded: Carmi Tint
  • Vote on whether or not to suspend the rules (need 2/3rds vote)
• Motion to Vote: Matan
  • Seconded: Sarah Frailin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B’Ad</th>
<th>Neged</th>
<th>Nimna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal Passes
Moving the Youth to Zion
by Sloth “Daniel” Fridman and Ruth Stevens

Whereas we are a progressive Labor Zionist Youth Movement, and
Whereas our vision of the State of Israel as a progressive, egalitarian, cooperative society
at peace with its neighbors has not yet been realized, and
Whereas the building of such a state can be best achieved from within Israel
Whereas Veida X of 1999 resolved that “the most effective way for chevrei tnua to
actualize HDNA’s Labour Zionist ideology is to be in Israel as a member of the
progressive, socialist Habonim Dror community…”

- Therefore let it be resolved that the first aim of HDNA read as follows: “To
upbuild… To this end, Habonim Dror calls first and foremost for Aliyah
particularly (Max Walcott) to communal and collective frameworks that
actively work to achieve the aforementioned goal (Jenni Tonti)

Seconded: George Stevens
Motion to caucus: Safi
Seconded: Carly Shenfeld

Notes:
- Sentence bolded is the alteration being proposed.
- Motion to amend (Max Walcott) strike the word “particularly” – Taken as
friendly.
- Motion to amend: (mazkirut): “….that actively work to achieve the
aforementioned goal” – Taken as friendly
- Motion to debate, seconded.
- Jamie Beran “ The people who have made aliyah this year are married and stuff!”
“But if they go to Israel, they’ll stay there”…that’s the point.
“This is our State, let’s go there, let’s have fun with our kvutzah there…”
“Losing people to aliyah is not losing people when you are in a Zionist
movement…”
“If you shoot for the moon and miss, you’ll end up among the stars”
Motion to amend (Lori Zeller): “…because they are critical for the actualization
for our Zionist goals.”
- Motion to Vote: Pro and Con Speakers
Pro: We think that it is really important that our movement is not really unbalanced so
that we favor aliyah only and don’t recognize the work we do in the Diaspora.
Con: We can’t pass this right now because there isn’t a direct goal/focus of our
movement right now – we need to decide what we favor more.
Con: We don’t need to keep a balance of power between aliyah and work in the
Diaspora. Instead we need to stress aliyah to Israel and work there as a movement
wide goal.

Vote on the unfriendly amendment (Lori Zeller):
…. Diaspora communities in support of the aforementioned Zionist goals”©
Motion to Vote on the proposal: Seconded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B’Ad</th>
<th>Neged</th>
<th>Nimna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal Passes!!

Article V: Authority
By Gil Browdy and Alex Sharone

Whereas the Constitution should reflect the actual practices of our movement
Whereas the Mercaz is an opportunity for the leaders of the year-round ken activities to join together in dialogue and coordination,
Whereas the Mercaz deals with the fluid and changing issues regarding Kenim, ranging from practical organization to ideological direction,

Let it be resolved that the following sections of Article V: Authority be amended in the following ways:

Section 1 shall be amended to read: “Supreme authority is vested in the membership and exercised at the Veida or through a referendum of the membership. Veida shall be held every two years at a time and place determined by the Mazkirut Artzit. All members of Habonim Dror Hadracha aged and older are entitled to representation at the Veida. Veida decisions can be amended or set aside only by the Veida. The Veida is the primary decision making forum of the movement. Decisions are made in this forum that relate to ideology, programming, movement projects and movement programs. Any voting member can bring a proposal to the Veida. The Veida also elects the Mazkir/a. If the election or re-election of the Mazkir/a occurs during a year when there is no Veida, an election shall be held at Winter Seminar.”

Section 2: The last sentence shall be amended to read “The Mazkirut Artzit consists of the Shaliach/a Merkaz/it, Mazkir/a, Gizbar/it, the Merakez/et Tochniot, Merakez/et Kenim and Merakez/et Habo U. The Mazkirut Artzit run the movement on a daily basis.”

