EXHIBIT D
DECLARATION OF LAURA BLAKE JONES

I, Laura Blake Jones, submit this declaration in connection with the above-captioned matter and in support of Defendants’ opposition to Plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction.

1. I am the Dean of Students at the University of Michigan. My current responsibilities include overseeing the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life and Student Legal Services, in addition to the programs and services of the Dean of Students Office and affiliated departments, including: Expect Respect, the Beyond the Diag Program, the Blavin Scholars Program, the U-M Debate Program and Institutes, and the U-M Central Student Government. I have held this position since 2009. I have over 33 years of experience working in higher education, including previously serving as the Interim Dean of Students, Associate Dean of Students and Director of
the Office of Student Life at the University of Oregon (1994-2009), as the Assistant Director of Housing and Dining Services at UC Berkeley (1987-1994), and as Community Development Coordinator at UC Davis (1985-87).

**Background on the BRT**

2. The Bias Response Team (“BRT”) at the University of Michigan is based out of the Dean of Students Office. It was established during the 2010-11 academic year as an informal resource to support students who feel they have experienced bias in the University community, to refer them to other campus resources as appropriate, and to educate the University community with respect to issues related to bias. It was initially run by Nina Grant, Director of Multi-Ethnic Student Affairs, followed by Sarah Daniels, Associate Dean of Students.

3. During the 2014-15 academic year, BRT expanded to include five members and added its first dedicated staff member.

4. In September 2016, Nicole Perry Banks, now Interim Director of Fraternity and Sorority Life and Assistant Dean of Students, took over leadership of the BRT. Ms. Banks also has over 25 years of experience working in higher education. She oversaw the BRT until October 2017.

5. The current BRT is comprised of representatives from the Dean of Students Office, the Office for Institutional Equity, the Office of the Vice Provost for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, the Division of Public Safety and Security, the Office of Multi-Ethnic Student Affairs, the Office of Student Conflict Resolution
(“OSCR”), and the University Housing, Diversity, and Inclusion Office. Since October 2017, it has been led by Julio Cardona, Interim Assistant Dean of Students. These individuals all have other full-time responsibilities at UM and only dedicate approximately 2-4 hours per month to their work as members of the BRT.

6. Dr. Cardona supervises the only two dedicated BRT staff members, Evelyn Galvan and Brooke Harris, whose titles are Bias Incident Prevention and Response Team Coordinators. Ms. Galvan and Ms. Harris also started in their roles in October 2017. Ms. Harris’ role focuses on proactive educational work with students. She serves as a back up to Ms. Galvan in responding to students impacted by bias incidents if Ms. Galvan is unavailable to respond.

7. Although I am not a member of BRT, each of the BRT leaders has directly reported to me while they were leading it, and I was personally involved in the BRT’s creation and implementation. I also review every entry added to the Bias Response Log before it is published. As Dean of Students, I engage regularly with the BRT and have personal knowledge of its mission and activities.

**Role of the BRT**

8. BRT is not a disciplinary body. It does not—and cannot—punish or sanction anyone. BRT does not make a determination regarding whether a reported incident should be considered an instance of “bias.”

9. Instead, BRT’s goal is to provide an empathetic ear and serve as an educational resource for students who feel negatively impacted by any conduct within
the University community that they perceive as “bias.” That is why the BRT website said that “[t]he most important indication of bias is your own feelings.” PI Ex. F at 3. BRT focuses on the perceptions of the student who feels that he or she has been impacted by bias and on providing support to that student.

10. The educational and support services BRT provides include providing individual support and making referrals to other campus resources as appropriate, teaching active listening skills, and providing voluntary educational programs for individuals and groups, as requested.

11. Because the BRT is focused on providing support to any student who needs it, and not on proving anything or punishing anyone, the description of a “bias incident” that BRT provides online—“conduct that discriminates, stereotypes, excludes, harasses or harms anyone in our community based on their identity (such as race, color, ethnicity, national origin, sex, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, disability, age or religion),” see https://deanofstudents.umich.edu/bias-incidents, attached as Exhibit 1— is intentionally broad. This is not a codification of a legal rule or a disciplinary standard. It is an invitation to students who feel impacted by what they consider to be bias to seek support from professionals who are equipped to help them should the students voluntarily wish to do so.

---

1 This Exhibit, and all subsequent Exhibits to this Declaration, are true and accurate copies of websites that were downloaded as PDF files on June 14, 2018.
12. To be clear, BRT does not investigate reports of bias incidents, nor does it make any findings or conclusions about the reported incidents. It cannot and does not require any student to do anything. All student participation is entirely voluntary.

13. BRT does not make a determination whether conduct reported as a “bias incident” constitutes a violation of University rules or the law. BRT explains online that “[b]ias incidents may involve conduct that does not violate any law or university policy,” although some cases “do involve conduct that may violate federal, state, or local laws or U-M policies.” See Ex. 1. When the substance of a report made to the team may indicate that the conduct could violate the law or University policies, the BRT may discuss appropriate referrals with the reporter.

14. BRT’s log (anonymously) reflects every incident that is reported. The listing merely indicates that a report has been received. It does not reflect any judgment about the incident.

15. I have read the Complaint filed in this lawsuit, including the portions of the Complaint that describe the open and intellectual debate in which Students A, B and C wish to engage. The incidents reported to BRT generally do not involve the type of debate described by Students A, B and C. To the extent political speech has been reported to the BRT, those reports touch on views on both ends of the political spectrum. For example, on January 19, 2016 a student of color reported that he was told by an unidentified man, “I’mma be like Donald Trump, if you ain’t a U.S. citizen, get the fuck out.” On the other hand, on February 4, 2017, a student reported that in
a University of Michigan Facebook group a student posted an inappropriate illustration that “appears to be mocking our current president Donald J. Trump.”

16. The limited role of the BRT—which does not include investigating or punishing anyone—has led to some vocal criticism from students who feel that the University is not doing enough to combat bias on campus. See, e.g., https://www.michigandaily.com/section/campus-life/despite-university-response-bias-incidents-minority-students-still-feel-unsafe, attached as Exhibit 2.

17. I believe that BRT plays an important role on the campus in providing support for our students, particularly students who feel especially vulnerable or come from marginalized communities. The BRT’s educational, referral and support services provide tremendous value to our University community. They do so, though, not through any coercion or discipline, but simply by being willing to listen to and support students in need of assistance.

18. This week the University added language to the BRT website to emphasize the voluntary and non-disciplinary nature of the BRT. Among other language, the following was added:

The BRT is not a disciplinary body. The Office of Student Conflict Resolution is responsible for disciplinary proceedings. The BRT may discuss with a student how to file a complaint with the OSCR or may itself refer a matter to OSCR if it appears that a violation of University’s Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities has been alleged, but it is not the role of the BRT to investigate or determine whether a reported incident involved bias or a violation of university policy. The BRT may invite persons alleged to be responsible for reported incidents to meet with a representative of the BRT to discuss the impact of the incident on
others, but participation in this process is entirely voluntary. The BRT’s sole purpose is to assist those who feel aggrieved by incidents of bias and to promote respect and understanding among members of the University community.

See Ex. 1. At the same time, language was added to emphasize that inclusion of an incident on the BRT log of reported incidents does not mean that bias was found to have occurred:

Because the BRT does not make determinations or judgments about whether bias occurred, inclusion of an incident on the log does not mean that bias was in fact involved. A bias incident may involve speech that is protected by the First Amendment.

See id.

Expression of “Unpopular” Views on Campus

19. As noted above, I have reviewed the allegations in the Complaint that Students A, B and C wish to express unpopular views on such subjects as abortion, welfare reform, immigration, gender identity, gun rights, the “wage gap” between men and women, affirmative action, Title IX, and support for President Trump. Compl. ¶¶ 86-128.

20. The University has a strong commitment to freedom of expression that includes the voicing of unpopular opinions and dissent. Based on my experience, students at the University openly express views similar to those that Students A, B and C claim to hold on a regular basis without any investigation or punishment, including in campus publications and outside media sources. In fact, there are a number of student organizations on campus, recognized by the University, whose
stated purpose is to promote conservative views. Upon request, the University has provided them with free office space on a space available basis. The University also routinely hosts outside speakers and debate forums where these views are publicly discussed.

**Student Groups Recognized by the University**

21. The University has a formal process for the recognition of student groups that contribute to the life of the University. Recognized student groups are listed on the Maize Pages website, [https://maizepages.umich.edu/](https://maizepages.umich.edu/), attached as Exhibit 3, and are eligible to make use of University facilities and services. Each of the student groups discussed in the paragraphs below enjoys University recognition and access to University space.

22. The University’s College Republicans aim, *inter alia*, “to make known and promote the principles of the Republican National Committee (RNC),” “recruit University of Michigan students as members,” and “provide a comfortable/safe environment for socialization of conservative students on campus.” See [https://maizepages.umich.edu/organization/collegerepublicans](https://maizepages.umich.edu/organization/collegerepublicans), attached as Exhibit 4. The group is active on campus. In September 2016, they formally and publicly endorsed Donald Trump for President. See [https://www.michiganreview.com/umich-college-republicans-endorse-donald-trump/](https://www.michiganreview.com/umich-college-republicans-endorse-donald-trump/), attached as Exhibit 5. During the 2016 election cycle, the group also attended campaign events, canvassed for Congressman Fred Upton and State Representative

23. The Federalist Society, based out of the University of Michigan Law School, “is a non-profit membership organization dedicated to bringing conservative and libertarian ideas into legal education.” See https://www.law.umich.edu/journalsandorgs/Pages/FederalistSociety.aspx, attached as Exhibit 7. The Society aims to “provide[ ] opportunities for members to debate and discuss these ideas among themselves, and adds necessary and desirable diversity of thought to the Law School and the University community.” Id. The group also hosts debates. For example, on October 23, 2017, the Federalist Society hosted an event with Professors Josh Blackman and Richard Primus, who debated the constitutionality of President Trump’s travel ban. See https://fedsoc.org/chapters/MI/michigan-student-chapter, attached as Exhibit 8.

24. The Michigan Review is “an independent, student-run journal of campus affairs” that was founded “to bring a conservatively-based review to the University of Michigan.” See https://www.michiganreview.com/about-3/, attached as Exhibit 9. The paper frequently features conservative opinions on a wide range of topics including abortion, gun rights, immigration and political correctness, see infra ¶¶ 32, 34, 41, 45, 54, and has a section on its website for “Satire” articles. It also hosts events
on campus, such as a debate on October 13, 2017, over President Trump’s immigration agenda with Hans von Spakovsky, senior legal fellow at the Heritage Foundation, and Bryan Caplan, economist and adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute. See https://www.michiganreview.com/michigan-review-hosts-immigration-policy-debate/, attached as Exhibit 10.

25. Young Americans for Freedom (“YAF”) is a “non-profit, non-partisan, educational organization dedicated to promoting conservative ideas of free enterprise, limited government, and a strong national defense” and “provid[ing] a visible presence for the Conservative Movement, energiz[ing] other students, and encourag[ing] other students to speak out.” See http://www.yafumich.com/about, attached as Exhibit 11. Their issues of interest also include entitlements. See http://www.yafumich.com/issues, attached as Exhibit 12. Our campus chapter has hosted speakers who have expressed views on a number of topics that overlap with the views of Students A, B and C—including Ben Shapiro, Buzz Patterson, Dinesh D’Souza, Bill Ayers, Raheel Raza, Tom Price, Deroy Murdock, Jonah Goldberg, Jeff Sakwa, David Littman, Jay Nordlinger, George Harbison, and David Horowitz. See http://www.yafumich.com/ourevents, attached as Exhibit 13; infra ¶¶ 58, 62, 63, 65, 71, 76.

26. The Adam Smith Society describes itself as an “association of MBA Students and business leaders who believe that business, entrepreneurship, and commerce are wellsprings that keep this country creative, prosperous, and free.”
“aim to build an influential network of future business leaders who are dedicated to preserving and strengthening the free enterprise system.” See https://michiganross.umich.edu/clubs/adam-smith-society, attached as Exhibit 14.

27. The Young Americans for Liberty (“YAL”) chapter is a libertarian organization that champions, *inter alia*, the free market, freedom of speech and action, private property rights, and the right to self-defense, including the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms. See https://maizepages.umich.edu/organization/YAL, attached as Exhibit 15.

**Student Publications, Petitions and Statements**

28. Opinions and beliefs similar to those attributed to Students A, B and C have been expressed openly and forcefully in a number of publications, petitions and statements circulated on campus.

29. On April 1, 2015, the Michigan Review published a satirical piece entitled “SAFE Unveils #UMMolest.” The piece satirized the Students Allied for Freedom and Equality group’s campaign to petition the University to boycott, divest from, and sanction companies involved in commercial affairs with Israel. See https://www.michiganreview.com/safe-unveils-ummolest-mvmt/, attached as Exhibit 16.

31. On October 4, 2015, a medical student wrote a piece in the Michigan Daily criticizing his colleagues’ petition against a planned visit from then-Congressman Tom Price. He defended Dr. Price’s votes on the Violence Against Women Act, the Constitutional Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act, and legislation transferring federal funds from Planned Parenthood to other community health centers. See https://www.michigandaily.com/section/viewpoints/viewpoint-conservatives-should-not-be-excluded-leadership, attached as Exhibit 18.

32. On October 17, 2015, a student wrote a pro-life piece in the Michigan Review that denounced Planned Parenthood as “an organization that butchers children in the womb for profit.” See https://www.michiganreview.com/pro-life-dead-on-the-diag/, attached as Exhibit 19.

33. On November 9, 2015, a student, a self-described Republican, wrote a piece in the Michigan Daily that argued in favor of adding “political and intellectual discrimination” to the University’s nondiscrimination policy. See https://www.michigandaily.com/section/viewpoints/victoria-noble-political-tolerance-ford-school, attached as Exhibit 20.

34. On September 12, 2016, the Michigan Review published a satirical piece entitled “Welcome to Michigan!” The post used humor to criticize, amongst other things, the dialogue surrounding micro-aggressions, gender politics, trigger warnings,


36. On September 29, 2016, a student wrote a piece in the Michigan Review denouncing “safe spaces,” “trigger warnings” and political correctness. In the piece, “Why I Dropped My English Major,” the student admits that he was “never chastised for violating safe space protocols” but “detected a ‘spirit’ of extreme intellectual complacency.” See https://www.michiganreview.com/dropped-english-major/, attached as Exhibit 23.

37. In the fall of 2016, a student who is the founding chairman of Young Americans for Freedom (“YAF”) at the University updated his preferred pronoun on official rosters to “His Majesty” to protest the “absurdity” of the University policy allowing students to be referred to by their preferred pronouns. The student was interviewed on Fox News and had his story shared in major national media outlets like the Washington Post. See, e.g., https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/education/wp/2016/10/07/a-university-told-students-to-select-their-gender-pronouns-one-chose-his-majesty/?utm_term=.cf6970576264, attached as Exhibit 24.


40. On November 21, 2016, a student wrote an article in the Michigan Daily arguing that “it’s time to stop calling Trump voters sexists, misogynists, racist [sic] and bigots” and that hashtags such as “#NotMyPresident” “represent intolerance.” See https://www.michigandaily.com/section/columns/max-rysztak-it-time-argue-unity, attached as Exhibit 27.

two/, attached as Exhibit 30; https://www.michiganreview.com/abortion-debate-series-round-three/, attached as Exhibit 31.

42. On January 12, 2017, the Michigan Daily quoted the student president of the University College Republicans, saying that the group was “thrilled” about President Trump’s 2016 victory and eager to help University Regent Ron Weiser in his campaign for Michigan Republican Chair. See https://www.michigandaily.com/section/government/michigan-college-democrats-and-republicans-reflect-2017-plans-following-trump, attached as Exhibit 32.

43. On February 1, 2017, a student published an article in the Michigan Daily denouncing the “unilateral criticism” of and “hateful rebuke” against President Trump. See https://www.michigandaily.com/section/columns/nicholas-tomaino-mythology-illegitimacy, attached as Exhibit 33.

44. On February 13, 2017, a student published an article in the Michigan Review criticizing Students4Justice, a student organization, for demanding that the University allocate “space on central campus for Black students and students of color to organize, and do social justice work,” calling their proposal “unprincipled and laughably regressive.” See https://www.michiganreview.com/u-ms-students4justice-demanding-segregated-space-campus/, attached as Exhibit 34.

