

CORPUS JCR



MEETING AGENDA

Eighth Week, Michaelmas Term 2024

Sunday Ninth March, 7:30 PM

President & Chair: Michael Leslie

Vice-President & Secretary: Angelina Hong

Returning Officer & Constitutional Oracle: Jacob Harvey

1. Report from the President

Michael: Thank you all for coming. I hope you have all been enjoying Hilary Term and looking forward to the end of it. To the second year classicists, best of luck with your exams. I hope last week has been good and next week even better. I went to Academic Committee meeting a few weeks ago. That was fine. The main point of discussion to do with us was AI use in academic work. Interestingly, the university is associated with two AIs. Basically what college has said is that they understand that students use AI, and they know that it is a useful tool for like some things especially like coding. They just want students to be ethical about it. They know that people are going to use AI, and that is the reality that we live in now. It is just about being ethical. I have been to PresCom in between then which was useful. This relates mostly to the first motion of the night, that I asked Oskari to submit, about the SU Bye-Laws. I don't think many people in here will have read them but they aren't the best. I strongly disagree with them as do all the other JCR Presidents. We have submitted some amendments to them, which will then be decided on in the Student Members Meeting this Tuesday. Jacob can tell you that in AOB. If any of you are free at the time and care about the SU or more importantly Corpus not being part of the SU, I would highly recommend you all going. I will get to that when it comes to the motion.

2. Questions to Officers

3. Reading from the Poet Laureate

[Cathy reads a poem.]

4. Ratifications from Previous Meetings

5. Constitutional Amendments

CORPEXIT

This JCR notes that—

- ❖ The recent proposed Bye-Laws of the SU include changes to the process of affiliation and the introduction of “Conference Collective Action” undertaken by the Conference of Colleges;

- ❖ Colleges under these proposed Bye-Laws will be automatically affiliated with the SU at the beginning of each academic year, regardless of their own Motions to disaffiliate (as Corpus did last Hilary);
- ❖ In order to then disaffiliate, Colleges must have a quorum of 20% of students reach a two-thirds decision, by vote through the SU's own website;
- ❖ This demands a much higher quorum than the SU's own referendums, and demands the use of their own dysfunctional website;
- ❖ Alongside this, the Conference of Colleges can demand collective action from all College if they reach a decision by a 50% + 1 majority on an action;
- ❖ This would mean that Corpus would be bound to act on something that we might not want, because the SU and other Colleges said that we have to do so;
- ❖ This includes things like political positions and actions against Colleges;
- ❖ These Bye-Laws represent a serious breach of independence for every College, including Corpus.

This JCR believes that—

- ❖ The Corpus Christi College JCR has existed since 1797;
- ❖ In that time, it has represented the interests of undergraduate students of Corpus Christi College to the best of its ability, and aims to continue doing so;
- ❖ Corpus owes no obligation to the irrelevant democracy of the Student Union, nor to the Conference of Colleges;
- ❖ Corpus owes no obligation to anything that the SU tries to force it to do, because Corpus is not a part of the SU;
- ❖ No SU Bye-Law should be allowed to force the Corpus JCR to do something that it does not want to do;
- ❖ Corpus has chosen to disaffiliate from the SU, and should not allow itself to be forcibly re-affiliated.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Mandate the President to maintain the sovereignty of the Corpus JCR, and maintain that Corpus will not associate with the SU except through our own decision to do so;
- ❖ Ignore entirely the Bye-Law 5 proposed by the SU, even in the event that it is introduced fully, unless such amendments are made to Bye-Law 5 so as to render it, in the judgement of the Executive Committee, no longer affected by the issues named in the preamble to this Motion;
- ❖ Amend the Constitution to include a new Section 3, Clause VIII which will read as follows: “The only manner through which the JCR can be affiliated with the Student Union is through the successful passage of a Motion at a quorate JCR Meeting to affiliate with the Student Union. If the JCR is not affiliated with the Student Union, then the JCR shall neither recognise any action of the Student Union nor recognise any action of any part of the Student Union.”;
- ❖ Renumber the current Section 3, Clause VIII so as to become Section 3, Clause IX.