Section 3 shall be amended to read: The Mercaz consists of the Rashei Eizor, Rashei Ken, Shlichim, and the Mazkirut Artzit. This group can only make decisions that relate to the coming ken year. All decisions made by this group must comply with the decisions of the Veida. The Mercaz meets at least once a year.

Section 4 shall be amended to read “The Camping Association consists of members from each camp, including MBI. Each camp has three votes, as does the Mazkirut Artzit. This
group has jurisdiction over decisions that relate to financial and technical aspects of Habonim Dror camps and develops national policies. It meets once a year.”

Section 5: The first sentence shall be amended to read “The Moetzet Machanot consists of the Rashim, Merakez/et Chinuch, Merakez/et Techni, and Madrichei Madatz of all the machanot, Shlichim and the Mazkirut Artzit.

Second - Naomi Azar

Motion to acclaim – Ruth Stevens
Second – Sharona Mallach
Acclaimed!!!

Mercaz Who?
By Gil Browdy and Alex Sharone

Whereas Mercaz is no longer the type of decision making body that it once was

Let it be resolved that HDNA’s constitution be amended in the following ways:

1. Article VI, Section 2: remove “and approved by the Mercaz.”
2. Article VIII, Section 2: remove “upon unanimous consent…may not be enacted by the last Mercaz meeting before the Veida.”
3. Article IX, Section 1: remove “the Mercaz or.”
4. Remove entire Article V in Procedures for Implementation of the Constitution
5. Remove Section 4 of Article VII in Procedures for Implementation of the Constitution

Second – Dick Halpern
Motion to acclaim – Sloth
Second – Sara Fralin
Objection – Safi

Motion to acclaim – Alon Hafri – second – Joel Bluman
Objection – Michal Waldfogel

Motion to acclaim – Amit Bob
Second – Oren Brandvain
Acclaimed!

Scratch My Back and I’ll Scratch Yours
By the Mazkirut Artzit

Whereas paying dues is a common way of expressing commitment to a movement and its beliefs,
Whereas mas ensures the daily operations of the Central Office of HDNA and the movement at large,
Whereas every chanich/a at the machanot in the movement is required to pay mas through tuition,
Whereas Ma’apilim are also expected to pay the prevailing mas,
Whereas a proposal, calling for mas to be deducted at each machaneh, was overwhelmingly passed at Veida in 1997

Let it be resolved that Article VII: Mas (Dues) of the Constitution be amended to read as follows:

1. A central mas shall be fixed by the Mazkirut Artzit and shall be collected annually by the machanot, including MBI, along with tuition. This mas will apply to all members of the Movement, except Ma’apilim.

2. A membership mas for Ma’apilim shall be fixed by the Mazkirut Artzit and collected annually. Mas shall be automatically deducted each year from the salaries of Ma’apilim who work at machaneh. For Ma’apilim who do not work at machaneh, mas shall be included in the payment of the first national program attended that year.

3. Mas collected at the Machanot shall be sent to the Mazkirut Artzit by the respective Camp Committees and is non-negotiable.

4. If a Ma'apil is unable to pay mas they are encouraged to utilize the kupa system. If after exploring this option they still find themselves unable to pay, they can appeal directly to the Mazkirut Artzit for a refund. The Mazkirut Artzit can then review and grant requests at their discretion, and they shall be reimbursed. Requests must be received by September 30th. (Gil Browdy) or one month after the attended seminar (Sloth “Daniel” Fridman) (Entire thing before Gil and Sloth’s changes – Jamie Beran)

Furthermore, let it be resolved that we request the Habonim Dror Camping Association to legislate that every HDNA machaneh deduct a Mas Ma’apilim from all madrichim Ma’apilim (Evan Chinoy) who work at machaneh. We request that this deduction be included in the contract that madrichim Ma’apilim (Evan Chinoy) read and sign at the beginning of machaneh.