45. On March 27, 2017, a student published a piece in the Michigan Review defending the President’s travel ban entitled, “Ninety Days: Donald Trump and the


48. On April 15, 2017, a student published a piece in the Michigan Review entitled, “Students Act Like Little Fascists Because They Refuse to Grow Up,” in which he used sarcasm and humor to criticize students at two other universities for “intolerance” who protested against a scheduled speaker on race and policing. See https://www.michiganreview.com/students-act-like-little-fascists-refuse-grow/, attached as Exhibit 38.

49. On May 23, 2017, the University’s College Republicans President and its Vice President of Internal Affairs praised President Trump’s budget proposal in the Michigan Daily. See https://www.michigandaily.com/section/news/trump-budget, attached as Exhibit 39.
50. On December 6, 2017, the Michigan Review Editorial Board published an op-ed entitled “Richard Spencer Has a Right to Speak” to voice support for the University’s negotiations to accommodate Richard Spencer’s request to speak on campus. See https://www.michiganreview.com/richard-spencer-right-speak/, attached as Exhibit 40.

51. On December 7, 2017, a student published a piece in the Michigan Review on what he sees as “disturbing” affirmative action practices in faculty hiring. He argued that “wording job listings and applications to signal ‘we are not interested in white men’ without outright saying the words themselves is an unacceptable means to an unsettling end.” See https://www.michiganreview.com/affirmative-action-frankenstein-u-m-bypasses-prop-2/, attached as Exhibit 41.

52. On December 15, 2017, the Michigan Review published a pro-life piece by a Democrats for Life member entitled, “What Does it Really Mean to be Pro-Life?” See https://www.michiganreview.com/really-mean-pro-life/, attached as Exhibit 42. He argued that the Democratic platform “has been pushed to the farthest extremes by groups like Planned Parenthood and its lobbying-arm NARAL” and blamed these “abortion-lobby extremists” for the party’s losses in 2010. Id. He also took a jab at liberal elitism, writing that, “It can be easy for us as Democrats to retreat into the headlines of the New York Times or clips from the latest Jimmy Kimmel monologue to convince us of the superiority of our ideas.” Id.
53. On January 5, 2018, a student published a piece highly critical of the University’s “costly and pointless diversity plan” (the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (“DEI”) Plan) for the website of the James G. Martin Center for Academic Renewal. See https://www.jamesgmartin.center/2018/01/university-michigans-costly-pointless-diversity-plan/, attached as Exhibit 43.


55. On April 28, 2018, the outgoing Editor-in-Chief of the Michigan Review published a farewell message in which he stated that he had “great confidence that we have made excellent strides toward creating a space on campus where all opinions are welcome, regardless of partisan ties. We have enshrined a publication for which any student can let their viewpoint be heard and contribute to difficult conversations regarding complex issues both in Ann Arbor and across the globe.” See https://www.michiganreview.com/a-fond-farewell/, attached as Exhibit 45.

56. That message echoed the sentiments expressed by a student on March 29, 2016 in an article for the Odyssey. Reflecting on his experience as a conservative on campus, that student wrote that he “love[s]” the “engaging policy discussion[s]” he has had with liberal students and that his fears that professors “would be pushy with their ideologies or if the student body was going to discount my conservative
views” have been “somewhat unwarranted.” See https://www.theodysseyonline.com/conservatism-liberal-campus, attached as Exhibit 46.

Speakers and Events Hosted or Permitted by the University

57. There have been a variety of events sponsored by the University, schools within the University, student groups, and others in which speakers have expressed views similar to those attributed to Students A, B and C, presented views from a conservative perspective, or addressed the importance of preserving free and open debate on campus.

58. On February 12, 2015, the University’s YAF chapter hosted an event on “liberal fascism” with bestselling author and syndicated columnist Jonah Goldberg of the National Review. See https://www.michigandaily.com/news/goldberg, attached as Exhibit 47. Among other things, Goldberg is the author of “Liberal Fascism: The Secret History of the American Left from Mussolini to the Politics of Meaning.”

59. On December 9, 2015, leaders and students from the University of Michigan Medical School held a closed-press meeting with then-2016 Republican presidential candidate Dr. Ben Carson before a campaign stop and fundraiser. See https://www.michigandaily.com/section/news/ben-carson-and-u, attached as Exhibit 48.

60. On February 9, 2016, the Federalist Society hosted Ari Cohn of the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (“FIRE”) to discuss free speech on
college campuses. See https://www.facebook.com/events/1669111693344933/, attached as Exhibit 49.

61. On February 23, 2016, the Michigan Review hosted a debate between Milo Yiannopoulos and Julie Bindel entitled “Does Feminism Have a Free Speech Problem?” Mr. Yiannopoulos’s provocative articles on Breitbart include “Attack of the Killer Dykes!”, “Feminist Bullies are Tearing the Video Game Industry Apart,” and “Does Feminism Make Women Ugly?” His Twitter hashtag #FeminismIsCancer also has generated controversy. The event was part of Mr. Yiannopoulos’s “Dangerous Faggot Tour 2016” and was moderated by Professor Lisa Disch of the University’s Women’s Studies and Political Science Departments. See https://www.facebook.com/events/1638591346401727/, attached as Exhibit 50.

62. On March 16, 2016, YAF and the Washtenaw County Republicans held an event entitled “Why We Are [Politically] Conservative: A Conversation with Leaders from the Jewish Community.” Among the speakers were Michigan Republican Party Co-Chair Jeff Sakwa. See https://www.facebook.com/events/1040001969397170/, attached as Exhibit 51.

63. On April 7, 2016, YAF and the University’s Central Student Government hosted an event with conservative commentator Ben Shapiro, where he described attacks on freedom of speech, such as micro-aggressions and the concept of privilege. See https://www.michigandaily.com/section/news/ben-shapiro-talks-truth-microaggression, attached as Exhibit 52.
64. On April 30, 2016, Michael Bloomberg gave our University’s Spring Commencement Address. In his remarks, Mr. Bloomberg spoke out against “safe spaces,” “code words,” and “trigger warnings,” calling them “a terrible mistake.” He also derided “microaggressions,” saying that “One of the most dangerous places on a college campus is a safe space because it creates the false impression that we can insulate ourselves from those who hold different views. . . . In the global economy, and in a democratic society, an open mind is the most valuable asset you can possess.” See https://www.michigandaily.com/section/news/bloomberg-talks-microaggressions-safe-spaces-spring-commencement-speech, attached as Exhibit 53.

65. On September 14, 2016, YAF hosted Fox News Commentator and National Review columnist Deroy Murdock, who gave a speech entitled “Give me liberty, or give me debt!” See https://www.facebook.com/events/191093731302600/, attached as Exhibit 54.

66. On September 22, 2016, the Federalist Society hosted Karin Agness, Founder and President of the Network of Enlightened Women, who spoke on feminism and conservatism. See https://fedsoc.org/events/feminism-and-conservativism, attached as Exhibit 55.

67. On September 29, 2016, YAL hosted Associate Professor Jon Shields of Claremont McKenna College to speak on political diversity in higher education. See https://yaliberty.org/news/jon-shields-comes-to-michigan/, attached as Exhibit 56.
68. On October 19, 2016, about 40 students gathered on campus to attend the College Republicans’ debate-watching party. Randy Clark, a GOP candidate for a Michigan state house seat, addressed the crowd before the debate to encourage student political involvement. Several students spoke openly with the Michigan Daily about their support for Donald Trump. See https://www.michigandaily.com/section/elections/college-democrats-and-republicans-hold-watch-parties-presidential-debate, attached as Exhibit 57.

69. On October 27, 2016, the Federalist Society hosted Sandra Froman, former president of the NRA, to discuss the Second Amendment. See https://www.law.umich.edu/newsandinfo/features/Pages/guncontrol_110216.aspx, attached as Exhibit 58.

70. On November 8, 2016, over 50 students from various conservative groups at the University of Michigan, including YAF, Students for Life, and the Campus Republicans gathered on campus to watch the results of the 2016 election and cheer when Mr. Trump won a state. At the event, several students spoke openly with the Michigan Daily to express their support for Mr. Trump. See https://www.michigandaily.com/section/elections/student-republicans-anxiously-await-results-election-watch-party, attached as Exhibit 59.

71. On November 30, 2016, YAF held an event on “progressive censorship” with David Horowitz, the founder and president of the David Horowitz Freedom Center and director of Discover the Networks, a website that tracks individuals and
groups on the political left. Mr. Horowitz has led advertising campaigns condemning the boycott movement against Israel on college campuses. His books include: “Progressive Racism,” “The Black Book of the American Left,” and “The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America.” See https://www.facebook.com/events/1060354250753135/, attached as Exhibit 60.

72. In the fall of 2017, the University offered a course entitled “Beyond Partisanship,” a course that sought to investigate issues on which a significant majority of Republicans and Democrats agree. See https://record.umich.edu/articles/course-promotes-search-political-common-ground-solutions, attached as Exhibit 61. One of the leaders who participated in the course was Beth Myers, GOP strategist and former Mitt Romney campaign manager. Id.

74. On October 11, 2017, the American Enterprise Institute Executive Council and College Republicans hosted a lecture and Q&A session with Dr. Charles Murray of the American Enterprise Institute. Dr. Murray is the author of “The Bell Curve” and “Losing Ground.” He is also the author of “What It Means to Be a Libertarian,” “Coming Apart,” and “By the People: Rebuilding Liberty Without Permission.” See https://www.facebook.com/AEIUofM/, attached as Exhibit 63.

75. On October 25, 2017, the College Republicans hosted an event with Michigan gubernatorial candidate and State Senator Patrick Colbeck. Mr. Colbeck addressed a wide range of issues including government spending, political discourse on college campuses, and the refugee crisis. Mr. Colbeck said he had encouraged Governor Rick Snyder to “keep his finger on the pause button in regards to Syrian refugees.” See https://www.michigandaily.com/section/government/republican-gubernatorial-candidate-speaks-candidacy, attached as Exhibit 64.

76. On October 26, 2017, YAF hosted conservative speaker Lt. Col Buzz Patterson, former Senior Military Aide to President Bill Clinton. The event focused on Mr. Patterson’s experiences in the Clinton White House and “what really happened” in in the 2016 presidential election. Noting that Mr. Clinton was “not quite the commander-in-chief [he] had expected,” Mr. Patterson accused Mr. Clinton of opting to watch golf instead of prevent thousands of Kurds from dying in Iraq. He also claimed the Clintons’ marriage was something of a farce and accused Mr. Clinton of losing the nuclear codes for “days or months” in the wake of the Monica Lewinsky
scandal.  See https://www.michiganreview.com/former-clinton-military-aide-tells-students-really-happened, attached as Exhibit 65.

77. On November 2, 2017, YAF co-hosted a panel discussion on immigration policy called “Who Should We Let In?” The event featured Reihan Salam of Slate and National Review, who “argues from a conservative perspective that open-border policies will train important social and political institutions, in part by dramatically increasing inequality.” See https://www.facebook.com/events/839749412854587/, attached as Exhibit 66. It also featured Hrishikesh Joshi, who “contends . . . that partial border enforcement is both unjust and bad public policy.” Id.

78. On December 4, 2017, the University’s Ford School of Public Policy hosted a dialogue on federal tax reform between Dave Camp, a former Republican Congressman from Michigan and Chair of the House Ways & Means Committee, and Ford School Dean Michael S. Barr. The talk was moderated by President Mark S. Schlissel. See https://news.umich.edu/federal-tax-reform-a-bipartisan-dialogue/, attached as Exhibit 67.

79. On January 8, 2018, Nathan Williamson, Field Representative at the Leadership Institute, which provides training for conservative activists, brought a giant beach ball labeled “Free Speech” to the Diag. Students wrote a variety of political messages on the ball without incident. See
80. On January 30, 2018, the American Enterprise Institute Executive Council held a lecture and Q&A session on “The Iran Deal, Iran Protests, and the Future of the Middle East” with AEI scholar Michael Rubin. See https://www.michiganreview.com/middle-east-policy-age-trump-talk-michael-rubin/, attached as Exhibit 69.

81. On February 13, 2018, the College Republicans hosted an event on ideological diversity featuring conservative pundit Charlie Kirk. Mr. Kirk is the Founder and CEO of Turning Point USA, a national student movement whose mission is to educate students about the values of limited government and free markets. See https://www.michiganreview.com/u-m-college-republicans-host-turning-point-usa-founder-charlie-kirk/, attached as Exhibit 70.


83. On February 19, 2018, the Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy, Center for the Education of Women, Wallace House, Institute for Research on Women and Gender, University of Michigan Law School, Department of Political Science, and Office of the Provost hosted Ana Navarro, a Republican strategist and


85. On April 11, 2018, YAF had Christina Hoff Sommers speak on “Where Leftist Feminism Went Wrong.” The event focused on how “the once noble cause of feminism lost its way and why it may take conservative women to put it back on track.” See https://www.facebook.com/events/155589421934745/, attached as Exhibit 74.

**Forums for Debate and Discussions**

86. Finally, there are several organizations on campus that provide a forum for precisely the kind of open and robust intellectual debate in which Students A, B and C say they wish to engage.

87. The Michigan Political Union (“MPU”) is a student-led group that “provides a non-partisan parliamentary forum to facilitate discussion and debate on contemporary political issues. The organization prides itself on its openness to provide a place for those throughout the political spectrum to communicate and its
willingness to tackle tough and at times controversial issues.” See https://maizepages.umich.edu/organization/mpu, attached as Exhibit 75. In recent years, its events have included debates on:

a. The merits of U.S. refugee policy on January 19, 2016, debating a resolution that “The United States of America should suspend the admittance of Syrian refugees into the country,” see https://maizepages.umich.edu/event/832827, attached as Exhibit 76;

b. Various topics including campaign finance, gay marriage, affirmative action, and the future of the Supreme Court, on March 8, 2016, see https://maizepages.umich.edu/event/832838, attached as Exhibit 77;

c. The merits of the Black Lives Matter movement on September 27, 2016, see https://maizepages.umich.edu/event/1079641, attached as Exhibit 78;

d. The qualifications of both candidates in the 2016 presidential race on October 18, 2016, including a resolution that “due to her negligence while handling classified information, American voters should not trust Secretary Clinton to be the military’s next commander-in-chief,” see https://maizepages.umich.edu/event/1109856, attached as Exhibit 79;

e. Immigration, Social Security, Guantanamo Bay, and climate change policy on October 25, 2016, debating, inter alia, a resolution that “The United States should place a temporary moratorium on all immigration as it readjusts its
priorities for admission,” see https://maizepages.umich.edu/event/1122203, attached as Exhibit 80.

f. Universal basic income on January 12, 2017, see https://maizepages.umich.edu/event/1179020, attached as Exhibit 81;

g. Whether Ann Arbor should become a sanctuary city in response to President Trump’s attempted DACA rescission on October 10, 2017, see https://maizepages.umich.edu/event/1595617, attached as Exhibit 82;

h. Gun control policies on October 24, 2017, see https://maizepages.umich.edu/event/1624734, attached as Exhibit 83;

i. Abortion, the New Deal, and secession on November 2, 2017, debating, inter alia, a resolution that “[d]espite the decision to legalize abortion in Roe v. Wade, such procedures are an inappropriate use of tax dollars,” see https://maizepages.umich.edu/event/1624733, attached as Exhibit 84.

88. WeListen is a grassroots organization founded by University students in September 2017 to facilitate small-group discussions between liberals and conservatives on campus. See https://www.michigandaily.com/section/campus-life/welisten, attached as Exhibit 85. So far, the group has hosted discussions on gun control, immigration, the right to protest, refugees, and the death penalty. Id. The group, whose leadership reports being equally split between conservatives and liberals, says that it makes a particular effort to reach out to conservative students and gets about 30 percent conservative attendance at its events. Id. The group aims to show
"that constructive political discourse is both possible and valuable." See https://maizepages.umich.edu/organization/WeListen, attached as Exhibit 86.

89. The Michigan Debate Program "is committed to student learning and development via participation in intercollegiate policy debate." See https://deanofstudents.umich.edu/article/michigan-debate-program, attached as Exhibit 87.