Proposer: Oskari Penttinen

Seconder: Ben Wharton

Questions:

Treya: I don't understand anything. Can you please explain all that?

Michael: Last year into this year, the SU now changed to a Conference of Common Rooms system. This is basically where every JCR and every MCR and potentially the Department of Continuing Education sits and everyone has one vote. You have a chair of the Conference of Common Rooms

and the Colleges decide on what to do, and, then, that is going to be passed by the SU and that is how the SU going to act. The SU's Constitution is called their Articles of Association. The Bye-Laws have been changed. Most of them are fairly fine to the extent that it doesn't really matter because Corpus isn't affiliated. To clarify for everyone, the College is disaffiliated, but, as an individual, you are still affiliated. You can personally disaffiliate, but I don't think that there is much point in doing that, because you do get some benefits as an individual. But, for the JCR, it is more of a detriment than a benefit. Their Bye-Law 5 is about what the Conference can decide for us to do and affiliation to the Conference. For the Freshers, we disaffiliated last year so we have no involvement in the SU at all. The SU can't tell us to do anything. With this Bye-Law 5, there are two main things that I have an issue with; the other Presidents had more, but, because we are disaffiliated, these are my two main issues. Firstly, at the beginning of each year, despite the fact that we are disaffiliated, we would be automatically reaffiliated at the beginning of every year. And, if we wanted to disaffiliate, we would have to do that through the SU's website, which does not work properly. The reason why I wrote this motion is because I was trying to check something on the SU's website, and it took me half an hour to find it and even then I couldn't find it. You have to use the SU's voting website, and, just to add to the issues, the SU does not even have an electronic counter. SU votes are counted by hand; they count every individual vote. Jacob's system is more advanced than the SU's despite their £1 million plus budget. You have to use the SU's website to vote. To disaffiliate, you would have to have a 20% quorum of the College, which is 20% of 400 students. And in the last SU referendum there was 5% turnout. They are asking for four times higher percentage of students to vote. And, within that 20%, it has to be a 2/3 decision to pass. They are basically demanding a lot to disaffiliate. So, that is the first issue, that you can be forcibly reaffiliated every year as a College despite the fact that Corpus has already said that we want nothing to do with it. The second thing is the Conference Collective Action, which means that, if the Conferences of Common Rooms decides by a 50% + 1 majority to vote on something and do something, we would then be bound to also do that. This would include political action. So, if the Conference of Common Rooms decided to take a rent strike, we would then be mandated to take part in it, despite the fact that our relationship with College is fantastic. An irrelevant College could decide that they are angry with their bursar, want to have a rent strike, and we would be lumped in by that if 50% + 1 of people voted to do it. despite the fact that we get on quite well here and we get on really well with our College staff. Political positions, that could be stuff like Israel-Palestine, we would be forced to take a position based on a 51% majority on any political position. And, they specifically included that in the text of the Bye-Laws which makes me believe that they are planning on doing that. Other than that they would not have mentioned it so specifically. Sanctions, stuff like that, it is just really...

Oskari: What Michael means by sanctions is that, if we fail to take this political position or whatever action they want us to take, they can initiate sanctions against us. There is no definition of what this means but essentially they can do anything.

Michael: They can very loosely do something against us. They have left it so open that it could literally mean anything.

Treya: What actual power, in your opinion, does the SU have to enforce against us. because they are at best an organisation.

Michael: This was the thing at PresCom; our meeting with SU on our amendments was like three hours long. Jacob will know more about the legal side than I do. There was a lot of arguing about charity law: the fact that they have trustees and CEOs. I don't know what they can do against us. One thing that I do know is that the SU loves to sue people. They have in the past sued people and JCRs for libel, for slander. They have a legal department and they have the money. I don't know if you have seen the Cherwell article and breakdown of where the money goes. The money doesn't go to what I think would be useful places. I don't know exactly what they could do. They also haven't listed exactly what they can do, which means that they could hypothetically do anything.

Jacob: I will read out the text of Bye-Law 5.28.3.1: "Conference may require individual Common Rooms to provide evidence that they have delivered the CCA and may hold those who do not accountable in whichever way Conference determines."

Rei: Just to clarify, if we are disaffiliated, they cannot sanction us?