Second – Gil Browdy

Notes:
-Chaverim expressed concern with the prospect of the financial burden of mas on Ma’apilim who possibly would be precluded from working
-Motion to amend - Bria Gray: The Central Office shall make provisions for those Ma’apilim who are unable to pay their mas. – unfriendly – not pursued
-Motion to amend – Leora Kanter: If a ma’apil is unable to pay the prevailing mas, the Mazkirut Artzit shall help them find alternative ways of contributing to the movement. – unfriendly – not pursued
-Motion to amend – Ben Meiselman: 4) If a madrich/a working at machaneh opposes paying mas they may send a written request to the Central Office and they shall be reimbursed. Madrichim shall be made aware of this option. Second: Sloth. – unfriendly

-Motion to amend – Rachel Bergstein and Ilan Brandvain: 2) A membership mas for Ma’apilim shall be fixed by the Veida… – unfriendly – pursued

-Some chaverim expressed their trust in the (impeachable and democratically selected) mazkirut artzit and decisions

-Others felt that education about the mas and the veida discussions

-Motion to close debate – motion to acclaim

-Vote fails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Be’ad</th>
<th>Neged</th>
<th>Nimna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-Motion to amend – Jamie Beran - If a Ma’apil is unable to pay mas they are encouraged to utilize the kupa system. If after exploring this option they still find themselves unable to pay, they can appeal directly to the Mazkirut Artzit for a refund. The Mazkirut Artzit can then review and grant requests at their discretion. – friendly

-Motion to temporarily suspend the rules – Safi Gerchak – Suspend the rules to table the currently debated proposal until after a conclusive decision on the proposal defining Ma’apilim. Second – Evan Chinoy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Be’ad</th>
<th>Neged</th>
<th>Nimna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion fails to reach the needed 2/3 majority

-Concerns were addressed about the specific definition of a ma’apil, which is not expressed in the Constitution. The Mazkirut Artzit specified that anyone with movement experience (machaneh and/or programs) or anyone who works as a madrich/a implementing a tochnit chinuch is currently considered a ma’apil.

-They then clarified – a member and graduate of the Workshop program or of the equivalent age. If you don’t consider yourself a member of the movement that is dealt with on a camp by camp basis in distinguishing tzevet techni.

-Motion to suspend the rules for the length of time needed to move the proposal until after the “Article I: Membership” proposal has been considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Be’ad</th>
<th>Neged</th>
<th>Nimna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion passes – then we ate lunch. It was grilled cheese and tomato soup. Yum.

**Article I: Membership**

By Gil Browdy and Alex Sharone

Whereas the Constitution should reflect the actual structure of our movement,

Let it be resolved that **Article I: Membership Structure** in Procedures for Implementation of the Constitution be amended to read:

1. General Habonim Dror membership shall be divided into three groups with the following designations:
CHANICHIM—Grades 2-10 *(amended from 4 to 2 – Molly Wernick)*
HADRACHA—Graduates of the Hadracha programs (MBI and Madatz) and/or chaverim/ot of the equivalent ages.
MA’APILIM—Members and graduates of the Workshop program and/or chaverim/ot of the equivalent ages and all chaverim/ot of the pre-Workshop kvutza who work at an HDNA machaneh.

-Safi explained a point of confusion which had caused the fracas. He and Shawn had made their successive motions because they didn’t understand that Article I Membership Structure of the Procedures, which Alex and Gil’s proposal addresses, relates only to the age structure of the movement. Article IV Membership of the Constitution itself defines a member as a person who meets the age requirements, and recognizes, accepts and adheres to the principles of the movement, so if you work at machaneh but are not a member, the mas proposal wouldn’t apply to you. So now we are going to deal with Gil and Alex’s and then go back in accordance with the Yoshevet Rosh’s ruling.