90. CONSIDER: "is a student run point/counterpoint publication on campus that features non-partisan civil discourse on a wide range of issues." See https://maizepages.umich.edu/organization/consider, attached Exhibit 88.

* * *

91. None of the students who have engaged in any of the speech or speech-related activities described in this Declaration have been subjected to any disciplinary action or any threat of disciplinary action. Indeed, it would be unimaginable for any University administrator to suggest that any of this activity was contrary to any University policy or an appropriate subject of any disciplinary proceeding.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on: 6/15, 2018

Laura Blake Jones
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EXHIBIT 1
Creating and maintaining a respectful and welcoming environment for all to live, learn, work and thrive is a priority at the University of Michigan. To that end, a group of professional staff members, the Bias Response Team, focuses on addressing incidents that may reflect bias against members of the University community based on their identity.

**Bias incident reports by U-M students, faculty and staff are addressed by the Bias Response Team.** The Bias Response Team (BRT) is committed to providing support for those who may have been targets of or affected by bias. The BRT works to ensure that appropriate University resources and expertise are made available to anyone who feels they have been harmed by bias. Therefore, anyone who feels they have been affected by an incident of bias is encouraged to make a report to the BRT, so the University can offer assistance. The BRT cannot impose discipline and no one is required to participate in any aspect of the BRT’s work. Its purpose is to assist those who feel aggrieved, to help students, faculty or staff understand how their behavior has affected others and, over time, to contribute to the maintenance of respect and understanding among members of the University community.

**WHAT IS A BIAS INCIDENT**

A bias incident is conduct that discriminates, stereotypes, excludes, harasses or harms anyone in our community based on their identity (such as race, color, ethnicity, national origin, sex, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, disability, age, or religion).

Bias may stem from fear, misunderstanding, hatred or stereotypes. It may be intentional or unintentional.
The **Bias Response Team** is comprised of representatives from the following units:

- Dean of Students Office (DOS)
- Office for Institutional Equity (OIE)
- Office of the Vice Provost for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI)
- Division of Public Safety and Security (DPSS)
- Office of Multi-Ethnic Student Affairs (MESA)
- Office of Student Conflict Resolution (OSCR)
- University Housing, Diversity and Inclusion

The Bias Response Team may include other university representatives as needed, including staff or faculty from academic schools and colleges, human resources, and relevant administrative units. Community representatives who serve the U-M community may also be notified and asked to assist in educational response efforts.

The BRT is not a disciplinary body. The Office of Student Conflict Resolution is responsible for disciplinary proceedings. The BRT may discuss with a student how to file a complaint with OSCR or may itself refer a matter to OSCR if it appears that a violation of University's *Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities* has been alleged, but it is not the role of the BRT to investigate or determine whether a reported incident involved bias or a violation of university policy. The BRT may invite persons alleged to be responsible for reported incidents to meet with a representative of the BRT to discuss the impact of the incident on others, but participation in this process is entirely voluntary. The BRT’s sole purpose is to assist those who feel aggrieved by incidents of bias and to promote respect and understanding among members of the University community.

**HOW TO REPORT A BIAS INCIDENT**

We encourage you to use these resources to report incidents and to encourage others to report if they have been the target of or witness to a bias incident.

There are several ways you can report a bias incident. The staff members at these offices are trained to be sensitive to student, faculty, staff and community concerns.

- **Online**
  
  ![Report Online]

**WHERE TO REPORT**

The University is committed to ensuring that students, faculty and staff can report incidents of bias in a confidential setting and without fear of retaliation. The staff of these offices has been trained to be welcoming and sensitive to student, faculty, staff, and community concerns. **Where to report.**

**WHAT HAPPENS NEXT**

After you report an incident, a member of the Bias Response Team will contact you to set up a meeting to discuss what happened and offer support and assistance. You will learn about your rights as a U-M community member and the available response options. With your input,
**By Phone**

Bias Incident Reporting Line: Call **734-615-BIAS** (2427) to report an incident during normal working hours (Monday-Friday, 8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.). If it is after hours, leave a message and a staff member will get back with you by the next business day. Faculty and staff who call the number during normal business hours will be connected to the Office for Institutional Equity; students will be connected to the Dean of Students Office.

**In Person**

Wondering where to report an incident? View our reporting areas. These offices and resources exist to support students, staff and faculty.

**Download the How to report an Incident PDF to print, post, and share this information.**
EXHIBIT 2
Minority students disappointed in University’s response to bias incidents

Wednesday, February 22, 2017 - 7:29pm

President Mark Schlissel at a Central Student Government Assembly meeting in the Union in November 2016. Buy this photo

Kevin Zheng/Daily

KAELA THEUT
Daily Staff Reporter

When posters promoting white supremacy were found covering the walls of University of Michigan buildings on multiple occasions last fall, students, including Art & Design senior Keysha Wall, tore them down. When Islamophobic messages were chalked on the Diag last spring, a group of Muslim students were some of the first to grab rags and buckets of water to wash the messages off themselves.

As bias incidents continue to occur across campus despite University-wide emails denouncing the actions of the perpetrators, students have started to question the
effectiveness of the way the administration responds to the attacks. Many have also called out University President Mark Schlissel for not adequately affirming his support for what they believe is minority students on campus.

Wall, a member of the University’s chapter of By Any Means Necessary, expressed her disappointment in the University’s response to the posters targeting minority groups on campus that occurred earlier this year. She believes the perpetuation of bias-related incidents is contingent on the lack of administrative pushback against hate speech.

“We can say that these attacks began with the racist and fascist fliers that started going up last semester,” she said. “Every time they went up, it was students, myself included, who tore them down. During this, the University's official statement was that they would take no action against ‘free speech,’ although I think we can all agree that what those fliers were expressing was hate speech, not free speech. And so the fliers continued to be put up.”

Despite students’ expressions of anger regarding the chalkings and posters, the University legally could not remove either, as they were posted in areas meant for the dissemination of information. If government-financed state universities adopt speech codes preventing free speech, organizations like the American Civil Liberties Union argue such regulations violate the First Amendment and constitute government censorship.

University spokesman Rick Fitzgerald said though the University cannot remove fliers or chalkings on the basis of content, it did remove the fliers from places where postings are not allowed. He further explained how, as a place of higher education, the University seeks to combat hateful speech through education.

“The general philosophy is that the First Amendment right is interpreted broadly, by us and by the courts, to mean all kinds of speech, including writings or posters or chalkings,” he said. “We believe that the best approach to combat speech that is hateful, or that we think is inappropriate or that we disagree with, is the use of more speech and education. The educational component is a really important part of our mission and our responsibility, to help educate the young people and others who are part of our University community, and that's a role we take very seriously.”

Fitzgerald noted if speech contains threats or promises of harm, the University and law enforcement can get involved. He also pointed to the University’s bias response team as a unique feature that not all schools have to combat bias incidents.

“If I threaten to do something, physical harm to you, that’s a threat and is dealt with differently than speech,” Fitzgerald said. “Having a bias response team is not something that all campuses have, our own Division of Public Safety and Security and our own
police force that is sensitive to and trains specifically for college campuses is not something that every campus has.”

In response to the racist poster incidents, student organization Students4Justice drafted a petition to Schlissel in September with a list of demands. These demands included requests for Schlissel to declare solidarity with students of color, schedule more office hours and time for students to voice their concerns to the president directly, and to display a Black Lives Matter flag — as means of addressing the humanity of Black students.

The petition was re-drafted in February after racist and anti-Semitic emails were sent out to University engineering and computer science students, and a prayer rug in the Shapiro reflection room was defiled. Though the University released official statements condemning the incidents, Wall believes administrators need to take more aggressive action in punishing the perpetrators.

“When those racist and anti-Semitic emails went out, and students, outraged and scared, marched to President Schlissel’s front door, he asked what he should do, what the University should do, what we wanted him to do, about the situation,” Wall said. “But the fact of the matter is that his concern was a long time coming, because this was not a new situation. Each time the University has done nothing to protect its students from violence, racism and bigotry. They do two things: They are letting us know we don't matter, and they are making it clear to racists and fascists and bigots that they won't face any repercussions for harming students.”

Walls explained that one of the ways students can protect their rights, and the rights of vulnerable people on campus, is to protest — even if the University opposes their methods. She affirmed how powerful students can be when they come together.

“Student strikes and protests are incredibly powerful,” she said. “I often think that we lose sight of the sheer amount of power we as the student body have when influencing what goes on here on campus, and also in the rest of the nation. Right now, we need to continue fighting for our most vulnerable peoples, especially undocumented students. We must also set the example for the University and the rest of the nation, and we cannot wait to only do so if the University gives us the OK to protest.”

Other social groups have attempted to harness the power of student activism. In an October meeting in the Michigan Union, Students4Justice leader Vikrant Garg, a Public Health student, said the administration needs to acknowledge the large amount of emotional and physical labor student activists put into their work. He also explained how, through student activism, Students4Justice attained a space in the Union to organize and reflect after meeting with Schlissel.
“We looked at the administration to be people who are receptive to student activism and student influences, and open to change,” Garg said. “There is a lot of unpaid emotional, physical and academic labor from students of color and other marginalized students on this campus — so this space that was created, was created in response to student activism on this campus and that has yet to be acknowledged by the administration.”

To show their disappointment in the administration’s response to recent bias incidents, members of Students4Justice have called for more protests as well — the most recent being the Campus Day Silent Protest on Feb. 17. This event was coupled with the release of a document titled, “Letter to President Schlissel #SchlisselWYA,” which voiced the group’s dissatisfaction with Schlissel for not answering its demands or voicing solidarity with its cause.

The group expressed frustration that Schlissel responded to a petition from supporters of President Donald Trump last fall who stated they did not feel safe on campus, but has not yet responded to their demands for a more inclusive campus.

“When our demands were first presented to you over dinner, the demands were glossed over and forgotten,” the letter reads. “Interestingly enough, according to your post-election interview with NPR in Fall of 2016, you reached out to the students who supported President Donald Trump after a simple Google document, #NotMyCampus, was sent out. It is very frustrating as an activist to not be acknowledged despite the time we dedicate to change on this campus for marginalized groups, whereas it takes a single Google document for primarily white students with oppressive opinions to grasp your attention.”

The letter also criticized Schlissel’s lack of understanding regarding his role of power in the University, and accused him of relying completely on his Diversity, Equality, and Inclusion plan — released last October — to avoid discussions of race.

“You need to understand your own identities and the power you have in creating a culture that is not oppressive for marginalized students,” the letter reads. “Instead, you lean on the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Plan to prove your commitment to diversity.”

The DEI plan was put into place with the goal of achieving a diverse and inclusive campus over the next five years, through initiatives including the increase of staff diversity, retention of under-privileged students and the assurance of equal compensation for all races, genders and identities. The overall plan comprises 49 unit plans created by all school, colleges and departments at the University. Two student panels consisting of 25 undergraduate and graduate students each convene every month to discuss new strategies and ideas with DEI leaders.
Fitzgerald noted the plan was conceived as a sort of “ground-up initiative,” and students are still encouraged to voice their ideas and opinions to improve its quality.

“The plan was intended from the very beginning to be one that is updated and evolved; it was never thought: ‘Here’s the five year plan, follow that and we will see you in five years,’ ” he said. “Updates and adjustments along the way are expected, and student input is critically important to that effort.”

In an interview earlier this month, Chief Diversity Officer Rob Sellers, vice provost for equity and inclusion, explained that though the plan can’t prevent individual hateful incidents on campus, it will, over a period of time, create a more inclusive environment.

“We have a whole lot of incidents that are sparks, and these sparks are being thrown on a floor that is full of gasoline, and so these fires are raging,” he said. “(We) cannot prevent the sparks. What the DEI is trying to do is create an environment where those sparks do not lead to explosions and fires. The fact of the matter is it’s going to take a while before we see all of the changes.”

Wall believes though the plan appears cohesive and proactive on the surface, it does not address how the University responds to bias incidents — one of the core concerns of groups such as BAMN and Students4Justice.

“I think one of the main problems with the DEI plan is that it mainly outlines more ways in which the University will ‘look into’ racist and biased/bigoted events,” Wall said. “Many of the points highlight looking at numbers, doing surveys or opening more lines for people to report bigoted events. These things seem proactive on the surface, but the fact is the problem has never been the need for more accurate numbers, or the University not knowing about the issues that have been plaguing the campus; the problem has always been how the University responds to these incidents.”

Wall explained the importance of ensuring students of color, LGBTQ students and immigrant students feel safe and a part of a diverse, inclusionary campus.

“We cannot be indecisive or weak in our actions now, and it is absolutely the onus of the University to prove that these are values that it upholds,” she said.
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In response to discovery of new posters, Schlissel emphasizes proactivity

Following week of protests, anti-Black, anti-Muslim and anti-LGBTQ posters found on campus
University president responds to month of various diversity, inclusion issues on campus
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EXHIBIT 3
Discover unique opportunities at University of Michigan - Ann Arbor

Search Events, Organizations and News Articles

Find Organizations
Join a new organization and utilize discussion, news posts, and group messaging.

Attend Events
Discover events happening on campus or in your area.

Track Involvement
Record your activities and memberships on campus to showcase your Involvement.

Events
### Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Boathouse 1</th>
<th>Open Boathouse 2</th>
<th>Open Boathouse 3</th>
<th>Open Boathouse 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🕒 Sunday, Septe...</td>
<td>🕒 Sunday, Septe...</td>
<td>🕒 Monday, Septe...</td>
<td>🕒 Monday, Septe...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>📍 Boathouse</td>
<td>📍 Boathouse</td>
<td>📍 Boathouse</td>
<td>📍 Boathouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Rowing</td>
<td>Men's Rowing</td>
<td>Men's Rowing</td>
<td>Men's Rowing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Latest News

**Miscellania is sponsored by Studypool, a leader in online homework help**

Tuesday, June 12

*Posted by Jordan Brown for Miscellania*
Studypool is an online marketplace that connects students with questions with tutors who can answer them. Using Studypool gives you access to thousands of verified tutors to help you with any question at any time.

**Sponsorship by Studypool**
Monday, June 11
*Posted by Keqiang Li for Wolverine Rock Climbers*

**Chemistry Help**
Sunday, June 10
*Posted by Zaid Fayyad for Students for Flint*

**Campus Links**

- Center for Campus Involvement (CCI)
- Student Organization Accounts Service (SOAS)
- Student Organization Resource Center (SORC)
- Student Organization Forms
- Student Organization Guidebook
- Central Student Government (CSG)
EXHIBIT 4
College Republicans at the University of Michigan

The objectives of CRs are to make known and promote the principles of the Republican National Committee (RNC) to the University of Michigan community; to recruit University of Michigan students as members of CRs and as Republican identifiers; to aid in the election of Republican candidates at all levels of government; to develop political skills and leadership abilities among Republican students as preparation for their future service to their party, communities, and nation; and to provide a comfortable/safe environment for socialization of conservative students on campus.

Contact Information

530 S State St
Room 4316
Ann Arbor, MI 48019
E: dylberge@umich.edu
Additional Information

Please provide an email in which people can contact the organization:
dylberge@umich.edu

The Center for Campus Involvement has identified this organization as a Voluntary Student Organization

Events

There are currently no upcoming events. View past events.

Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECRETARY</strong>&lt;br&gt;Monika Konrad</td>
<td><strong>VICE PRESIDENT</strong>&lt;br&gt;Emma Terbeek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT 5
Acknowledging that much of the rhetoric coming from the campaign early on may have been “jarring for some people,” Zalamea insisted that “any Republican is better than Hillary Clinton” and that “any vote not for Trump is a vote for Clinton.”

College Republicans at the University of Michigan made a formal endorsement of Donald Trump and Mike Pence for President and Vice President on Wednesday, September 14, saying in their official statement that “the College Republicans at the University of Michigan will officially be endorsing the Trump-Pence campaign for this election.”

This news comes in the wake of many College Republican chapters’ at various esteemed universities, including, Princeton, Penn State, and Harvard, opting not to endorse the GOP presidential nominee—and even going so far as to endorse Libertarian presidential candidate, Gary Johnson, as was done at Cornell University.
While there are undeniably divisions within the Republican Party when it comes to supporting the Trump-Pence ticket, Enrique Zalamea, the president of the University of Michigan College Republicans, told the Michigan Review in an interview on Friday, September 16 that there was “a really great response” when they announced the endorsement at their mass meeting. In fact the first question raised at the meeting was, “When do we start … when do we start campaigning?”