Michael: No.

Jacob: The Conference cannot sanction Common Rooms that are not affiliated with the Conference. However, under the current Bye-Laws, this Common Room would be affiliated automatically to the Conference.

JJ: Just for the Freshers, why did we disaffiliate?

Michael: The SU is virtually useless to JCRs. To students individually, I do think can be useful. The SU is not hopeless. At other universities it very clearly works. Cambridge's SU is not bad. Ours is just very rubbish.

Oskari: Last year before reaffiliation, there was also a very damning exposé on the SU's electoral practices. There is an article on it in the Cherwell but there was a lot of somewhat dodgy scheming and manoeuvring that went behind the SU presidential election at the time, which involved one of our ex-presidents. That also contributed to our decision because we were generally dissatisfied with the democratic practices of the SU and they did not live up to our standards.

Michael: The SU also does some useful stuff, so the SU runs the Freshers' Fair, but as individuals, you are all allowed to go to that.

Treya: The SU effectively works as a students' union. That is the point of it, so if you have any issues with College, if you have any issues with university administration, if you have an issue with how a sexual harassment case has been handled, the SU is where you would go.

Michael: The SU is not hopeless for students. For JCRs, it is negligible. Our biggest issue is how we deal with College. This stuff like Conference Collective Action could significantly worsen our relationship with College. If we have to have a rent strike because Hugh's has decided to beef their bursar... SUs can work, and they do at other universities. Our just doesn't seem to work despite its many transformative periods. Regarding PresCom, we drafted a lot of amendments and we have submitted them to the SU because we had a really long meeting with them. They have said that in principle they have said that they are happy to accept all of them pending their trustees agreeing to it, which is where my doubt comes in, because the SU can be a business; it has trustees and a CEO. It is a charity, but it is also a business. These people are not elected. They are adults. They are bankers. They are consultants. They might not necessarily have students' best interests at heart. So, we drafted amendments, including a very easy disaffiliation process, the removal of Conference Collective Action. If all of those go through, then, this motion that I asked Oskari to submit shouldn't really have that much of an impact because we can send an email to the SU and be disaffiliated like that immediately. However, because this is pending trustee review, and because PresCom agreed that either all of these amendments are accepted or none of them are, and we remove our approval not endorsement of this, I would quite like this to be in place. One thing the SU does actually like is if we say that we democratically voted on this. If I go to the SU and say that you can reaffiliate us as much as you want, but this is in our Constitution, which is not only backed up by ourselves but also backed up by College, which is important because our Constitution is part of our College's wider constitution whenever it gets passed through GB, it basically means that this is a certain level of insurance against the SU. This has been a large part of my life in the past few weeks so I am happy to explain anything else if anyone has any further questions.

Vote:

For: 22
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion passes

6. Motions of No Confidence

7. Charity Motions

8. Monetary Motions

HDMI CABLE FOR LIVINGSTONE ROOM

This JCR notes that—

- ❖ The HDMI cable in the Livingstone Room is really rubbish.

This JCR believes that—

- ❖ We should have a working HDMI cable to watch films et cetera for the collective enjoyment of the JCR.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Mandate the Clubs and Societies Officer to spend up to £6 on a new HDMI cable.

Proposer: Clara Woodhead
Seconder: Rio Moore

Questions:

Treya: We bought HDMI cables for the Livingstone Room last term, I believe. I bought them; what happened to them?

Logan: I know where one of the cables is, we had to move to the BC for Corpus Challenge. That is my fault for not returning it.

Treya: And what about the other one?

Logan: I think that the other one is the one currently there that is rubbish) the good one is the one currently in the BC.

Ben: So we can just return it?

Michael: Alternatively, do we need a HDMI cable in each place?

Treya: We spent £50 on HDMI cables when we bought them.

Logan: We normally have an HDMI to USB-C cable. It was just that Tom's laptop did not have an HDMI to USB-C connection.

JJ: Does the one in the Livingstone Room actually not work because me and Jacob used it the other night to watch a movie?

Clara: For the entire international movie night, it wouldn't connect to the laptop.

Treya: Do we know how to safeguard them? It's like the mugs. What is stopping them from being stolen and a recurring expense?