-Motion to acclaim – seconded – no objections

*The proposal passes*

Discussion resumes on “Scratch My Back and I’ll Scratch Yours” on Article III, Mas (Dues) by the Mazkirut Artzit
-Motion to amend striking the sentence “The Mazkirut Artzit can then review and grant requests at their discretion” from section 4 and replacing it with “and they shall be reimbursed. Requests must be received by September 30th,” – seconded

– received as friendly, with the notes recording discomfort on the part of the proposers with the possibility of frivolous requests, and the possibility of reviewing this.

Motion to amend – Sloth “Daniel” Fridman
-Motion to amend – Dov from Tavor: to strike shall because it can only be used in the first person. Unfriendly – not pursued.
-Alex reflects for the notes that it should be explained to madrichim what mas represents and why it’s automatically deducted.

Motion to acclaim – seconded – no objects

*The proposal passes unanimously.*

**Article II: Membership in Good Standing**

By Gil Browdy and Alex Sharone

Whereas the Constitution should reflect the actual structure of our movement,
Whereas the word “shall” is Constitutionally-friendly

Let it be resolved that Article II: Membership in Good Standing in Procedures for Implementation of the Constitution be amended to read:
1. A member in good-standing of the Chanichim shall pay the prevailing Mas, attend peulot regularly, an indicate interest and good faith in being in the movement. Such a member may then participate in movement programs, vote in local decision-making forums, and receive movement publications. Chanichim recognize the principles of Habonim Dror.

2. A member in good-standing of the Hadracha shall pay the prevailing Mas, attend peulot regularly, and be willing to assume positions and tasks of responsibility within his/her kvutza, ken and/or eizor. Such a member may then participate in movement programs, vote in local decision-making forums, participate in a Veida, and receive movement publications. Hadracha recognize and accept the principles of Habonim Dror.

3. A member in good-standing of the Ma’apilim shall pay the prevailing Mas and assume positions and tasks of responsibility and leadership in an eizor, or machaneh of Habonim Dror, or be an active participant in a Ken Ma’apilim, or in some other form of Zionist work, like the UPZ. Ma’apilim should take an active role in the ken unless there is a valid reason for one not to participate.

To be a Ma’apil/a in good-standing requires striving for the following goals:
1) Becoming knowledgeable in the Hebrew language, Jewish History, a pluralist Jewish Culture, Jewish Traditions and Jewish Sources.
2) Being an activist and a leader in the Jewish Community.
3) Being an activist and leader in the struggle for Social Justice in the world.
4) Creating a personal relationship with the Jewish Homeland by returning to Israel on a long term basis within 6 years of Workshop or high school graduation.

Ma’apilim and Ma’apilot recognize, accept, and adhere to the principles of Habonim Dror.

Second – Jamie Beren

Motion to amend – George Stevens “(unless unable)” after “shall pay the prevailing mas” all three times. – unfriendly – withdrawn
Motion to amend – Jonny Jon “Soul Man” Sulman – add “in good standing” in the three last sentences – unfriendly – withdrawn
Motion to amend – Lonny Moses - standardize the hyphens
Motion to amend - Rachel Bergstein – “A Ma’apil/a in good-standing strives:
   1) To become knowledgeable in the Hebrew language, Jewish History, a pluralist Jewish Culture, Jewish Traditions and Jewish Sources.
   2) To be an activist and a leader in the Jewish Community.
   3) To be an activist and leader in the struggle for Social Justice in the world.
   4) To return to Israel on a long term basis within 6 years of Workshop or high school graduation and to be an active participant in Zionist activity in the Diaspora in order to create a personal relationship with the Jewish homeland.
   5) To live in a communal framework” – not friendly – withdrawn
Motion to amend – that Israeli girl from post-MBI –
Motion to acclaim – seconded – no objections

The proposal passes unanimously

Maintenance
By Ben Meiselman

Whereas our Constitution should reflect our practices

Let it be resolved that the HDNA’s constitution be amended in the following ways:

1. The subheading after Article X, “PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONSTITUTION,” shall be removed from the Constitution, and the subsequent numbered articles shall be adjusted accordingly. Move “Procedures, Article II: Membership in Good-Standing” to the Constitution, Article V.
2. The sections under “Article VII: Procedure of Election of the Mazkir/a” shall be moved to “Article VI: Election of a Mazkir/a,” and the empty article shall be removed. Numbers be adjusted accordingly. (Gil Browdy)
3. A fifth section shall be added to “Article II: Affiliation” that reads, “Habonim Dror encourages a relationship of mutual support and cooperation with the Union of Progressive Zionists.”