Zalamea told the Michigan Review that the College Republicans at the University of Michigan will now be formally working with the Trump campaign, saying, “We will be hosting some events here pretty shortly.”

Acknowledging that much of the rhetoric coming from the campaign early on may have been “jarring for some people,” Zalamea insisted that “any Republican is better than Hillary Clinton” and that “any vote not for Trump is a vote for Clinton.” When asked about many Republicans’ reluctance to support Trump due to his “in-your-face” rhetoric and bombastic style, Zalamea wanted to remind voters that “it’s not just one individual coming into office; it’s an entire administration.” Zalamea believes that Trump should receive the full support of the GOP despite the “mudslinging” in the primaries. However, in the event of a Republican loss in November, he said the blame would be “distributed among all of us [Republicans],” not just the “Never Trump” crowd.

In both the organization’s official endorsement and in his interview with the Michigan Review, Zalamea encouraged voters to vote “down-ballot Republican for both your state and congressional candidates” regardless of their support of the GOP presidential nominee.

Here is the full statement: “The College Republicans at the University of Michigan will officially be endorsing the Trump-Pence campaign for this election. I know that some you may not agree with all of Mr. Trump’s statements and policies, but the campaign is not about one person. Mr. Trump in the White House comes with an entire administration of conservatives that, as Republicans, share many of the same ideals that we would not see represented under Clinton’s presidency. And any vote not for Trump is a vote for Clinton. But regardless of your views on Mr. Trump, I encourage you all to make the effort to go to the polls and vote down-ballot Republican for your state and congressional candidates.”

(Visited 1,939 times, 1 visits today)
REASON MAGAZINE PODCASTS

- 'The Libertarian Party Is the Right Answer, as Broken as It Is:' Larry Sharpe June 12, 2018
- Expect Fully Legal Weed Within 5 Years, Says Former Top Pharma Lobbyist and Congressman Billy Tauzin June 8, 2018

LATEST FROM NATIONAL REVIEW

- Trump Downplays Kim's Brutality, Says 'A Lot of People' Are Guilty of Atrocities June 14, 2018 Jack Crowe
- Before Going to Bed . . . June 13, 2018 Jay Nordlinger
EXHIBIT 6
Campus groups make final push to encourage students to vote before election

Sunday, November 6, 2016 - 9:08pm
LYDIA MURRAY
Daily Staff Reporter

As the election season comes to a close, the University of Michigan’s chapters of College Democrats and College Republicans plan to encourage student voting through campaign events and watch parties of differing sizes.

The College Democrats are lauding a campus visit from President Barack Obama on Monday, where he will campaign for Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton.

LSA junior Collin Kelly, chair of College Democrats, wrote in an email interview that he hopes Obama’s strong support in the community will encourage students to vote for Clinton the following day. In his last visit in 2014, Obama spoke to a crowd of more than 1,400 students at the Intramural Sports Building.

“We could not be more excited to have President Obama on campus,” he wrote. “If anyone can energize campus and help us rally volunteers to get out the vote, it's President Obama. He is incredibly popular nationwide, and even more so by students. We think this rally is just what we need to carry the momentum of the entire campaign into Election Day.”


On Election Day, the organization will also be working with the Clinton Ann Arbor coordinated campaign office to get out the student vote.

“We will be tabling on the Diag, canvassing student neighborhoods, and providing any other support we can to make sure students make their way to vote,” Kelly wrote.

College Democrats is not sponsoring any election watch parties Tuesday night, but is instead encouraging its members to join the Students for Hillary viewing.

On the other side of the aisle, College Republicans have also been working to encourage
Campus groups make final push to encourage students to vote before election | The Michigan Daily

Student electoral participation through smaller events connecting conservative students, according to LSA junior Enrique Zalamea, president of College Republicans.

“In these final days before the election, College Republicans at the University of Michigan have been energizing students by attending campaigning events such as last weekend where we met CR chapters from around Michigan while canvassing for Congressman Fred Upton and State Representative Brandt Iden,” he wrote in an email interview with the Daily.

During Election Day on Tuesday, Zalamea wrote that College Republicans plan to assist Chairman Ronna Romney McDaniel, chairman of the Michigan Republican Party, and senior MIGOP staff at the Michigan Republican Party Headquarters in Lansing. In the evening they will be hosting a private viewing party for their members while encouraging other students to attend the public watch party hosted by Fox News.

**Correction:** Due to misinformation from a source, an earlier version of this article incorrectly stated Young Americans for Freedom are hosting a watch party. The watch party is hosted by Fox News.

---
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EXHIBIT 7
Federalist Society

The Federalist Society at the University of Michigan Law School is a non-profit membership organization dedicated to bringing conservative and libertarian ideas into legal education. We sponsor debates, speeches and symposia to advance our principles that the state exists to preserve freedom, that the separation of governmental powers is central to our Constitution and that it is emphatically the province and duty of the judiciary to say what the law is, not what it should be.

The Society is firmly committed to presenting a variety of perspectives to broaden the exposure of Michigan students and the community. By emphasizing libertarian and conservative legal scholarship, the Society provides opportunities for members to debate and discuss these ideas among themselves, and adds necessary and desirable diversity of thought to the Law School and the University community.

To learn more about Michigan law’s chapter of the Federalist Society and stay up to date on current events, please visit our Facebook page or follow us on Twitter.

Copyright © 2018. All rights reserved. The Regents of the University of Michigan. All images property of Michigan Law. The University of Michigan Law School, 410 North Trowbridge, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1215 USA. Contact Us.
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EXHIBIT 8
MIHCIGAN STUDENT CHAPTER
Ann Arbor, MI

About the Federalist Society
FAQs
Our Background

Sign up!

President
Jessica Opila
opilaj@umich.edu

President
John D. Ramer
johndurossramer@gmail.com

Vice-President
Alex A. Belica

Past Events

**Apr 12, 2018**

*Can Special Prosecutors Ever Be Objective?*

*Michigan Student Chapter*

University of Michigan Law School
100 Hutchins Hall
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Speakers: Geoff Shepard

Sponsors: Michigan Student Chapter

**Feb 15, 2018**

*War Powers Act*

*Michigan Student Chapter*

University of Michigan Law School
100 Hutchins Hall
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Speakers: Robert F. Turner

Topics: International & National Security Law
**Dec 4 2017**

**Ambiguities and the Administrative State**

*Michigan Student Chapter*

University of Michigan Law School  
100 Hutchins Hall  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Speakers: Raymond Kethledge

Topics: Administrative Law & Regulation

Sponsors: Michigan Student Chapter

---

**Nov 29 2017**

**Should the Supreme Court Bring Back the Privileges & Immunities Clause?**

*Michigan Student Chapter*

University of Michigan Law School  
625 South State Street  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Speakers: Alan Gura • Richard Primus

Topics: Supreme Court

Sponsors: Michigan Student Chapter

---

**Nov 7 2017**

**The Constitutional Implications of the Disappearing Jury**

*Michigan Student Chapter*
This event has concluded.

This event has concluded.

This event has concluded.

Oct 23 2017

The Constitutionality of the Travel Ban

Michigan Student Chapter

University of Michigan Law School
625 South State Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Speakers: Josh Blackman • Richard Primus

Topics: Civil Rights • Constitution • International &

Sponsors: Michigan Student Chapter

Oct 18 2017

Can the Left and Right Find Common Ground on Criminal Justice Reform?

Michigan Student Chapter

University of Michigan Law School
625 South State Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Speakers: Vikrant P. Reddy
Bans on Political Apparel at Polling Places

Michigan Student Chapter

University of Michigan Law School
625 South State Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Speakers: Wen Fa

Topics: Campaign Finance

Sponsors: Michigan Student Chapter

Civil Forfeiture

Michigan Student Chapter

University of Michigan Law School
625 South State Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Speakers: Clark Neily

Topics: Property Law

Sponsors: Michigan Student Chapter

The Restructuring of the Ninth Circuit

Michigan Student Chapter

University of Michigan Law School

This event has concluded.
This event has concluded.

12:00 p.m.  EDT  
625 South State Street  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Speakers: Diarmuid F. O'Scanlайн
Topics: Federal Courts
Sponsors: Michigan Student Chapter
EXHIBIT 9
The Michigan Review provides a broad range of in-depth coverage of campus affairs at the University of Michigan. The Michigan Review is published bi-weekly September through August. The Michigan Review is the independent, student-run journal of campus affairs at the University of Michigan. We neither solicit nor accept monetary donations from the University of Michigan. Contributions to The Michigan Review are tax-deductible under Section 501 (c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Service Code. The Michigan Review is not affiliated with any political party or any university political group. Unsigned editorials represent the opinion of the editorial board. Ergo, they are unequivocally correct and just. Signed articles, letters, and cartoons represent the opinions of the author, and not necessarily those of The Michigan Review. The Serpent's Tooth shall represent the opinion of individual, anonymous contributors to The Michigan Review, and should not necessarily be taken as representative of the Michigan Review's editorial stance. The opinions expressed in the publication and on this website do not necessarily reflect those of the advertisers or the University of Michigan.

In Response to Needs and Demands

December, 1982

Change does not occur in a vacuum. All political and cultural shifts produce a ripple pattern which penetrates the surrounding social fabric.

The most dramatic cultural shift in recent history took place in the 1960’s and the repercussions of this turbulent era continue to be felt in the American political arena.

The “anti-establishment” attitudes of the 60’s released a series of backlashes unprecedented in U.S. history. In the fires of rebellion, a new social conscience was forged. The healthy distrust of authority which emerged brought with it a flood of self-proclaimed crusaders for justice. Political activism became the goal of every educated man and woman, and for every social ill, real and imagined, federal legislation was offered as a cure.

College students of the 60’s were overwhelmed by the battle cries of the “War on Poverty,” and at the same time plagued by a guilty conscience resulting from our questionable involvement in Vietnam. They leaped feet-first into the whirlpool of activism – lashing out against what they mistakenly understood to be the cause of society’s problems – the capitalist system.

But the quest for Utopia by college students during this era proved to be a doomed one. The “War on Poverty” soon ended without a victory, leaving taxpayers and minorities as its casualties. Activism became the hobby of a few aging actors and sheltered college students, and it became apparent that raw emotion is no substitute for a persuasive and rational argument. The deafening screams of the radical left for a “workers’ revolution” drove away the very workers they were supposed to attract. The decidedly anti-establishment attitude which prevailed among members of all radical groups had the same effect. And so, in search of a cause, the 1960’s student radicals proclaimed a takeover of the liberal banner. To fight the establishment, they created their own liberal establishment.

The decade that followed the left’s shift in position proved to be the demise not only of the worker’s voice, but also of the American Dream. To satisfy the demands made by the liberal establishment, the government began to implement vast “social welfare” programs which ballooned the national debt to over a trillion dollars. A more
damaging effect, however, was the gradual erosion of the work ethic, with its promise of success as the result of individual effort.

The social misconduct of students during the 1960’s brought to the surface a new breed of activists demanding change. They demanded change because the political power had become too centralized, and the abuses of power too common. The unsatisfied contingent entering college in the late 70’s and early 80’s began to challenge the bromides of liberalism with a unique style; unique because they had relinquished the irrational principles of their predecessors and had set a new course for a more prudent order. This new brand of radical, repelled by the blindly altruistic intentions of their 1960’s counterparts, sought to purge the college activist movement of its guilt-ridden and emotional tendencies.

Thus, the 1980’s brought with them a tide of change in college students, with its roots in a profound respect for the free-market and individual liberty. A radical dissenter of conservative origin was born – a dissenter who was not concerned so much with maintenance of the status quo as with the creation of a better future.

The results of the 1980 elections proved that the unsuccessful liberal blueprint for change had been abandoned by the American people. The time was ripe for action – and what better setting than Ann Arbor, Michigan, a city transformed by the chaos of the “era of upheaval,” to serve as the backdrop for a revival of rational political commitment?

A group of adherents to this new political commitment conceived of a forum in which to present their concerns and desires to the rest of the college population. The forum would take the form of a review, a scholarly piece devoted to essays, commentary and issues salient to college life.

The idea was to confront the existing liberal media bias on Michigan’s campuses. The dream had been born, and only a spark was needed to ignite the powder-key, of dissatisfaction among radical activists.

It happened on a Tuesday in October of 1981. An editorial appeared in The Michigan Daily, the University’s student newspaper, condemning the College Republicans and its chairman, Thomas Fous. Fous, a former employee of The Michigan Daily, sought an appropriate tactical rebuttal. A scheme was devised after a conversation with Alan Miller, a Detroit News writer and National Review contributor, who had written an article pertaining to the Dartmouth Review’s contemptuous attitude toward the university in Hanover. The scheme involved taking the liberal establishment head-on by battling philosophy versus philosophy.

The drama started to unfold as Fous began contacting sources on the plan to bring a conservatively-based review to the University of Michigan. Paul W. McCracken, distinguished economist and presidential advisor, encouraged the idea and pledged his support. The enterprise would eventually manifest itself as The Michigan Review. For Fous, a former writer for The Flint Journal, the formation of a student publication came easily. He set about the task of securing bonafide writers and staff personnel. Ronald J. Stefanski, an English major, proved to be the perfect addition to the Review’s mixture of satire and commentary.

Along with the tasks required to establish such a publication, certain less tangible assets are also necessary to insure the longevity of The Michigan Review. A host of reputable individuals have given their acknowledgement and support to the enterprise. Among them are: Gerald R. Ford; Russell Kirk, famed conservative intellectual; Peter Fletcher, former Republican National Committeeman; Irving Kristol, renowned neoconservative; R. Emmett Tyrrell, editor of The American Conservative; and Stephen Tonsor, history professor and conservative intellectual.

The radical conservative seeks to mesh the essentials of the conservative philosophy with the 1960’s flair for instigating reform. The hope is to concretize the “best of the tried and true” with the hope of arriving at a rational order, based not on the whims of self-proclaimed social reformers, but on a deep understanding of human nature. The quintessential purpose of The Michigan Review is to confront the existing liberal establishment on Michigan’s
The radical conservative nurtured by a generation of idealists, politicized by the 60's need for social rearrangement but not overwhelmed by the emotional and guilt-ridden excesses has arrived on the college campus. Their desires and concerns are now articulated in The Michigan Review.

This essay was originally published in The Michigan Review’s very first issue printed December 1982.
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EXHIBIT 10
On the evening of October 13th, the Michigan Review hosted a debate between Hans von Spakovsky, senior legal fellow at the Heritage Foundation, and Bryan Caplan, economist and adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute. The event, which was held at the Pendleton Room in the Michigan Union, focused on the topic: “Does President Trump’s immigration agenda harm America?” The debate was moderated by Washington Examiner columnist, Tim Carney, who managed the speaking times of the debaters and the following Q&A.

Over the nearly hour-long debate, Caplan consistently voiced doubt regarding President Trump’s competency, commenting at one point that the President is “so intellectually lazy and irrational, he cannot keep his own stories
Caplan made a special note of including this economic productivity to both high and low skilled workers, arguing that low-skill immigrants work in jobs that increase our economic growth. Seeing no significant difference between illegal aliens and legal immigrants, Caplan stated that he hoped to see illegal immigration end by it becoming legal. Although he believes that Trump’s proposed immigration policies “pander to popular prejudices” and would harm our nation, he does not think it is likely that his policies will be enacted.

While Caplan decided to address the economic benefits of unfettered immigration, Spakovsky took a more legalistic approach to the topic. He argued that the debate over illegal immigration is manipulated by those that “blur the lines” between illegal and legal immigration, “so that people who want to make sure that our laws are enforced against illegal immigration can be called racists.”

Although Spakovsky noted that legal immigration is a benefit for our country, with his own parents immigrating to the U.S. as WWII refugees, he argued that illegal immigration has massive net costs for our tax base, citing a figure of 6.3 trillion dollars. He argued that the current immigration system is not broken, but the laws are not being enforced, pointing to sanctuary policies in cities like San Francisco and Ann Arbor that provide a haven for illegal immigrants. Spakovsky contends that sanctuary policies grant immunity for criminals as they are guarded from federal policies, allowing them to evade the law.

