

Joe Cotton  
12<sup>th</sup> March 2018

Dear Elections Committee,

Thank you for informing me of your ruling yesterday.

I understand that I may have given you the impression that the use of iPads was central to my campaign; that the majority of the votes I received were made on iPads; and hence if it is ruled that voting in this way is unconstitutional, then disqualification is warranted.

However, this was not the case, as the vast majority of my campaign was through friendship networks, pidgeon-holing, and word of mouth, with people voting elsewhere. **According to our best estimates, the number of votes cast within three metres of a candidate or campaigner on a device provided by that candidate or campaigner was around 88.** In saying this, I am not accepting the interpretation of a “polling station” in Article G.10.viii that my disqualification is based on, although I would like to identify my compliance with that interpretation once it was made known to me (on Friday 9<sup>th</sup> March at 2:30pm), which shows my commitment to every rule that I am aware of, and that this alleged rule breach was unintentional (further detailed over the page).

I am providing you with this information in good faith so that:

- a) You have a full picture of the extent of voting that was allegedly unconstitutional
- b) You can (re)consider whether disqualification is a proportionate response
- c) I can refer back to this estimate, dated before the results were announced, if I decide to appeal your decision.

<i>Campaigner(s)</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Device</i>	<i>Votes*</i>
■	Christ's	Tue 6th	7:30-8:15pm	iPad 1	7
■	Clare Hall	Tue 6th	8:30-10pm	iPad 1	2
■	Wolfson	Wed 7th	12:30-2pm	iPad 1	15
■	Wolfson	Wed 7th	7:30-8pm	iPad 1	12
■	St Edmunds	Wed 7th	9-10pm	iPad 1	4
■	Wolfson	Wed 7th	12:30-2pm	iPad 1	9
■■■■■	Newnham	Wed 7th	6-8pm	Laptop	8
■■■■■	Wolfson	Wed 7th	7-9pm	iPad 2	3
■	Lucy Cavendish	Thur 8th	7:05-7:30pm	iPad 1	9
■■■■■	Murray Edwards	Fri 9th	12-1pm	Laptop	3
■	Wolfson	Fri 9th	12:14-2pm	Laptop	0
■	Grad Cafe	Fri 9th	12:30-2:15pm	iPad 1	12
■■■■■	Physics	Fri 9th	1-2pm	iPad 2	4

					88
--	--	--	--	--	----

\*Total number of estimated votes cast within three metres of a candidate or campaigner on a device provided by that candidate or campaigner. If the IT facilities exist, these devices can be provided so that the number of votes can be traced by IP address, which would corroborate these estimates.

Further to the evidence I presented to [REDACTED] yesterday; I would like to state that after meeting with the EC on Friday 9<sup>th</sup> March at 2:30 and hearing your interpretation of the “three metre rule”, I was so afraid of being in the wrong that I lost all my confidence and stopped face-to-face campaigning for the rest of the day. Half the members of the CUSU sab team saw me in the Trockel, Ulmann & Freunde café on multiple occasions in the time between the EC meeting and voting close and could confirm I was just sitting at my laptop. I was with [REDACTED] until 3:30pm, after which I went to Jesus College to pick up some audio equipment for my MPhil research from [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were also at Jesus and could confirm that I did not campaign there either. My reaction to this meeting with the EC was so strong exactly because it was a such a shock that I couldn’t confirm I had always followed your interpretation of the “three metre rule”, and I honestly thought I had not been in violation of the rules up until that point.

I would also like to state that rule breaking is so far out of my character that even when breaches were out of my knowledge and control (as was the case with [REDACTED]), I still lost a lot of confidence and missed most of the day of campaigning after meeting with the Elections Committee. You can see in the table above that on Thursday (in which I saw the Elections Committee on multiple occasions, starting at 9:30am) I only recover and go out campaigning once on the whole day by 7pm, (and this is only after a really energising meeting with a college association buoyed my confidence, and because they provided me with advice for a good location to campaign). You will remember the time and energy that I devoted on Thursday to giving you the fullest possible account of what happened with the Facebook post, including screenshots and emails, and the physical impact that being in the wrong had on me (which occasionally put members of your committee in the role of carers).

My argument here is that if rule breaking is unintentional, the punishment should be less severe. To this end, I believe that **my disqualification should only be upheld if it can reasonably be believed that the scale of allegedly unconstitutional voting made a difference to the outcome of the election.**

Once again, I would like to say that I deeply regret all of the labour and stress that has been caused by this, and that I respect you all for just doing your job in such difficult circumstances.

However, I think that it is disproportionate to disqualify me on the basis of (an interpretation of) a technicality that I was not aware of at the time, and which I responded to immediately once made aware of, rather than docking a proportional number of votes.

If you would like to speak with me today before the results are published, I would be much obliged. If not, I request fair warning of when the results and rulings will be published so I can gather some friends and mentally prepare myself.