JJ: In theory, I am meant to have bought storage for them, which will definitely discourage people from stealing it. If they know that I am tracking all the wires. When I get around to it, I think that that will be a good deterrent.

Debate:

Clara: I found a cable on Amazon for £6.

Oskari: I just have a question about the quality of the cable. If this cable gets purchased, will the £6 HDMI cable actually transmit any information?

Clara: I do not know anything about HDMI cables. I put it in Amazon and it was the average price, and I thought that it would be standard.

JJ: This is a £6 motion of however much money the JCR has.

Michael: No, no, I would like to contest this. Just because it is a small amount of money does not mean that we should spend that money. Money in the JCR is not infinite and even small purchases can accumulate. As it has been shown this term. I think it is wise that we actually do look into the quality of the cable.

Oskari: And, even more importantly, the reason we are able to spend money so freely through JCR motions is because the College trusts us to spend the money in a sustainable way. If the College deems that we do not scrutinise these purchases, and that we are not spending the JCR's money in a sustainable way, they can force us to go through additional measures such as bursarial approval to spend any money.

Michael: Monetary motions in other Colleges do have to go through College before they are approved. So, we are quite fortunate that we are in this position, because we take time to debate on small purchases.

JJ: What amount of money would you be happy to spend to get a good quality cable?

Oskari: I understand the premise of the question but I think it would be beneficial for those who actually use the HDMI cables to do the research. I have no knowledge about HDMI cables or ISO standards.

Ben: Just to be clear, in the time we have spent on this debate, Logan could have gone downstairs and returned the cable. I am not going to say that this is pointless and ask to vote, but get on with it, people.

Rio: Apparently, Amazon's choice is £5.94

Clara: I am happy for there to not be a cable if returning the cable will be the solution

Logan: Can I raise an amendment to mandate me to just return the cable from the BC?

Jacob: This was submitted as a monetary motion, so there would need to be a procedural motion to transfer this motion into motions as submitted. This is because that amendment would change into which section this motion should be placed.

[Treya raises procedural motion to moves this from monetary motion to motions as submitted.]

For: 19
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Procedural motion passes

[Logan proposes amendment to mandate the Entz President to bring the cable back to the Livingstone room and remove the mandate to buy an HDMI cable.]

[Amendment taken as friendly.]

Logan: On behalf of Entz, I am very sorry for taking the cable from the Livingstone Room. I will go and grab it.

Vote:

For: 17
Against: 4
Abstain: 1

Motion passes

HDMI CABLE FOR LIVINGSTONE ROOM (final)

This JCR notes that—

- ❖ The HDMI cable in the Livingstone Room is really rubbish.

This JCR believes that—

- ❖ We should have a working HDMI cable to watch films et cetera for the collective enjoyment of the JCR.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Mandate the Entz President to bring back the HDMI cable from the Beer Cellar to the Livingstone Room

Proposer: Clara Woodhead
Seconder: Rio Moore

FUNDING FOR OXFORD UNIVERSITY WIND ORCHESTRA (OUWO) TO GO TO NATIONAL CONCERT BAND FESTIVAL

This JCR notes that—

- ❖ Funding for the arts is crucial, yet this is often a challenge for student-led arts initiatives;

- ❖ OUWO, as one of Oxford University Music Society's leading ensembles, consistently performs to a high level and is composed of quality players from a wide range of Oxford Colleges;
- ❖ After performing at the regional festival and achieving the highest accolade of a Platinum award, OUWO has been invited to compete at the national festival, held at the prestigious Royal Northern College of Music in Manchester.

This JCR believes that—

- ❖ Giving some money towards OUWO's trip to the National Concert Band Festival finals would greatly benefit the musical experiences of OUWO's players, including Blanche Cheng at Corpus Christi College;
- ❖ Financially contributing alongside numerous other Oxford Colleges is of great importance to supporting the arts at Oxford, and will be greatly valued by OUWO and its supporters.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Mandate the Treasurer to give £100 to Oxford University Wind Orchestra to help secure their trip to National Concert Band Festival.