After the two debaters finished speaking, a Q&A followed, providing audience members the opportunity to pose questions to the two speakers. In an event covering such a contentious topic, Caplan, Spakovsky and the audience members engaged in productive civil discourse.

For those that missed it, a full video of the debate can be found here.
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EXHIBIT 11
About

Leadership:

Grant Strobl - Advisor
Jacob Chludzinski - Chairman
Buddy Brosky - Vice-Chairman
Megan Sugrue - Treasurer
Blake Bormes - Secretary

What We Stand For

Young Americans for Freedom at The University of Michigan is a non-profit, non-partisan, educational organization dedicated to promoting conservative ideas of **free enterprise, limited government, and a strong national defense**. We are not wedded to any particularly political party or candidates for public office: meaning that we advocate for conservative principles without the concern of pleasing Washington interests. Our goal is to provide a **visible** presence for the Conservative Movement, energize other students, and encourage students to speak out.

Young Americans for Freedom is a project of Young America's Foundation. The two YAF's united in 2011. The original Sharon Statement, the founding document of Young
Who We Are

Young Americans for Freedom at The University of Michigan is made up of passionate undergraduate and graduate students whose goal is to educate students about conservative values and the principles of limited government.

What We Do

Our goal is to maintain an active and visible presence on the University of Michigan campus by promoting our beliefs through a variety of events, services and displays. We plan on organizing a display of nearly 3,000 flags commemorating those who lost their live on September 11th, 2001. The 9/11 Never Forget Project is a project of Young America's Foundation.
©Young Americans for Freedom at the University of Michigan

Sign in with Facebook, Twitter or email.

Follow @YAFUMich
EXHIBIT 12
Limited Government:

The Private Sector:
Self Determination:

National Security:
Entitlements:
EXHIBIT 13
Who We've Hosted - Young Americans for Freedom at the University of Michigan

* = U-M Alum

Ben Shapiro
Editor-in-Chief of the Daily Wire,
Political Commentator

Buzz Patterson
Carrier of the "Nuclear Football" for President Clinton
Best-Selling Author
Dinesh D'Souza  
Bestselling Author & Filmmaker  

Bill Ayers* (Debating Dinesh D'Souza)  
Professor, Co-Founder of Weather Underground  

Raheel Raza  
President, The Council of Muslims Facing Tomorrow  

Tom Price* (GA)  
Former Secretary, Health and Human Services
Who We've Hosted - Young Americans for Freedom at the University of Michigan

Deroy Murdock
Fox News Contributor & Nationally Syndicated Columnist

Jonah Goldberg
Senior Editor of the National Review,
Author & Syndicated Columnist

Andrea Fischer Newman*
Regent, University of Michigan

Jeff Sakwa
President, Defeat the Label

* Andrea Fischer Newman is a Regent, University of Michigan, and Deroy Murdock is a Fox News Contributor & Nationally Syndicated Columnist. Four images are shown, each of which is associated with one of the individuals listed above.
David Littmann*
Senior Economist, Mackinac Center for Public Policy

Jay Nordlinger*
Senior editor, National Review

George Harbison*
Chief Financial Officer at Unitek Information Services, Inc.

David Horowitz
Founder of the David Horowitz Freedom Center

Do you like this page?
Tweet

©Young Americans for Freedom at the University of Michigan
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EXHIBIT 14
Adam Smith Society

The purpose of the Adam Smith Society is to build a community of Michigan Ross students interested in exploring the links among the economy, government, and society.

The Adam Smith Society is a chapter based association of MBA Students and business leaders who believe that business, entrepreneurship, and commerce are wellsprings that keep this country creative, prosperous, and free. We aim to build an influential network of future business leaders who are dedicated to preserving and strengthening the free enterprise system.

Officer Info
President, Bo Jones, bojones@umich.edu
EXHIBIT 15
Principles:

We seek a world of liberty; a world in which all individuals are sovereign over their own lives and no one is forced to sacrifice his or her values for the benefit of others.

We believe that respect for individual rights is the essential precondition for a free and prosperous world, that force and fraud must be banished from human relationships, and that only through freedom can peace and prosperity be realized.

Consequently, we defend each person's right to engage in any activity that is peaceful and honest, and welcome the diversity that freedom brings. The world we seek to build is one where individuals are free to follow their own dreams in their own ways, without interference from government or any authoritarian power.

We challenge the cult of the omnipotent state and defend the rights of the individual.

We hold that all individuals have the right to
exercise sole dominion over their own lives, and have the right to live in whatever manner they choose, so long as they do not forcibly interfere with the equal right of others to live in whatever manner they choose.

Governments throughout history have regularly operated on the opposite principle, that the State has the right to dispose of the lives of individuals and the fruits of their labor. Even within the United States, all political parties grant to government the right to regulate the lives of individuals and seize the fruits of their labor without their consent.

We, on the contrary, deny the right of any government to do these things, and hold that where governments exist, they must not violate the rights of any individual: namely, (1) the right to life -- accordingly we support the prohibition of the initiation of physical force against others; (2) the right to liberty of speech and action -- accordingly we oppose all attempts by government to abridge the freedom of speech and press, as well as government censorship in any form; and (3) the right to property -- accordingly we oppose all government interference with private property, such as confiscation, nationalization, and eminent domain, and support the prohibition of robbery, trespass, fraud, and misrepresentation.

Since governments, when instituted, must not violate individual rights, we oppose all interference by government in the areas of voluntary and contractual relations among individuals. People should not be forced to sacrifice their lives and property for the benefit of others. They should be left free by government to deal with one another as free traders; and the resultant economic system,
the only one compatible with the protection of individual rights, is the free market.

Individuals should be free to make choices for themselves and to accept responsibility for the consequences of the choices they make. No individual, group, or government may initiate force against any other individual, group, or government. Our support of an individual's right to make choices in life does not mean that we necessarily approve or disapprove of those choices.

Environment:

We support a clean and healthy environment and sensible use of our natural resources. Private landowners and conservation groups have a vested interest in maintaining natural resources. Pollution and misuse of resources cause damage to our ecosystem. Governments, unlike private businesses, are unaccountable for such damage done to our environment and have a terrible track record when it comes to environmental protection.

Private Property:

Property rights are entitled to the same protection as all other human rights. The owners of property have the full right to control, use, dispose of, or in any manner enjoy, their property without interference, until and unless the exercise of their control infringes the valid rights of others. We oppose all controls on wages, prices, rents, profits, production, and interest rates. We advocate the repeal of all laws banning or restricting the advertising of prices, products, or services. We oppose all violations of the right to private property, liberty of contract, and freedom of trade.
defend the right of individuals to form corporations, cooperatives and other types of companies based on voluntary association. We seek to divest government of all functions that can be provided by non-governmental organizations or private individuals. We oppose government subsidies to business, labor, or any other special interest. Industries should be governed by free markets.

Education:

Education is best provided by the free market, achieving greater quality, accountability and efficiency with more diversity of choice. Recognizing that the education of children is a parental responsibility, we would restore authority to parents to determine the education of their children, without interference from government. Parents should have control of and responsibility for all funds expended for their children's education.

Healthcare:

We favor restoring and reviving a free market health care system. We recognize the freedom of individuals to determine the level of health insurance they want (if any), the level of health care they want, the care providers they want, the medicines and treatments they will use and all other aspects of their medical care, including end-of-life decisions. People should be free to purchase health insurance across state lines.

Foreign Affairs:

We support the maintenance of a sufficient military to defend the United States against aggression. The United States should both avoid entangling alliances and abandon its
attempts to act as policeman for the world. We oppose any form of compulsory national service.

Self Defense:
The only legitimate use of force is in defense of individual rights — life, liberty, and justly acquired property — against aggression. This right inheres in the individual, who may agree to be aided by any other individual or group. We affirm the individual right recognized by the Second Amendment to keep and bear arms, and oppose the prosecution of individuals for exercising their rights of self-defense. We oppose all laws at any level of government requiring registration of, or restricting, the ownership, manufacture, or transfer or sale of firearms or ammunition.

Personal Relationships and Choices:
Sexual orientation, preference, gender, or gender identity should have no impact on the government’s treatment of individuals, such as in current marriage, child custody, adoption, immigration or military service laws. Government does not have the authority to define, license or restrict personal relationships. Consenting adults should be free to choose their own sexual practices and personal relationships.

Contact Information
423 Benamin Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
United States
E: andrewqk@umich.edu

Additional Information
The Center for Campus Involvement has identified this organization as a Voluntary Student Organization.

Events

There are currently no upcoming events. View past events.

Officers

President
Cody Chipman

Documents

Young Americans for Liberty.pdf
EXHIBIT 16
SAFE Unveils #UMMolest

Satire   April 1, 2015   Michigan Review

Last night, the BDS resolution proposed by Students Allied for Freedom and Equality (SAFE) failed to pass Central Student Government for the second year in a row. The proposal petitioned the University to boycott, divest from, and sanction (BDS) companies involved in commercial affairs with Israel.

After a long-fought #UMDivest campaign that resulted in 25 CSG representatives voting against and 15 in favor of its resolution, SAFE has announced that it will be overhauling its name and strategy: #UMMolest.

SAFE announces new initiative (Twitter)

Now SAFE will be pursuing BDSM: Boycott, Divest, Sanctions and Masochism. The change in strategy is due to the overwhelming loss at last night’s vote and urgency to support Palestinian human rights through not only divestiture, but also erotic acts of domination and submission.

https://www.michiganreview.com/safe-unveils-ummolest-mvmt/
“If we can’t use student government as a platform to initiate change, maybe we can do so through sexual dominance and abuse all around campus,” said BDSM activist Ali Ibn Baba. “When students misbehave, the best way to control them is always to spank them, slap them around a little, you know?”

“We will use leather straps to spank students into submission. Then maybe they’ll think twice about that evil empire Israel,” explained Ibn Baba. “We also may use rope and hog-ties.”

SAFE’s inspiration for the new movement comes from the recent novel by E.L. James, 50 Shades of Grey. Ibn Baba went on to explain how the protagonist, Christian Grey embodies the “pervasive patronizing patriarchy” of Zionists on campus, and that SAFE seeks to reverse this power dynamic through the use of sexual masochism in a retaliatory fashion. “If the Central Student Government isn’t responsive to our rhetoric against Zionism, then why not put all options on the table?”

“Palestinian human rights are constantly in bondage,” a spokesperson for SAFE told the Review. “So let’s fight bondage with bondage.”

BDSM advocates plan on making posters and banners to put around campus in addition to hosting a speak-out event called 50 Shades of the IDF, in which they will carry out acts of sexual deviance instead of acting as Israeli soldiers at checkpoints. “The hope is that students will finally understand that Zionists, just like Christian Grey in E.L. James’ book, are the dominant patriarchy, and that Palestinians are nothing more than meek victims, like Grey’s slave, Anastasia,” the spokesperson explained.

“The BDSM movement is just the first step in slapping Israel right off the map,” he added. “First we tie them up, then we blind-fold them, then we spank ‘em…then they’ll know how oppressed we feel.”

When asked about ISIS and the countless acts of violence occurring in the Middle East, the SAFE activist reminded the Review that ISIS already had sex slaves.

“It would kind of take the creative spin off the #UMMolest movement to mock ISIS for something they’re already doing,” he admitted. “So we’d rather focus on Israel.”

Pro-Israel students don’t seem worried though, citing the absurdity of the campaign from the beginning.

“They get more extreme and absurd every year. At this point it’s just like whatevs,” said an unenthused Ari Gold, a business student from New York.

The latest development in the #UMMolest movement is SAFE’s brand new Edward Said BDSM lounge. Activists assure us that the lounge, inspired by Christian Grey’s playroom, will be a safe and inclusive space for all students.
Sexual Assault and Concealed Carry

From One Direction to ISIS: The Zayn Malik Story
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EXHIBIT 17
Ever since its conception, the implementation and adaptation of the welfare state have both intrigued and perturbed economists. While many have praised welfare’s ability to maintain and support a minimum societal level of well-being for all citizens in their time of need, others have expressed doubts at its level of effectiveness—especially its ability to motivate the impoverished out of poverty. In the United States alone, many financial analysts became concerned at a sudden spike in citizens dependent on welfare—up almost 10 percent over the past decade (HHS Report). These unfortunate statistics represent the manifestation of many economists’ fears surrounding the effects of the welfare state—a deadening of personal initiative. In theory, the welfare state should only provide financial relief on a temporary basis, lasting only as long as it takes the recipient to re-enter the labor pool. In practice, however, the ideological flaws in this idealistic notion reveal themselves. Rather than boosting morale and providing the social services necessary to improve the lives of the poor, the modern welfare state in effect traps the unemployed under the umbrella of government-provided assistance, effectively limiting the individual self-motivation to improve one’s economic status.

The glaring fault in the welfare state stems from an unintended side effect, known today as the unemployment trap.
The Modern Welfare State Erodes Individual Initiative - The Michigan Review

At its most basic level, the unemployment trap hypothesis theorizes that by giving welfare benefits to the unemployed, the opportunity cost of returning to work becomes too large, leaving the impoverished “trapped” within the welfare system. This notion has been in existence for almost sixty years, beginning with the findings of political scientist Charles Murray. In his work, Murray asserts that the welfare state creates a pervasive incentive—a government provided benefit that creates adverse effects—that leads to the unemployment trap (Murray, 9). In his words, he believed that instead of assisting the poor, government welfare “produced more poor instead” (Murray, 9). Since then, multiple studies have been released that support the existence of this financial trap. At the turn of the century, studies noted that while the welfare transfer payments steadily increased, the poverty line did not (Anderson). As a result, many recipients of welfare realized that they could earn a better, more consistent income through welfare support—which included a multitude of benefits—than they could through the market economy.

Milton Friedman described this phenomenon through a scenario where if a citizen chose to make more money than welfare provided, they would then lose their plethora of benefits, including subsidized housing, food stamps, and income support (DeLong). In this situation, Friedman argued, it would be completely rational for a welfare recipient to lose any self-motivation to re-join the workforce, as the benefits received through the government are greater than what can be found on the free market. In practice, economists have seen the negative effects of the unemployment trap at work. A study conducted in 1980 concluded that only 12% of welfare recipients in New York City would be willing and able to leave the welfare system (Mead). Overall, by providing benefits via welfare payments that do not exceed the opportunity cost of searching for a job, an unemployment trap is created, leading to a direct decrease in overall individual initiative.

In an effort to document the effects of the unemployment trap on individual initiative, a comprehensive case study conducted by Amy Butler on the effects of the welfare state in Poland during the 1990’s was conducted and appears to confirm the suspicions of previous economists. Before any labor statistics were taken, a personality inventory of the Polish people revealed some startling results. According to the survey, many of those who had recently lost their jobs still held the belief that a new job would automatically seek them out, while in reality the converse is true (Mozolowski). As a result, many of whose on government assistance simply lost the desire to search for a new job, as they incorrectly assumed that a new form of income would appear without extensive effort. Additionally, the study found that many Poles were content to remain on welfare until a “great opportunity” presented itself (Butler, 11). The study determined that these ideologies were a result of the current setup of the welfare state in Poland, and most likely contributed to the dismal statistics found during the study. By 1990, the study found that while 45% of Poles had a desire to improve their financial situation, a meager 5% had actually begun to search for a new job (Butler, 11). On the other side, many employers were disappointed with the 5% that eventually decided to apply for new employment. A survey of employers found that many believed that welfare negatively impacted the Poles’ ability to think critically on their own, leading to their measured decrease in personal initiative (Butler, 12). This startling fact may be the result of government educational facilities set up in Poland. An adjacent study of the government educational system at the time discovered that their efforts were both “inadequate” or even “nonexistent”, causing many to return back to welfare assistance (Bartyzel). In its entirety, Butler’s study of 1990’s Polish welfare shed light onto to initiative-diminishing effects of the welfare state, showing how a combination of ideological fallacies and unemployment trapping lead to the deadening of self-motivation.

