Committee recommends the revised CLOCS application for recognition

On October 16, the committee voted 9-3-0 to recommend the revised Columbia Law Opera and Classical Society (CLOCS) for recognition. On October 1, the committee had voted 4-5-0 not to recommend. Before the committee considered the revised application, Jessica sought to make the committee more representative by expanding it from 9 to 12 members. The three new members had originally been assigned to the committee but could not attend its first meeting.

CLOCS letter to recognition committee (excerpts)

- "The biggest argument against CLOCS seemed to be the group’s intent to use budget money to buy or subsidize tickets for its members. ... I have removed from CLOCS’ constitution any mention of ticket-buying or subsidization. Nowhere, including in our group’s statement of purpose, is there any mention of buying or paying for tickets for our members."

- CLOCS will become a forum through which students can join and participate in the community of classical music fans at Columbia Law School. CLOCS intends to bring in speakers to address its members at lunches throughout the year. I myself have connections to the Met’s general counsel and to the Philharmonic’s programs manager; I know that other CLOCS members have connections to Columbia’s professors of music. Besides organizing excursions to various events off campus, CLOCS will also serve a critical role on campus for students who wish to enrich their knowledge of classical music and meet like-minded people.

- "I have also broadened our mission statement to include all the fine arts that involve classical music. Now, not only will we encompass a broad spectrum of the student body, but also we will be able to absorb other related student groups that may be proposed in the future."
  - [chairperson's note: this change was proposed to CLOCS in a meeting with three committee members, who were concerned that recognizing this group would force fans of other fine arts -- such
as ballet and musical theater -- to "balkanize" into separate groups.]

### Pro votes (excerpts/examples)

- "I appreciate the fact that the subsidizing of tickets was removed from the constitution, and they are focusing on other aspects of the organization, such as bringing in guest speakers. In addition, I find persuasive the fact that they have 50 people who are currently interested in membership and that individual people have approached me expressing their enthusiasm as to whether a "substantial" number of students are interested in this organization."

- I feel that their willingness to make adjustments to accommodate concerns of certain Senators shows their commitment to getting CLOCS off the ground. I also think they have demonstrated that there is significant student interest in this group by having already found 50 students to sign up.

- [I]f there are concerns about the current Senate policy that mandates new clubs receive core funding, these concerns should be addressed. However, I do not think we should deal with these concerns by penalizing students who are trying to form new clubs. ... [I]t seems to me that any problems that exist in Senate's policies are there because we have failed to fix them, and I believe it is unfair to use this as a reason to deny students who pay the student activities fees the chance to create a student group or to inconvenience them by delaying the process while we try to fix the problem.

- "My vote is changing because the purpose of the group has changed to remove mention of ticket buying. Also the expanded purpose of the group will benefit a larger portion of the student body."

- Sounds like a great group, lots of student interest.

- I'm recommending because we already have a Poker Group and it doesn't matter what I think; the student body that I represent, the 1Ls, assures me that they want this."

### Con votes (excerpts/examples)

- [T]he Senate ought to carefully consider the kinds of groups to which the school's limited resources will be made available, to ensure their most efficient use. By their nature, SPECIALIZED hobby groups whose purposes have no connection to the LAW or legal study cannot be presumed to offer a distinct benefit to a SUBSTANTIAL number of LAW students. CLOCS has not convinced me otherwise. . . . The Bicycle Club presented a similar case (1) as a hobby group, (2) with no purposeful connection to law or legal study. . . . To my mind, the distinguishing factor there was health benefit. Given how CLS students generally treat themselves, opportunities for aerobic exercise seem
more likely to offer a distinct benefit to a substantial number of law students than do the activities proposed by CLOCS.

* addendum: "This does NOT mean that specialized hobby groups can NEVER have a "beneficial purpose," only that their beneficial purpose is not as obvious as those groups with law-related missions. In this specific instance, I did not find CLOCS's presentation compelling."

- These high-society lifestyle groups organized and funded directly through the law school coffers distract students from their obligations and responsibilities as law students and future attorneys, and siphon money away from socially responsible uses of student tuition money. There are sundry university-wide and external groups that celebrate the fine arts, which do not tax our time and waste our money. This would become a different debate if Mr. Hershey sought to create a classical music performance troupe that musically-talented law students could join. At least a group like that would be productive and functional.

- They have an e-mail list of 50 members, which ... could seemingly be utilized to recommend that all of the people go to an opera and save everyone $300 (and time). Also, I think this fully opens the door for all hobby groups: would you feel the same about a hip-hop group (CLHHS)? ... An independent film group?