Proposer: Blanche Cheng
 Secunder: Catherine Scoon

Questions:

Rei: Jacob, can you explain why this cannot happen?

Jacob: This JCR does not fund student theatre groups, musical groups, student societies, plays, trips, et cetera. The College has the Personal Development Fund and various other funds available. Roughly once a term, someone does a motion like this, but the JCR does not do this type of funding. That would constitutionally require the JCR pass a motion of affiliation with the Oxford University Wind Orchestra. We have never done this in the time that I have been at Corpus.

JJ: Doesn't the SU offer financial support student groups?

Michael: there is a thing you can submit as a society to the SU to get a certain amount of money. I don't know if they have or haven't done that.

JJ: If this motion passes, does it not matter because there still wouldn't be any money given?

Jacob: Yes, this is unconstitutional. The JCR cannot give money to a non-affiliated, non-charitable organisation

Vote:

For: 7

Against: 9

Abstain: 1

Motion fails

9. Motions as Submitted

10. Emergency Motions

11. Any Other Business

Jacob: This Tuesday, from 5:30 PM to 7:30 PM in the SU Building, there is a Student Members Meeting. Corpus' students don't normally attend SU matters, and, in fact, most students do not attend SU matters. At the last SU Hustings, I was one of about six students that weren't standing for election or chairing. With that said, this meeting is something you should genuinely all attend. This is where you can approve or disapprove the Articles of Association and discuss the Bye-Laws, including the amendments to the Bye-Laws. It is important that we demonstrate the voice of Corpus Christi JCR, whatever that might be, as part of this decision-making process. I am coming, and Michael is coming, but you do not have to sit with us.

Michael: I know most people don't normally care about this type of thing. That is because we are in a privileged position where we can choose to not care about it. If we are in a position where we are forcibly reaffiliated, we will have to care and we might be in very tough spots. The amendments proposed and written by PresCom will be voted on, I would highly encourage you to go and vote in favour of them, I know I will because it means we don't have to care about what the SU says. As we have been allowed to do previously.

Jacob: Also, on the SU's website, you can see the amendments in full. I have posted it on the Facebook page, where you can read them. There are ten that were proposed by Nick Lang, which are the ones proposed by PresCom, and two other ones.

JJ: Is it possible to navigate the SU website?

Jacob: I will send a link which directly takes one to the page with the proposed Articles of Association, with the proposed Bye-Laws, and with the proposed amendments. This will bypass any difficulty.

[(Note from the RO) Anything after this point in the minutes has no constitutional effect.]

Various Joke Motions...

AN ISSUE WITH THE LIVINGSTONE ROOM

This JCR notes that—

- ❖ The have recently been “upgrades” to “improve the lighting” of the Livingstone Room;
- ❖ The JCR is incredibly divided over these “upgrades”.

This JCR believes that—

- ❖ Despite the JCR initially voting in favour of the Motion to “upgrade” the lighting in the Livingstone Room, there is now a clash in the décor;
- ❖ The only way to resolve this is with a second Motion.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Choose a new flooring for the Livingstone Room to complement the new lights (see artefacts 1 to 15).

Proposer: The Livingstone Room reformer

Seconder: Local hardwood retailers

Questions:

[Jacob picks a large stack of samples of hardwood flooring from next to him. The stack consists of around twenty square and rectangular pieces.]

Treya: Where did Jacob get those?

Jacob: These are not mine. The proposer gave them to me as a prop.

Treya: No, where did the proposer get them?

Jacob: You will have to ask the proposer.

Ben: JJ can order the samples online for free.

[Samples are passed around the room to be assessed.]

Rei: Would local hardwood retailers be willing to do this all for free, as a donation?

Jacob: These were all free.

JJ: In theory, I have already calculated this, if everyone in here got samples, we could technically floor the Livingstone room with just the free samples.

Debate:

[Ben proposes amendment so that we replace all the lightbulbs with the warming chicken heating lamps.]

Ben: Because they are really cheap at the moment, so we can turn the Livingstone Room into an incubation room.

Treya: For what Ben?

Jacob: I presume that this would be for incubation.

Angelina: Corpus Chickens! We can start a farm.