The development of the welfare state over the past century has provided ordinary citizens comfort and support in knowing that financial assistance can be provided in times of economic downturn. While this system has its benefits, many continue to express skepticism over its overall effectiveness, especially concerning its effects on personal initiative. From the results of multiple studies, many notable economics have agreed upon the existence of an unemployment trap created by government welfare, raising the opportunity costs associated with reentering the workforce and convincing many citizens to remain on government assistance. Through the systematic entrapment of impoverished citizens under publicly funded financial aid via the unemployment trap, the modern welfare state...
The Modern Welfare State Erodes Individual Initiative - The Michigan Review

removes the incentives necessary to motivate the unemployed to continue to pursue work, leading to the overall deadening of personal initiative.
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Viewpoint: Conservatives should not be excluded from leadership

Sunday, October 4, 2015 - 3:45pm
BENJAMIN D. LONG (AUTHOR)

I was disappointed to see several of my colleagues, under the pen name “Concerned Medical Students at the University of Michigan Medical School,” criticize the invitation of Dr. Tom Price, a Republican member of the House of Representatives and alum of the University of Michigan Medical School, in an opinion piece (https://www.michigandaily.com/section/viewpoints/viewpoint-tom-price-visiting-med-school) published on Sept. 24, before Price was scheduled to speak. Price spoke at the Medical School as part of the “Conversations with Leadership” series, where medical students are able to learn from notable Medical School alumni who have become leaders in their fields. Because he is a congressman, chairman of the House Budget Committee and an alum, Price certainly qualifies. But my colleagues apparently disagree, not because of any lack in leadership credentials, but because they disagree with his political views.

In unintended irony, the authors largely criticize Price for “(maintaining) partisan lines,” although these lines are, by definition, maintained by both political parties. They then criticize Price’s votes on various issues (unfairly paraphrased by the authors), which were often in line with the overwhelming majority in the House of Representatives. My colleagues state they were “not (rebuking) Price’s invitation to speak to our medical school,” but they question whether individuals like Price can be promoted as a “model of leadership” given his conservative voting record, thereby tacitly implying that neither Price nor any other conservative should ever be invited as a speaker. Furthermore, and perhaps more dangerously, the authors imply that conservative medical students are not qualified to serve as future physician-leaders, because conservatism is allegedly at odds with medical ethics.

My colleagues insinuate that Price encourages violence against women because he voted against the deeply flawed Violence Against Women Act, that he supports gun violence because of his support for the Constitutional Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act, and that he seeks to deprive the poor of irreplaceable medical services by voting to transfer the public funding of Planned Parenthood to other community health centers that provide vital services to poor women.

Many conservatives opposed the Violence Against Women Act because they believed the bill would have the unintended consequence of increasing violence against women. A 2007 study (http://www.nber.org/papers/w13186.pdf) from the National Bureau of Economic Research found that in states that implemented mandatory arrest laws, where police are required to arrest someone if they receive a domestic violence complaint, domestic violence homicides actually increased, possibly because abused women were more reluctant to report domestic abuse out of the fear that their partners would be arrested.
The gun bill that my colleagues cite, the Constitutional Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act, does nothing to reduce the number of guns. Rather, it seeks to apply a uniform standard of enforcement to a patchwork of state gun laws. It was proposed in response to cases like that of medical student Meredith Graves, who in 2011 was arrested (http://www.nbcnewyork.com/news/local/Tourist-Loaded-Gun-911-Memorial-Site-Check-Security-Arrest-Misdemeanor-Weapons-Charge-Plea-Meredith-Graves-143459496.html) in New York City for self-reporting her concealed weapon (which was legal in her home state of Tennessee) to police when she learned that guns were prohibited at the 9/11 Memorial. At the time, she was charged with a felony that, if convicted, would have ruined her medical career.

Many who watched the recent videos released by the Center for Medical Progress believe that Planned Parenthood was selling fetal tissue for profit (which would be a violation of federal law) since Planned Parenthood executives were shown apparently haggling over prices for fetal organs and joking about using money to buy luxury cars. For this reason, the House of Representatives voted to transfer the public funding of Planned Parenthood to other community health centers that provide vital services to women that Planned Parenthood does not provide directly, such as mammograms.

Certainly, my colleagues have the right to express displeasure with Price’s politics. The ability to freely express and challenge ideas is the cornerstone of an open educational environment and a free society. But to suggest that individuals are unfit for leadership, or even to speak and be heard, simply because they disagree with one’s extremely partisan policy positions is antithetical to both free speech and the spirit of diversity at the University. A large part of being a successful physician is having the ability to work with patients who may have views and experiences very different from our own. I applaud the Medical School administration for inviting a strong conservative voice to our campus, allowing students to hear from distinguished individuals with different worldviews. I believe that interacting with individuals with whom we may disagree will make us all more thoughtful students and citizens. We should promote a culture where all students are heard and encouraged to become America’s future leaders.

*Benjamin D. Long is a second-year Medical student.*
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EXHIBIT 19
Pro-Life, Dead on the Diag

Campus  October 17, 2015  Deion Kathawa

The Diag, Ann Arbor – Students for Choice (SFC), a pro-choice group at the University of Michigan, held an informational event on the Diag on Thursday, Oct. 1st.

Support was shown by Planned Parenthood by allowing students to create “thank you” cards and pose for pictures holding signs that read #StandwithPP, to pass out stickers, buttons, and condoms, and to correct misinformation. In the roughly three hours that I spent there, I saw around 50 students visit the table that SFC had set up.

One student, Connie, an organizer for SFC, had this to say when asked about her personal opinion on abortion: “It’s complicated. My mother actually had several abortions in China—because of the one-child policy. … I just think women should have a choice—whether to raise a child, abort, give it up for adoption. And those options should be safe.”

One must be willfully ignorant of embryology to believe that what is inside a mother is not a human being. I wonder if this is Connie’s view, or if she recognizes the humanity of the unborn but simply averts her gaze? Does she realize that the option to abort is never even remotely “safe” for the baby because a successful abortion always results in the death of a child?

Planned Parenthood President Cecile Richards gave sworn testimony before Congress on September 30th, admitting that Planned Parenthood’s over 600 clinics do not have a single mammogram machine and thus do not provide that service to women, and that abortion is 86% of the organization’s business, not the oft-bandied-about
Asked about the hearing, Connie responded, “I'm not sure I want to offer my reaction because of how you might want to twist my words.” She added, “We have a lot of great resources for women.”

I spoke with a number of other students—both organizers and casual observers—about the event and their views on abortion and Planned Parenthood more generally.

Tyree, a kind student at the university who stopped by the table to have a hashtagged picture taken of herself and pick up some memorabilia, told me that she thinks it’s “everybody’s choice” about whether to avail oneself of an abortion procedure.

Apparently this egalitarian courtesy stops at babies.

She continued, “Anyone should be able to get one if they want it. I don’t think my personal opinion should decide if someone gets one or not.”

Her view seems fairly commonplace among the American electorate. For its abortion policy poll, Vox.com solicited answers from 1,067 adults. Sarah Kliff breaks it down in her April piece, What Americans Think of Abortion, with a chart that shows that over 70% of people “want a woman’s abortion experience” to be “nonjudgmental.”

“So abortion restrictions are a no?” I asked Tyree.

She laughed a bit uncomfortably. “I know people in high school and they weren’t at a point where they could have a child. It wouldn’t have been good for either the mother or the baby. But I also know others who were fine with having the child; that’s what they wanted. I just think the option should be there.”

Tyree had no opinion on Cecile Richards’ testimony before Congress, as she “isn’t super political.”

Yet she is able to take a stance on one of the most charged and politicized issues of contemporary America. She feels it is not her place to step up and speak out for those who cannot literally do this for themselves. That she would allow the powerful to kill the powerless makes my stomach churn.

But what do I know?

I was able to connect with a male organizer of the SFC event, Jake, later that day.

“I think it's up to the woman,” he explained when asked his view on abortion. “She should have her choice be an option regarding healthcare and her own body.”

I pressed him on Cecile Richards' testimony that occurred the day before. He was extremely reluctant to even admit that the testimony had even happened. I again pressed the point, saying, “The testimony did occur. Are you saying that it did not, that Cecile Richards was lying under oath?” He would only say that “Cecile Richards might have had her facts wrong. Just because she is the president of Planned Parenthood doesn’t mean that she knows everything about the organization.”

Pressed further, Jake said, “But if this were true, hypothetically, it would be very concerning.”

He concluded our brief conversation by saying “I’m here to empower women and to support women and their healthcare. I stand with Planned Parenthood.”

The cognitive dissonance and confirmation bias are strong with this one, to say the very least.
Some students were reluctant to speak with me after I declared that I was a reporter for the Michigan Review.

One student, Moe, didn’t want to answer any of my questions on the record when I caught up with him after he’d left the SFC table. I had my pen poised to take down notes on his reply to my first question, “Why do you consider yourself to be pro-choice?” He would only say that he just didn’t “want to be quoted in anything” as he quickly walked off.

He was brave enough to stand with an organization that butchers children in the womb for profit but couldn’t take a even a minute out of his own day to stand by those convictions in print. It makes you wonder how courageous one really has to be to identify as pro-choice. Just enough to pick up your free bumper sticker and condoms, it seems.

I approached a few students a little ways away from the SFC table, sitting on a bench and one leaning against light pole. I introduced myself and asked their opinion on abortion and on the event. One man, Robert, said, “I see myself as pro-life. But I don’t fit as pro-life or pro-choice,” as he leaned back to stretch.

“So you don’t consider yourself pro-life in the standard sense?”

“No, especially as a dude, you know?” he quipped. “Definitely not my place to be saying anything!” as he laughed a bit with his two other male friends.

But 50 percent of children destroyed in the womb are males, Robert. Will you not speak up for your brothers in the womb, and protect them from the abortionist’s forceps?

The most interesting interview I had that day was with Andy, a non-Christian Unitarian Universalist. “My personal religious values inform my political values,” said Andy.

When asked if he considers himself pro-choice, Andy replied, “Yes. It’s basic healthcare. I’m pro-choice the same way that I’m pro hip replacement, pro appendectomy, and pro wisdom teeth removal.”

I’m a man. I’ve never had the opportunity to become pregnant.

“I think the STD screening, preventing unplanned pregnancies, are hugely important work. I don’t think you can separate those from the other work they do,” said Andy.

When asked his opinion on Richards’ congressional testimony the day before, specifically about Planned Parenthood’s admission that they do not, and never have, provided mammograms, he said, “Like other organizations, they review out for various procedures [like cancer screenings].”

He added, “I trust Planned Parenthood. Their hearts are in the right place. And I think the people interrogating Cecile Richards for over 5 straight hours were trying to make a political point.”

I’m sure the millions of babies killed in utero would have preferred reception of actual basic health care like a wisdom tooth removal or a hip replacement to death in an abortion. If asked, they would probably also have preferred interrogation before Congress to a shot of poison before birth.

But what do I know?

In my three hours on the Diag, I did not come across a single person who was pro-life, in the traditional sense.

Deion Kathawa can be reached at kathawad@umich.edu.
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EXHIBIT 20
Victoria Noble: Protecting political expression

Monday, November 9, 2015 - 6:25pm

VICTORIA NOBLE

Columnist

Despite being a historically liberal institution, the University fails to include the prohibition of political or intellectual discrimination in its anti-discrimination policy. (http://spg.umich.edu/policy/201.89-1) Across campus, the lack of institutional protection for unpopular opinions — including conservative views — can have a chilling effect on class discussion and student expression.

In all academic fields, discussion is critical to understanding the nuance of claims presented about the world. In some disciplines, like public policy — which strives to educate students not only on current policies but also on how to change them — understanding multiple angles of divisive political issues and working with people who hold opposing viewpoints is essential.

Discussions in my Ford School of Public Policy classes regularly prompt dialogue on contentious political issues like minimum wage laws, detention of terror suspects and the far right’s influence in Congress. Here, disagreements are political, and discussions often reveal ideology if students participate honestly. Group discussions can become more heated than average if one or two students disagree with the rest of their peers, and students may avoid expressing views that might conflict with the opinions they believe their professors hold.

Despite the opportunity for disagreement, faculty members require students to participate in discussion, and give participation considerable weight toward final grades. Most Public Policy professors who I have come into contact with have been amenable to a diverse range of opinions. But, when students can’t be sure how accepting a professor will be, they may elect not to express their views at all.

Susan Collins, dean of the Ford School, told me in an interview that most policy schools across the country tend to have greater liberal representation, and past surveys of Ford students show that relatively few self-identify as Republicans. Despite this, Collins believes that Ford students should be exposed to a wide range of viewpoints.

“I feel very strongly, and this is a view shared widely around the building,” Collins said, “that as a policy school, it’s really essential that people hear and understand and grapple with a range of perspectives, but in particular political perspectives.”

Even still, Collins said that students have expressed to her their discomfort in expressing their views in class when they didn’t think any of their classmates shared them.

As a Republican in the Ford School, I can certainly relate to these students. One of my policy classes spends a considerable amount of time in small group discussions, where, in my experiences, the majority of group members have tended to share similar views on topics, and I’ve tended to disagree. Sharing my opinion to a group of people who believe the opposite can be intimidating, and has been met, on occasion, with sarcastic, less-than-flattering remarks.
I tend to be outgoing and outspoken, and probably more willing than average to share my thoughts with those who might disagree. If I was afraid of sharing my opinions with liberals, I probably wouldn’t have identified myself as a Republican in the Daily so many times over the past two years. But when my peers don’t take my opinions seriously or make negative comments, it makes me think twice before choosing to participate in class discussion again in the future. If I have occasionally felt too uncomfortable to share my opinion in class, I can only imagine how my Republican peers might feel.

In most classes, faculty members seem to do their best to encourage dissenting opinions and highlight multiple sides of arguments. This isn’t just inclusive; it’s good pedagogy. To the extent that the Ford School aspires to produce effective public servants, it should strive to ensure its students can effectively communicate in institutional environments with far greater intellectual diversity than the Public Policy school itself. It can’t do that if only one side of every issue is afforded serious consideration.

Despite expressed openness to ideas from all areas of the political spectrum, it’s clear that the school has a long way to go if it truly wants to become as tolerant of different ideologies as it strives to be. A solid first step toward this goal doesn’t have to be Ford-specific: Adding political and intellectual discrimination to the University-wide nondiscrimination policy could go a long way to assure students their views will be respected.

Should the University continue to neglect this issue, the Public Policy School should draft an anti-discrimination policy of its own that specifically prohibits discrimination based on political expression or ideology, and strengthens existing measures to promote an inclusive environment conducive to active, vocal participation from all students, regardless of background or identity.

But making the Ford School as diverse in political thought as the government bodies many Ford students want to work in after graduation will require much more than a one-off policy change.

The Ford School should increase representation from political conservatives and Republicans. Better outreach to right-leaning student organizations will help students who don’t already have a network of Public Policy students to tell them about the program or help them through the application process.

Even more importantly, the Public Policy School needs to become a place that can credibly claim to prospective students an acceptance of a wide range of viewpoints. This might include framing class discussions to highlight both sides of an argument, or assigning a paper in one of the required classes that asks students to argue a policy position they don’t support, prompting them to give serious consideration to an opposing point of view. It may also encourage faculty to avoid party-line generalizations that tempt students to think about Republicans and Democrats as being homogenous groups without ideological variation, pitted against each other without room for compromise.

This isn’t to say that conservative students can’t find a place at the Ford School, or benefit from the excellent classes it offers. On the contrary, I think that students holding underrepresented ideologies have a unique role to play in making the Ford School even better than it already is. By creating an environment in which students challenge each other to develop best possible policy solutions, the Ford School can more effectively produce leaders who know how to work through the gridlock that plagues government today.
I doubt that this can happen in classes where the viewpoints expressed are frequently the same, either because there are too few students who disagree, or because the ones who disagree don’t feel comfortable expressing their views. Progress on this issue will benefit not only campus conservatives but also the Public Policy School itself, by helping it provide a more comprehensive education for all of its students.

Victoria Noble can be reached at vjnoble@umich.edu.
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EXHIBIT 21
Welcome to Michigan!

Satire  September 12, 2016  Satire

You’re probably wondering what to expect from this university which purports to attract and create the “Leaders and Best”? Well, first off, brace yourself for … just brace yourself.

Hey you! Yes, you. You’ve just picked up a quality publication’s writing, which means you’re intelligent and have great taste. (And probably fairly attractive — see, it’s not just your mom who’s told you that now!) You’ll drunk text your high school ex at some point this year, but congratulations on making a smart choice at this moment, at least!