Second – Evan Chinoy
Safi – motion to acclaim – second – Theo Ephraim – objection
Caucus reports:
- a “security barrier” was erected between tables 13 (“East Germany”) and 15 (“West Germany”)
- Thanks to Chaver Meiselface for writing this
- Discomfort with Mazkir/a because females may not be suitable
- The Berlin Wall fell but Gil ruled it not funny enough
- Gil felt that the distinction between Constitution and Procedures was useful and should not be removed, but perhaps “Article II: Membership in Good Standing” should be moved into the Constitution.
- Articles should be clarified by which part they’re in, and what does #2 mean?
Ben clarified that it would merely adjust the numbering logically.
Motion to Amend – Sara Fralin – to add “of the Procedures” in #2
Motion to Amend – Gil Browdy – Strike #s 1 and 2, move “Article II: Membership in Good-Standing” becomes Article V of the Constitution and the numbering of the Procedures be adjusted accordingly.
- second: Ruth Stevens – accepted as friendly
- motion to acclaim – Sloth – second: Joel Daniel Newman – no objections

The proposal passes unanimously.

On Veida Procedure
By Ben Meiselman

Let it be resolved that the following sections shall be inserted to “Article III: Veida Procedures” before the “VOTING” subheading:

1) The Mazkirut Artzit shall inform the Veida at its outset the schedule of the plenary sessions and of any other decisions on the agenda, such as the consideration of a Gar’in or the election of a Mazkir.
2) Quorum must be set before any other motion or proposal is considered by the Veida. The Mazkirut Artzit will determine the number of people that must be present for quorum to be set.
3) **The Veida procedures in this Constitution carry from one Veida to the next and do not need to be re-approved.** – Veida procedures carry from one Veida to the next. After quorum is set, changes to Veida procedure may be proposed and passed with a 50% yes vote. Then the remainder of Veida procedure should be re-approved. The changes to Veida procedure will only be in effect for the Veida in which they pass. (Jon Sulman)
4) The Veida shall open with reports from each member of the Mazkirut Artzit, including the Rakazei T’nuua, then reports from each eizor.

Second – Yona Meiselman
- Chaverim raised concerns about the perennial Shlichim and mitbach caucus issues
Caucus reports:
- Concern that review of the procedures reminds people how Veida works and is useful.
- Yeah, sure, whatever
Ben addressed concerns, and rephrased section 3 of his proposal
Motion to amend – Jon Sulman “The changes to Veida procedure will only be in effect for the Veida in which they pass” – second – George Stevens. Friendly.
Motion to acclaim (Safi) – Second (Gil) – no objections
*The proposal passes unanimously.*

Plenary session ends.

New plenary session as per Sloth’s proposal!!!!
Don’t Shoot the Shlichim
By Max Wolcott, Sam Hertz, and Idon Natanzon
Where Habonim Dror has not formal written definition for the role of Shlichim in Veida procedure
Whereas Shlichim officially represent organizations outside of Habonim Dror in addition to their affiliation with HD,
Whereas future questions about their roles, especially in voting procedure could be attached to ideological issues

Let It be resolved that Article III: Veida Procedures include: “The role of Shlichim in Veida procedure is one of an advisor. Their opinions shall be taken with equal weight;
however, they cannot make privileged motions. The results of their votes will be reported to the Veida but will not be calculated into the total and their presence will not affect the quorum.”