[Amendment taken as friendly]

[Sam Cohen proposes amendment to use the lights to grow weed]

[Amendment taken as friendly]

Jacob: Of course, you will mean garden weeds, such as dandelions, grasses, and the like.

Ben: Can the treasurer be our distributor?

Treya: I think that you should charge £1 per packet.

Logan: Hypothetically, if there was a JCR drug empire, whose mandate would that fall under?

Michael: Environment and Charities.

Fresher Ben: Oskari is the guy

Michael: I am going to hold both options and the people can decide.

Vote by acclamation (option 2 Lux 12 mm chestnut oak laminate wins)

Vote:

For: a lot

Abstain: a lot less

Against: a lot less

Motion passes

AN ISSUE WITH THE LIVINGSTONE ROOM (final)

This JCR notes that—

- ❖ The have recently been “upgrades” to “improve the lighting” of the Livingstone Room;
- ❖ The JCR is incredibly divided over these “upgrades”.

This JCR believes that—

- ❖ Despite the JCR initially voting in favour of the Motion to “upgrade” the lighting in the Livingstone Room, there is now a clash in the décor;
- ❖ The only way to resolve this is with a second Motion.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Choose a new flooring for the Livingstone Room to complement the new lights (see artefacts 1 to 15);
- ❖ Replace all the new lights with chicken warming incubation lights and to turn the Livingstone Room to an incubation room;
- ❖ To use these new lights to grow garden weeds.

Proposer: The Livingstone Room reformer

Seconder: Local hardwood retailers

BRING BACK WELFARE

This JCR notes that—

- ❖ Corpus has NO Welfare.

This JCR believes that—

- ❖ It is NECESSARY to BRING BACK Welfare.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Revert the name of the Community Officers to Welfare Officers, then further change the name of Welfare Officers to Welfare Warriors.

Proposer: BIG WELFARE

Seconder: *BIG WELFARE (but in italics)*

[Ben proposes an amendment to stop certain welfare officers capitalising their emails so that he doesn't get shouted at every time he reads their emails]

Treya: I agree. I second this amendment

Jacob: Big Welfare I know is very hostile to this amendment and opposes this amendment in any form.

Treya: I feel like it is unfriendly. And the capitalisation is unfriendly.

Vote: (for Big Welfare to be more lower case)

For: 14

Against: 1

Abstain: 0

Jacob: Big Welfare is now little, lowercase welfare.

Treya: Can we make this an actual motion? I don't want to be shouted at in my emails.

Jacob: Joke motions are not actually motions; they are part of Any Other Business. Therefore, there cannot be a procedural motion to make it change section.

JJ: The reason why Big Welfare is Big Welfare is because of Big Brother from 1984.

Treya: [Sarcasm] What? Really?

Fresher ben: Do you want Corpus to be a police state?

Michael: Tell them Ben. Ben what are your thoughts on Big Welfare?

Fresher ben: I personally believe that not living in a police state is a good thing actually.

Michael: So true king, so true. Facts.

Jacob: All facts, no printer.

JJ: Do we not agree that Big Welfare always watching to make sure you are welfared is good?

Angelina: Watching is scary.

Ben: I don't need to be watched.

Michael: I would rather people not watch me.

[Ben amends to remove the welfare warriors section]

[Amendment taken as friendly]

Ben: I am a sick fuck.

Vote:

For: 13

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Jacob: Actually, Big Welfare has just messaged me to say that they are voting against the Motion, and I am fairly certain that their vote counts for at least a hundred votes. Alas, the Motion fails.

Motion fails

BRING BACK WELFARE (final)

This JCR notes that—

- ❖ Corpus has NO Welfare.

This JCR believes that—

- ❖ It is NECESSARY to BRING BACK Welfare.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Make big welfare little welfare (lower case welfare)

Proposer: BIG WELFARE

Seconder: *BIG WELFARE (but in italics)*

[Michael raises procedural motion to remove the RO]

[Trey a seconds]

[Jacob walks from the Executive bench to a more comfortable chair. He sits down.]

Jacob: After one year of service, my time as Returning Officer is finally over.