You’re probably wondering what to expect from this university which purports to attract and create the “Leaders and Best”? Well, first off, brace yourself for … just brace yourself.

As you pack yourself into a lecture hall like a sweaty, human sardine and try to catch the eye of that cutie in the white crop top (did you just assume in your imagination that they were a biological female who also identifies as a woman?! How dare you, you homophobic, cisnormative bigot!), all eager to learn, the prof will first give a “trigger warning,” which is done to alert you that what you are about to read or hear might make you uncomfortable and/or
Welcome to Michigan!

That’s super icky stuff, I know, but fear not, for campus is riddled with “safe spaces” where you can hide from the real world and all of the scary, evil opinions of the roughly 14 conservatives and libertarians you’ll (never) encounter on campus — and their insidious “Trump 2016” messages inscribed on the ground in chalk, to boot (yes, that stuff children play with; you’re not insane — [MICROAGGRESSION!] — yet).

Have you heard of Relationship Remix? No? You will soon enough. That’s where they’ll teach you (if you’re a male, that is) how not to rape a woman. Oh, you already knew innately that such an act was disgusting and should merit the death penalty? Wrong! You need to re-learn exactly what “rape” entails.

Wrong! You need to re-learn exactly what “rape” entails.

Pro-tip: If she’s been drinking, or you’ve been drinking — Hell, if even a single drop of Satan’s sweat (alcohol, for those less of a fundamentalist, Bible-thumping Christian than myself) has slid down either of your throats — do not so much as touch her with a ten foot pole. Don’t even look in her direction. Oh, you clever fiend! Surely if I am a blacked out male Amherst student and receive a blowjob from a woman, then I’m safe, you say? Nope, and the fact that you thought such a thing means that you’re a sexist misogynist whose wretched existence proves that the Patriarchy is real. Shame! Shame! Shame!

Pro-pro-tip: It may just be safer to steer clear of women for this phase of your life.

But college = freedom, so you’ll finally be able to express yourself with reckless abandon, right?! Wrong! This is where ChangItUp! enters stage Left (get it? “Left”! Hahahaha) to ruin all your First Amendment and liberty-related fun. You see, grasshopper, microaggressions — caution: learning ahead! — are unintentional, everyday words and actions which grievously (perhaps even mortally) offend someone (read: a minority), and this, if you haven’t guessed yet, is A Very Bad Thing — perhaps even The Worst Thing Imaginable.

It’s done totally subconsciously, mind you; it’s all subjective; and it can be something as innocuous as asking someone whom you have never met (this sort of thing, believe it or not, tends to happen quite a lot in college) a basic question that up until about 17.235 seconds ago was considered appropriate for such a first-time encounter: “Hey, where are you from?”

*Sirens go off in the distance; the Apocalypse begins*

Before you start thinking that there’s simply no possible way to have fun — I mean, they already took away your right to speak your mind (which could get you sex), ask basic get-to-know-you questions (to prep for sex, of course), and sex itself, for goodness’ sakes! — there are still classes. (Okay, fine; classes aren’t fun, but bear with me.)

If that all sounds precisely like an Orwellian, dystopian hellhole, then congratulations, your reading comprehension skills and general social awareness are both light years ahead of your average Social Justice Warrior peers (you know, the ones with blue hair who voted for Bernie and think Marxism, which is directly responsible for the deaths of tens of millions of people, is totally rad). They’re a riot! (As in, be careful, since they might actually start a riot because MoJo “culturally appropriated” Hispanic culture with Taco Tuesdays.)

Granted, that you’re more stable than these folks isn’t saying much, but, hey, it’s a start.

Let us know if you want to talk (mrev@umich.edu).

Welcome HoMe, kid. Go Blue!

This is the first of a series of “Welcome to Michigan” satire pieces written by Michigan Review Staff.
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EXHIBIT 22
Navigating Privilege Politics at U of M

On this campus “power” and “leadership” are synonymous with a claim to an oppressed identity.

As you begin your classes at the University of Michigan this fall, you are likely to be bombarded with words like “privilege,” “identity,” and “oppression.” While these might seem innocuous enough — and the first time year hear them you might even pause to think about your privilege and identity — you will soon realize that these
words mean that you (white, male, not poor, attractive, able to walk ... whatever “identity” that you hold) are not welcome in this circle, that club, or that council.

If you do find yourselves in any of these spaces — presumably by mistaken invitation — you had better be prepared to say sorry and shut up. Asking questions? Clearly you are marginalizing minorities lived experiences. Trying to be a leader? Definitely taking power from others in the room and furthering white supremacism.

On this campus “power” and “leadership” are synonymous with a claim to an oppressed identity.

Don’t let this realization dash your hopes of becoming a social justice bro or scoring a position in a club that has “diversity” in its title, though. There there is a simple solution to claiming a coveted oppressed identity all for yourself! All you have to do is decide which depression or anxiety or really any other mental health diagnosis is the easiest to remember, and claim it as your own!

Once you have your disorder picked out — you can even get creative and combine two — look at yourself in the mirror and rehearse your story. Be sure to include that you really struggled and that you felt like an outcast. It helps too if you mention something about how hard it is to talk about. Don’t worry, you never even have to pretend to have talked to a mental health professional either as you can simply say that you felt too much stigma around it. If you want to strengthen your story though, you can always say something vague like “CAPS is really great” even if you don’t know what CAPS stands for. Trust me, no one else does either.

Now that you have your story down, tell it whenever you can. The more people who know and can point you out as someone who is oppressed the better. These people will always back you up and invite you to join clubs and groups meeting in exclusive safe spaces.

"Once through that door in some trendy space with a name like the “Edward Said Anti-Israel Lounge” you can make up the details of the story as you go — nobody will question you."
So what are you waiting for? This fall make depression/anxiety/whatever you think sounds cool your best friend and join the cult of oppressed identities on campus. Before you know it, you will be offered a position on ResStaff and will probably be elected to student government too!

This satire piece is part of the “Welcome Back” project by Michigan Review staff writers and editors.
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EXHIBIT 23
Why I Dropped My English Major

Campus  September 29, 2016  Amo Manuel

As a steadfast believer in the value of literature I am appalled at the degree to which English standards have degraded at a top-tier school like the U of M. If there is any lesson I would like to impart from my experience with the department, it is that rhetorical measures, like those taken by the University of Chicago administration, are crucial to maintaining a truly intellectual atmosphere.

In light of the University of Chicago’s administrative decision to take a stand against “safe spaces” and “trigger warnings,” and in light of the backlash this admirable stance received, I’d like to insert my personal experience with the left’s monopoly on academia here at Michigan. One of my liberal friends on Facebook, a current student at the University of Chicago, wrote a lengthy opposition to the administration’s letter. Interestingly, he did not choose to attack the practical consequences of abandoning emotional safety measures. Instead, he objected to the “spirit” of
the letter. To him it represented a “flippant” attitude toward the so-called marginalized members of the U of Chicago community; to him it was a sign of the university’s appeasing its more privileged students.

What, then, is the “spirit” of trigger warnings and safe spaces? The left would have you to believe it is a spirit of empathy and humility, a spirit of inclusiveness and equity. Whether or not these are legitimate concerns or mere virtue-signaling is unclear. What is clear to me as a direct witness to this spirit’s academic manifestation, is that it results in a stagnant, crippled, intellectually unhealthy classroom experience.

I entered the University of Michigan dead-set on becoming an English major. I had always loved reading and I excelled in my high school English classes. I had high expectations for college English – I couldn’t wait to tackle much more challenging texts and refine my ability to analyze literary meaning. Over the course of my Freshman year I took two 300-level electives and the English major prerequisite survey. As it turns out, college English and high school English share very little in common (at least at Michigan). The former is concerned less with literary texts themselves and more with a set of half-baked philosophies known as ‘literary theory’ or ‘critical theory.’ This is not necessarily a bad thing: I found some theorists like Viktor Shklovsky and Jacques Derrida quite insightful on topics such as language’s tricky nature and the purpose of art. However a good half of the theorists we read struck me as social justice demagogues, using Shakespeare or Jane Austen as a pretense to feverishly rant about the evils of the white man.

However, what bothered me more than the emphasis on ‘identity politics’ in my classes was the way the material was presented and received. While I was never chastised for violating safe space protocols, I detected a “spirit” of extreme intellectual complacency. My professors implicitly guided their classes toward social justice dogma, speaking of “dead white male” authors in snarky, dismissive tones and preaching “intersectionality” with smug confidence. When discussing academically fashionable topics like “queer theory,” they avoided opening up any sort of serious and critical debate. Instead we were encouraged to apply skepticism to older, more formal theorists and writers on grounds of racism, sexism, transphobia or colonialism.

My classmates, by and large, seemed to blindly accept the ideologies they were presented. Even when the professor introduced a point not covered by the reading or clearly mis-explained an aspect of the text, they would eagerly nod along in agreement. In particular, when topics of race came up in class (which they did, frequently) discourse became almost nonexistent. Fearful of being branded as racially insensitive, my predominately white classmates would only venture meek affirmations of the week’s theory of white oppression or African literary achievement.

For many students, this cult-like system of learning resulted in a kind of intellectual regurgitation. To paraphrase the great JS Mill, an idea must be filtered through unflinching analysis and impartial discourse in order to be truly understood. An idea simply received and accepted is shallow; it fundamentally lacks intellectual meaning. In the
process of peer-editing my classmates' papers I found countless iterations of that latter kind of thinking. One memorable example was a term paper written by a girl in my Shakespeare class on the gender fluidity of several characters in *Twelfth Night*. To me, it resembled a sort of “mad-libs” of liberal academia: terms like “heteronormativity” and “genderqueer” were blithely thrown around with little regard for their usefulness or meaning. Her thesis, that during the course of the play several main characters are forced into assigned gender roles, seemed quite hollow to me. Perhaps her theory was true, but it was merely a statement about the play. I tried asking her questions along the lines of “why does this matter?” and, “what further, big picture point are you trying to make?” Unfortunately, before she could respond my professor checked in on our session. He gave her paper a quick read-through then thoroughly praised her “subversive” take on the Bard. I wouldn't be the least bit surprised if she ended up receiving an A.

Since then I have switched to focusing on a History major. Perhaps due to History’s higher degree of accountability to hard evidence, I have found a much more intellectually satisfying classroom atmosphere. However, as a steadfast believer in the value of literature I am appalled at the degree to which English standards have degraded at a top-tier school like the U of M. If there is any lesson I would like to impart from my experience with the department, it is that rhetorical measures, like those taken by the U of Chicago administration, are crucial to maintaining a truly intellectual atmosphere. If we want to impart a substantial dose of artes, scientia and veritas on our graduates, we must take serious steps to challenge ideology-driven teaching and deferential learning. Students must be encouraged to think critically and bravely, not fall in line with social justice dogma. The “spirit” of trigger warnings and safe spaces impedes our intellectual growth; we need a new spirit of intellectual freedom and productive discourse.

(Visited 998 times, 1 visits today)
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Students were told to select gender pronouns. One chose ‘His Majesty’ to protest ‘absurdity.’

By Lindsey Bever  October 7, 2016

The University of Michigan has implemented a “designated pronoun” policy to allow students to choose the way they want their professors to refer to them in class.

As a protest measure, one student created a new identity: “His Majesty.”

Grant Strobl, a junior at U-M and a conservative activist, inserted himself into an emotionally charged national debate over gender identity last week when he used the school’s new policy to declare himself royalty.

“When I realized that the university decided to live a fantasy of allowing students to insert words that aren’t even actual pronouns into the university online database that updates the rosters, I decided, well, I might as well be the king of that fantasy, and I henceforth shall be referred to as His Majesty,” he told Fox News last week.

“The more and more we go down this road of political correctness at these universities,” Strobl said, “the question is: When will that end? How much is the university willing to sacrifice its pursuit of truth and its mission for this fantasyland of political correctness?”
Students were told to select gender pronouns. One chose 'His Majesty' to protest 'absurdity.' - The Washington Post

Strobl, who is studying political science, German and international studies, is the founding chairman of the university’s Young Americans for Freedom chapter, a group whose stated goal “is to provide a visible presence for the Conservative Movement, energize other students, and encourage students to speak out.”

He did not respond to requests for comment from The Washington Post.

University officials sent an email Sept. 27 to faculty members and students explaining a new process that allows students to designate personal pronouns, which will appear on class rosters. The new policy states that students may select from pronouns — such as he, she, they or ze (a gender-neutral pronoun) — or choose none at all and opt to just have their names used instead.

It states:

You can’t always know what someone’s personal pronoun is by looking at them. Correctly using someone’s designated personal pronoun is one of the most basic ways to show your respect for their gender identity.

When someone is referred to with the wrong pronoun, it can make them feel disrespected, invalidated, dismissed, alienated, or dysphoric (or, often, all of the above.)

Strobl told conservative news site CNSNews.com that when he accessed the system, it also gave him the option to “make up your own” pronoun.

So he did.

Kim Broekhuizen, a spokeswoman for the university, told The Washington Post in an email that students proposed the pronoun policy and it was considered by a campus committee. An online petition urging the administration to put students’ personal pronouns on class rosters garnered almost 800 signatures.

“Trans students at the University of Michigan often find themselves facing threats to their mental and physical safety,” the petition said, adding that transgender students were forced to reach out to their professors to avoid being misgendered. “This can be a mentally and emotionally draining experience for individuals who constantly have to inform or correct their
Students were told to select gender pronouns. One chose ‘His Majesty’ to protest ‘absurdity.’ - The Washington Post

After the policy was implemented, Strobl said, he joined “hundreds of students” who “changed their pronouns to protest the university policy.”

“Students have been calling me His Majesty, those that have read the story, and it really do illustrate the ridiculousness of the policy in ignoring the English language,” he told CNSNews.com. “It just creates more complexity, more difficulty for our society as a whole, and it goes against the university’s mission to pursue truth.”

In an interview with Fox affiliate WJBK he said, “We are really happy that we are spreading the absurdity of this policy.”

Strobl said some professors have sent him emails showing support. But one professor has promised to punish those who abuse the policy.

“I’ve received tons of support from all across the country and even at the university,” Strobl told Fox News. “However, I have had some students say that I am disrespectful. But that’s simply not true. I love all humans — this is not out of disrespect; I just want to restore reality.”

The new measure at U-M comes amid a nationwide debate about gender identity and the push for greater acceptance. More than 150 U.S. colleges and universities allow students to designate a first name other than their legal name on school records, and more than 50 allow students to choose their genders without documentation of medical intervention. U-M has joined five other schools that allow students to choose the pronouns they wish to go by, according to Campus Pride, an advocacy group that compiles such data.

[Vanderbilt University’s Faculty Senate Gender Inclusivity Task Force recently released a handout on gender pronouns for faculty members, encouraging them to tell colleagues and students which pronouns they use for themselves, to include them on email signatures and class syllabi and to survey students on their own pronouns.

Earlier this year, the Justice Department and the Department of Education released guidance on Title IX protections against sex-based discrimination for transgender students. Genny Beemyn, transgender policy clearinghouse coordinator for Campus Pride, told The Post that Title IX implies that colleges and universities must respect the names and pronouns that transgender students choose for themselves and, to do that, the schools must ask them what those names and pronouns are.

“The point is for students to be able to be gendered in keeping with how they identify and not have faculty members or others misgender them,” said Beemyn, director of the Stonewall Center, an LGBT resource center at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Beemyn is transgender and uses the pronouns “they” and “them.” “It feels like I’m being made invisible when people are not
Beemyn said policies, such as the one implemented at the University of Michigan, give transgender students an important choice. “Everyone has pronouns; it’s not just trans people,” Beemyn said. “This gives cisgender people a sense that ‘I have a certain privilege here.’”

Broekhuizen, the U-M spokeswoman, said the school implemented the “designated pronoun” policy to accommodate all students but will monitor the program and make any changes as needed. “But it is an important part of our efforts to be inclusive of all students, including those who do not identify as strictly male or female,” Broekhuizen said in a statement. “We’ve seen an outpouring of gratitude from these students for our recognition of their identity. It is unfortunate that some students are not taking this serious.”