Second – George Stevens
-clarifications about the meaning of “equal weight” and why they were not allowed to vote in the first place

Michal Waldfogel: Motion to amend – “taken” with equal weight to “respected” – unfriendly, withdrawn
Matan Shuchman: Motion to amend – to strike “they cannot make privileged motions” – unfriendly, withdrawn
Sascha Benderly Craft: Motion to amend – to add “to members of Habonim Dror” after “with equal weight”. Unfriendly, withdrawn.

Ruth Stevens - motion to debate. Second – George Stevens.
- Shlichim have an important contribution to opinions with their special knowledge.
  - Gil said that it’s important to discuss the role of the Shlichim every year
  - Yona agreed that it’s the Veida’s decision, and recognizes their special place and the trust between them.
  - Iris said that they should be able to make privileged motions so as not to be second-class citizens.
  - Sloth clarified the difference between points and motions but resident Robert’s Rules guy Gil said they all technically count as a motion.
  - Ruth said their
Sascha B-C Croatia - Motion to amend – allowing privileged motions “they cannot make motions with the exception of point of pers
Motion to acclaim – seconded – objections
Lonny - Motion to vote – Second – George

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Be’ad</th>
<th>Neged</th>
<th>Nimna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal passes.

The 3/5 Compromise
By Theo Ephraim

Whereas our Constitution provides a basis for all actions and goals for the movement
Whereas many eligible hadracha-aged members are not able to attend Veida for various reasons
Whereas a 50% plus 1 majority has the potential to misrepresent the sentiments of the movement as a whole

Let it be resolved that the first paragraph of article X be amended to read:
This Constitution, or any part of it, shall be amended by a Veida decision with a 60% majority yes vote.
Second – Rachel Bergstein

-60% was clarified to mean 60% or more.

Caucus reports:
- Article X now gives special consideration to Constitutional amendments.
- Shulchan Gerchak: the Constitution should not be judged more important than ideology, programs, etc, and this would imply it is
- Shulchan Soul Man: The Constitution need not be more important, but merely more stable, and the Ideology plenary session is the place for fluid changing in ideology
- 50% plus one seemed fine to Rofrano and his ilk, and 60% seemed arbitrary.
- Matan: Stability is useful.
- Sam said that could impede the progressive nature of our movement, but probably he just said that to be smart.
- Chaver Lonny opined that a 41% minority would now be able to block change, exacerbating the difficulties of misrepresentation presented by the attendance of Veida issue.

George Stevens: Motion to temporarily suspend the rules until the proposal is dealt with dictating that only a 60% majority can pass this proposal, so as to avoid blatant hypocrisy. Second – Ruth Stevens.

Idon Natanzon – motion to acclaim – Second – Noam Chomsky/Yaillen
Safi Gerchak - Motion to debate. George Stevens – second.
- The last two days have shown that there’s an extensive review process. Also we’re a movement, why should we wait to stagnate? “Our constitution is the heart and soul of this movement” which is why we should hold it to the same standard as everything else.

Jamie set a time limit, Safi threatened to appeal, Jamie explained it would be two minutes and he withdrew.

Motion to close debate: Noam Yaillen. Second: Joe from Tavor.
Motion fails to reach two-thirds majority needed, so debate continues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Be’ad</th>
<th>Neged</th>
<th>Nimna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Jon said something
- Sascha says we’re not a country so our Constitution is not the legal framework on which our movement is based. It probably has less effect on the movement than the other plenary sessions, so why distinguish it in such ways.
- Laura said it’s ridiculous to say that 50%+1 doesn’t represent us because it’s a majority.
- Sam: Because we’re progressive, our constitution should progress with us.
- Lonny: The Constitution is more important, thus we should make it more important that it accurately represent who we truly are.
- Sloth: One person’s presence of absence can affect the vote no matter what the ratio is.
- Theo: 60% does not necessarily make amendments more important, but more stable, because it builds a framework for the rest of what we do. It’s also more likely to
represent the movement as a whole. We passed everything at this Veida by more than 60%.