A CONFESSION

This JCR notes that—

- ❖ In previous years, the number of Motions of No-Confidence that have reached JCR Meetings has been very few, no more than one per year on average;
- ❖ However, there have been no fewer than three in the last year, including two almost unprecedented Motions of No-Confidence in the Executive Committee, with two further attempts that have not made it to the JCR Meeting, also against the Executive Committee;
- ❖ These have all been anonymous, meaning that nobody knows the disruptor, the demagogue, the dastardly deliverer that submitted them.

This JCR believes that—

- ❖ Upon a careful mathematical analysis, it will be revealed that all five of these Motions of No-Confidence occurred during the term of the present Returning Officer;
- ❖ Though the present Returning Officer has insisted that he is unable to submit Motions of No-Confidence and that he would really prefer to not have to deal with the communication with the Dean and the paper ballot, this is not the full story;
- ❖ It is time to reveal the full story.

This JCR resolves to—

- ❖ Declare that the true proposer of all five Motions of No-Confidence has waived his anonymity;
- ❖ Acknowledge that Jacob Harvey submitted all five Motions, in order to take out his rivals in the Executive Committee, use the chaos as an excuse to claim unparalleled supervision over Motions of No-Confidence under the new constitutional rules, and assert his constitutional dominance;
- ❖ Weep as the true scale of Jacob's evil genius becomes apparent.

Proposer: Jacob Harvey (the greatest villain)

Seconder: Ben Wharton (the second-greatest villain)

Questions:

JJ: Which role on exec do you want?

Jacob: All of them.

Treya: Jacob is big Exec.

Jacob: I am Big Exec. I am the Enormous Brother.

Logan: Jacob does this mean that you also wanted environments and charities?

Jacob: I want everything. The JCR Committee Board should just be my face. All of them should be replaced with a huge photograph of me.

Saul: Ahar is your ideal of a JCR?

Jacob: Having read 1984, I am Ben's worst nightmare. I am the police state.

Treya: Jacob, how would you enforce your rule?

Jacob: Unflinchingly, ruthlessly, and with immense cruelty.

Ben: Would you support Corpus death squad?

Jacob: I would be the death squad.

Treya: How did you feel about the no-cons failing.

Jacob: I was upset but I will persevere, I will survive, and I will dominate.

JJ: Will you act aggressive in this police state?

Jacob: We need more thoughtcrime in this JCR.

Ben: I have a question a question about the logistics of all of this.

Jacob: Of course, you do.

Ben: So, last Trinity, when we were all sitting in my room in our flat in Liddell, Treya had just received her no-con, were you just lying to our faces?

Jacob: Oh yes, mwu-ha-ha-ha, I am the master deceiver.

Ben: Then you claimed to walk back to College to handle something. Did you just stand in the courtyard for a bit turning in circles?

Jacob: Yes, my lies are tenfold. I was just circling the garden for three hours. You two lived with me and I deceived both of you

Sam: Under your regime, will Ben Wharton be silenced?

Jacob: Ben Wharton will be the silencer.

[Boos]

Michael: I think you just lost the opinion of the people there

Logan: What other roles will there be in your regime?

Jacob: Other roles? Why would we need other roles?

Logan: Like the silencer.

Jacob: No, no. He is just my puppet. He is actually just me in a suit. There is actually just two of me, and one of me is Ben Wharton.

Treya: Jacob, how does it feel to be peacefully transitioning power to a new RO?

Jacob: Horrible.

Treya: Jacob, will you become a fat cat?

Jacob: I will be the largest feline that you ever did see.

Rei: After this, will you then change the Constitution so that you can then become the RO?

Jacob: I will not merely be the RO. I can't be the Returning Officer, because I don't return things; I just take things.

Debate:

Ben: Jacob, about four weeks ago, explained to me how he intentionally, every single time he has an election, breaks his constitutional rules for the sick sadistic thrill of it. Jacob, every time he has an election, is mandated to submit all names in an arbitrary order. He puts it in alphabetical order. So, I am proposing a No-Con against Jacob.

[Treya seconds]

[Fresher Ben thirds]

Michael: Now, we are having a no confidence motion against Jacob.

Ben: Should we call Marion?

Vote:

For: 13

Against: 2

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

[The meeting is adjourned at 8:33 PM.]