Lonny Moses: Motion to vote. Second: George.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Be’ad</th>
<th>Neged</th>
<th>Nimna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal fails.

BTW: Workshoppers in Veida OMG!
By Lonny Moses and Amit Bob

Whereas Habonim Dror has always tried to be inclusive and democratic,
Whereas Workshoppers make up a large number of movement members,
Whereas new technology has created opportunities were not available in 1982,

Let it be resolved that an additional point be added to the end of Article III, before the “VOTING” subsection reading “Provisions should be made if possible for Workshoppers and Habo U participants to vote in Veida through a chat room caucus table and/or an internet messenger system in a caucus table through any available and reasonable means to communicate with them.” (Dustin Hellinger)

Second – George Stevens

Dustin Hellinger: Motion to amend to “in a caucus table through any available and reasonable means to communicate with them.” Second – George Stevens. Friendly.

Joe Harrow: Motion to caucus. Second – George Stevens. Reports:
- Many chaverim want it because they’re going to be on workshop.
- Some commended the spirit but thought that the Constitution was not the place.
Some recommended that they email their opinions on the proposals, so as to be heard, but without counted votes.
- Leora Kanter and friends wrote an amendment stipulating that Workshoppers could have their votes counted only on proposals they wrote.
- Sloth and his posse thought feasibility issues do not belong in the Constitution, and it should be tabled.
- Safi and his cult-like followers emphasized that the idea was good, but now is not the time so it should respectfully be voted down.
- Jonny Jon and people in his direct vicinity expressed “overwhelmingly negative sentiments” and that such a procedure would be damaging to the Veida, as well as disagreeing with its placing of the burden on the Veida to find solutions. Argument that webcams would create their presence, and the counter-argument that webcams are shitty. Something about the effort to come to Veida, and Toni wants to marry Lonny and Amit. Ilana says that Amit has a hot sister (two – ed. [and the editor is Ruth. That’s me! Ha, ha.]) and wants the aforementioned sister on the webcam specifically.
- Alon and his acquaintances felt that not hearing the Veida’s debate would undermine the Workshoppers’ ability to decide. He also noted the possibility of an amendment clarifying that the Central Office gets to pick, and wondered about the ratio of Workshoppers and their friends to present Veida participants.
- Elliot Shriner-Cahn said that they liked the sentiment.
- Matan threw together a ragtag band of misfits and ne’er-do-wells, but after a cock-a-mamie session of arguing they decided to repeat everyone else’s points. Also it leaves out everyone who can’t come who’s in North America, and the Constitution is the wrong place.
- Some girl at Noam’s caucus table (“Mosh mazkirut 2008”) thinks that the proposal selfishly excludes future Workshops that might be in Europe at this time.
- Mazkirut felt that it doesn’t need to go in the Constitution.
- Moose thinks it’s good because Workshoppers are seriously actualizing, which differentiates them from chaverim who choose not to attend from North America.
- The proposers responded that they think their own idea is a good one,

Leora Kanter - Motion to amend: “Workshoppers and Habo U participants who wish to participate in Veida through the available means will have their votes counted and be counted.”
Second – George Stevens. Friendly.
Kara Segal – motion to amend – excluding them from the quorum. Strike the last sentence and add “Let it also be resolved that members of Workshop and Habo U will not be counted in the deciding or counting of quorum.”
Joe Harrow - Motion to Vote. Second – George Stevens. Pro/con speakers:
- “I just don’t think it’s fair or remotely practical to allow people who aren’t in this room to decide what our movement believes.” - George Stevens
- But it’s ridiculous to say they’re not making the effort, they’re on Workshop and coming together during their chofesh in order to stay up all night doing this.
- Jon likes the podium, it makes him feel important, and the physical presence in this room is, like, clutch,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Be’ad</th>
<th>Neged</th>
<th>Nimna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal fails.
Ruth Stevens – motion to adjourn. George Stevens – second.

Sof Veida.