Beemyn said that mocking such programs is “offensive” to transgender people. “I think it’s unfortunate,” Beemyn said about the push back. “It’s belittling the importance of this for trans people. It’s not recognizing that, for trans people, this is needed to be treated in accordance with how we identify.”

Strobl is not alone in pushing back against what he called the “fantasy land of political correctness.” Jordan Peterson, a psychology professor at the University of Toronto, recently staged his own protests over gender-neutral pronouns — particularly, against Canadian legislation that intends to include gender identity and expression in prohibited forms of discrimination, according to the Toronto Sun. Last week, Peterson began releasing YouTube lectures saying that such policies violate freedom of speech.
Students were told to select gender pronouns. One chose ‘His Majesty’ to protest ‘absurdity.’ - The Washington Post
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Lindsey Bever is a general assignment reporter for The Washington Post, covering national news with an emphasis on health. She was previously a reporter at the Dallas Morning News. Follow @lindse beyer
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EXHIBIT 25
If you’re not one for facts and simply believe that Donald Trump represents ‘hate,’ I suggest you watch his victory speech from late last night. His tone was one of inclusivity, calling to unite a diverse America of all “races, religions, backgrounds and beliefs.”

If you’ve been anywhere near social media during the last 12 hours you’ve probably seen instances of Trump-related hysteria. To a certain extent I understand the anxiety. Personally, I am concerned about Trump's stances on the environment, the global economy and privacy issues.

Most of my left wing friends, however, seem to be primarily upset with the supposed fact that Donald Trump is a racist, sexist, xenophobe, etc.. Many genuinely believe that Trump’s presidency will usher in an age of KKK-style racial persecution; that Trump intends to deport all Mexican people living in the United States; that LGBT people have reason to “fear for their lives.”

Let me correct the record here for a second. Trump wishes to crack down on illegal immigration – the notion that Donald Trump hates/disparages Mexicans is an outrageous stretch of the media’s imagination. Donald Trump’s views on LGBT issues are much more progressive than those of most Republicans – he even spoke out in favor of
transgender bathroom freedom. Donald Trump supports a temporary ban on Muslim immigration to the United States – if you’re a Muslim already living in the US you will not be deported or persecuted.

While Trump’s “locker room talk” may be in poor taste, there is absolutely no evidence that he is guilty of sexual assault or that his policies will lean anti-women. If you’re not one for facts and simply believe that Donald Trump represents ‘hate,’ I suggest you watch his victory speech from late last night. His tone was one of inclusivity, calling to unite a diverse America of all “races, religions, backgrounds and beliefs.”

The mainstream media is to blame for Trump-induced panic attacks and meltdowns. Even reputable news sources like the New York Times resorted to unsubstantiated name-calling, throwing around heavy labels like “racist” and comparisons to Adolf Hitler with little regard for fact or neutrality. They obsessively, neurotically spread statistics around uneducated white male support for Trump, often groundlessly asserting racial malice among these voters.

The abject failure of these same media sources in predicting Hillary Clinton’s victory is a testament to their profound disconnect with American voters. From their sheltered NYC bubble of liberal superiority, right-wing voters represent an alien threat, unworthy of a real listening-to.

It is far too late to backtrack and attempt to reach an understanding, as Donald Trump pulled off the greatest political upset in recent history. But cancel your ticket to Canada, because Trump and his supporters are not monsters. They are real people with conscience and intelligence. In the coming days and months I truly believe that the “only thing we have to fear is fear itself.”

(Visited 1,392 times, 1 visits today)
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EXHIBIT 26
Petition condemning campus protests, administrators' statements gains support

Sunday, November 13, 2016 - 11:50pm

Hundreds of University of Michigan community members signed a petition (https://docs.google.com/document/d/1L_gzINAw03sCZrj66KpNNkPFFWg374xViUwR1cQPd7c/edit?ts=582933b2) condemning recent protests and vigils held on campus, as well as statements made by University President Mark Schlissel, over the election of Donald Trump for president.

The petition, signed by over 300 University community members as of Sunday night, were in solidarity with a open #NotMyCampus letter to administrators written by LSA sophomore Amanda Delekta. In the letter, Delekta charged that she has faced bigotry on campus for holding conservative views. Delekta also wrote the University administration has not fostered conversations respectful of all ideologies, according to The Michigan Review.

Delekta did not respond immediately to a request for comment.

ALLANA AKHTAR (@AUTHOR/ALLANAKH)  KATIE PENROD (@AUTHOR/KCPEN)
Daily News Editor           Daily News Editor

. Buy this photo (http://store.pub.umich.edu/michigan-daily-buy-this-photo/)

In the past week, students have planned several vigils and protests to speak out against Trump’s rhetoric on minorities, for which he has faced heavy criticism from civil rights groups and protesters nationwide, and express fear following his election. During a vigil on Wednesday, Schlissel said, “Ninety percent of you rejected the kind of hate and the fractiousness and the longing for some kind of idealized version of a non-existent yesterday that was expressed during the campaign,” and urged students to continue works of advocacy and activism.

He, along with multiple administrators, have also sent out several emails about the election condemning hateful acts and offering resources to students feeling upset or afraid following the election.

Several of the events on campus, as well as Schlissel’s emails, have also focused on hate crime incidents based on race and gender that have occurred nationwide over the past few days. On Friday in downtown Ann Arbor, a female student was forced to remove her hijab after a man threatened to light her on fire if she didn’t comply. Additionally, another University student reported finding his door vandalized with a swastika and hateful messages.

Along with signatures, the #NotMyCampus petition also includes many personal statements from students who signed, detailing feelings of exclusion due to their conservative viewpoints or disappointment with Schlissel for not fostering what they described as community dialogue inclusive of Republicans on campus.

Engineering freshman Lincoln Merrill wrote that he felt Schlissel expressing support for students who voted for Clinton was unwelcoming and excluding to the viewpoints of students who voted for Trump. Merrill added the University only allows for the freedom of expression for liberal beliefs and oppresses conservative thought.

“I am saddened to see that the University does not support my expression of ideas equally when compared to people who have different opinions,” he wrote.

LSA junior Molly Grant wrote that she has received more verbal attacks and insults this past week than she has in her entire life for her Republican viewpoints, and that she fears for her life walking into her classroom and sharing her viewpoints. She asked the University to provide safety for all students, including conservatives, deeming the protests as “vulgar”.

“I’ve voted in elections where I have come out on the losing side,” Grant wrote. “I didn’t resort to vulgar protest, I didn’t end friendships, and I certainly didn’t inflict harm on the other party.”

LSA sophomore Ashley Calcagno wrote she felt disheartened by the faculty’s negative response to the election, noting a instance when a history professor likened the ascension of Donald Trump to the way Adolf Hitler assumed power. She also wrote that she feels polarized by the extreme biases towards the left side of the political spectrum.

“I expected so much more from the University of Michigan, and thoroughly I am appalled at how University officials made those of us who did indeed support President-Elect Donald Trump feel as though we were people of a deplorable character,” Calcagno said.
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Laura Jones · Education advocate at A C C E S S Education Michigan
Every one of these signers just affiliated themselves with racism and misogyny. The protests and comments are about behavior, not votes. You can vote for Trump and not endorse his bigoted rhetoric. So if you're feeling guilty about your vote and identifying with what is being decried, that's your conscious trying to hide. No one said Republicans are evil.

In fact, Conservatives should be very angry that anyone’s rights to free religion, dress or access are being interfered with by people on the common street. Conservatives who embrace liberty and freedom should be standing with those who are being attacked. That would be in keeping with accepted old values. No man above or below the law.

Like · Reply · 94 · 1y

Jakub Jonderko · Works at Student
Oh, please. Is everything REALLY a race and gender problem? Is this what you blame all your problems for nowadays? All you SJWs do is be mad over a rigged election in favor of Hillary that was lost anyway. Now you make riots and make a big fuss about something that did not go your way. I cannot stand your hypocrisy, filthy americans! This election showed that America’s got enough of politically correct things. They are done with all this crap you have been putting for last about eight years by now. They are done with a country that cares all about that little safe zone, that little echo chamber... See More

Like · Reply · 8 · 1y

Corey Alexander Walker · Works at Francis W. Parker School
Jakub Jonderko If you think this is about Hillary losing an election, you aren’t paying attention. Hate crimes are flooding the country, even here in liberal Ann Arbor. This is people standing up for what’s right and supporting our fellow man. If not wanting to see children be told "you’re don’t belong in our country" or called racial slurs while just trying to go to school makes us a SJW, then I guess I am. History tells us what happens when hate becomes the norm and is left unchecked. People are concerned for the safety of themselves and their friends. I don’t see what the issue is here.

Like · Reply · 59 · 1y · Edited

James Song · Ann Arbor, Michigan
Jakub Jonderko Honestly, I cannot believe you were able to state such hypocrisy without giving yourself an aneurysm. Trump had quite LITERALLY made this entire election about race and gender
Also, you argue that people that "cannot adjust [themselves] to this world and will keep screaming about how bad it is" clearly have no place in it; you DO realize that a lot of the issues that Trump promised to fix e.g. bringing coal miners back, bringing jobs back from foreign countries, etc. are quite the opposite of adjusting to this world (not just America), where globalization is a common and rising trend?

Show 6 more replies in this thread

Chanelle Sa'Trena Miles · Works at Student
The commentary on the document proves how misinformed people truly are.

Jinhui Chen · Phoenix, Arizona
How stereotypical you are! Did you know anyone of them, or just merely wishful thinking and perception?

Charles Ellison
There are scientific methods, strategies for discovery and learning, facts, theories and interpretations based on those facts, beliefs, opinions, habits, prejudices, views that are products of socialization, and more. One can indeed believe whatever one likes. However, no one should expect a university to offer equal educational time to fantasies and opinions that have long ago departed the world of evidence. For example, one is free to believe in a supreme being. One can study religions and religious beliefs. But we cannot teach this: “There is a god because I know there is and he teaches me ... See More

Chuck Wynn
Can you please provide evidence of a religion or religious belief system that teaches that “There is a god because I know there is and he teaches me that others unlike me should be denied their constitutional rights and equal place in our society, because he holds that their conduct is immoral”?

Otherwise, I fear the above characterization of people who hold to theistic belief systems is just another fantasy and opinion that has long ago departed the world of evidence.

Charles Ellison
Chuck Wynn There is no definitive proof or evidence that there is or is not a supreme being. Nor is it clear that the claim itself is intelligible. Case closed. And, there are millions of people in the US that believe precisely what I described. And more who act as though they do. Ducks.....

Samuel G. Ferraro · University of Michigan
I have always been proud of having been a UM student in the days of SDS and the anti-Vietnam war and Civil Rights Protests. We accomplished a considerable amount of good and helped the nation progress away from travesties of that era. More power to the student and faculty protesters of today, and may they accelerate the abandonment of Trump's minority views and intentions. Power to the People.

Eileen Enright · Ann Arbor, Michigan
Wouldn't it be great if these conservative students could reflect on this relatively brief discomfort from feeling marginalized and develop some greater empathy for their fellow students who are marginalized to a MUCH more extreme extent due to their race, religion, gender, sexuality? Especially since the fact that the...
...more extreme extent due to their race, region, or gender expression? Especially given the fact that the candidate these conservative students voted for actively campaigned for those groups’ marginalization? The irony in this story could almost be funny if we weren’t actually discussing a life or death situation for some people.

Bill Sutton · President at Sutton Yantis Associates Architects
Please send the petition to me. I want to add my signature.

Liz Morgan
Lol protesting protests... none of you see the irony?

Luke Hutchinson
Liz Morgan, it’s on par with being violent and intolerant because you want to protest against violence and intolerance...

Silke Weineck

Carol Kelly Hindman · Macomb, Michigan
What I find so interesting is a complete lack of Tolerance from the so-called party of Tolerance. The nastiness and the name calling is unreal. Most of us have never seen the like of it. So many of us conservatives where severely disappointed when Barack Obama won the last two elections. We were all concerned about the direction he would take the Country in. Did we run around the streets crying and carrying on, of course not. The students are entitled to their opinion and their voice. If some students feel uncomfortable about these unnecessary protests and the coddling of these students they s... See More

Eric Perkey · Ann Arbor, Michigan
You’re talking about a courtesy that Trump didn’t afford Obama. You remember how Trump instead of “getting along” questioned the citizenship of the president for the next several years?:
http://mashable.com/2012/11/06/trump-reacts-to-election/

This couldn’t be more ironic:

"The phoney electoral college made a laughing stock out of our nation. The loser one (sic)!"


Luke Hutchinson
Typical liberal... Instead of recognizing your faults, you blame someone else on a different topic all together.

Eric Perkey · Ann Arbor, Michigan
Lateral thinking may not be a strong suit of yours: I’m pointing out the fact that DJT did not “learn to lose with dignity and move on in a respectful way” after the 2012 election. He instead propogated a false conspiracy theory with racist and xenophobic undertones about Obama’s birth for multiple years. These same racist and xenophobic undertones of his campaign are what have people uniquely upset about DJT as our president-elect. You may not perceive these undertones, but a large proportion (if not majority) of people do and are very worried by them-- hence the protests & the majority of Am... See More
Nicolas Martin
I didn't vote for Trump. I find his views odious. But the intolerant atmosphere at U. Mich is a disgrace. The legislature should shut the damned place down until civility is the norm.

Charles Ellison
Can we just agree that civility in the face of a fascist campaign and movement is too much to ask for? Could we not agree that calling for a Republican legislature and governor - already guilty of deliberate poisoning of Flint's population - to shut down a university that seeks to provide a great learning experience for all on an equitable basis is an act of political terrorism? The comment would seem to endorse an abuse of power that is the precise antithesis of civility.

Nicolas Martin
Charles Ellison
You forgot the kitchen sink. Public universities that are hostile environments to non-leftists should be held accountable by those who fund them. Universities should be hospitable to all people, regardless of their viewpoints. Differences of opinion should be settled in civil ways. Faculties should not be dominated by the repressive left, but should be inclusive of diverse views. (Not all leftists support intolerance.)

Charles Ellison
Nicolas Martin It is not about left/right. It is about fact/fantasy and learning/bigotry and pluralism/white supremacy. There are plenty of legitimate and reasonable conservative political claims, but they are rarely made by those who mistakenly understand themselves as conservatives.

ChrisSheri Phelps
I can also make the argument that everyone who voted for or supports HRC abets a person who is a congenital liar, lacks integrity and has abused her authority to enrich herself personally. She has also abused and defamed other women who have been attacked by her husband for the sole purpose of ensuring her own rise to power in the DNC. I could paint all of her supporters with these characteristics just as you paint Trump supporters as racist and misogynistic. Every candidate has personal flaws, some more spectacular than others. It's time to grow up and move on instead of name calling.

Kathleen McKee · Overland, Missouri
Some people hate inconvenience over everything else...
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EXHIBIT 27
Max Rysztak: It is time to argue for unity

Monday, November 21, 2016 - 5:01pm
MAX RYSZTAK (/AUTHOR/MRYSZTAK)
Columnist

Two weeks after the election, members of our community still feel attacked, reduced and unsafe — no matter their political opinion. The days following the presidential election have been hard on us all. These feelings cannot go unnoticed; they are justified, regardless of political party or ideology.

There is still an unmeasurable animosity between the left and the right, but I truly believe there is plenty of room to come together. Before this can happen, people need to accept the results of election night. Refusing to accept the results, crying for the abolishment of the Electoral College and spreading hate against our peers, no matter who they voted for, hinders our community’s ability to unify after the election — and both sides are at fault.

If you truly want the inclusive country many of you argue for, it’s time to stop calling Trump voters sexists, misogynists, racist and bigots. Whether you agree with them or not, they are Americans who have a right to vote for any candidate. Victory, however, doesn’t give anybody the justification for spreading hate, especially on campus. Hate crimes, such as violently attacking those of the Muslim faith, are completely unacceptable. To any Trump voters who now feel they have the right to express their views in inappropriate ways, your candidate says (http://www.cnn.com/2016/11/13/politics/donald-trump-60-minutes-first-interview/index.html) “Stop it.”

A large proportion of Conservatives and Trump voters are not the racist, sexist, homophobic bigots that they are made out to be. While it is only the miniscule proportion that seems to be having the loudest voice, most Conservatives are bundled with the extremists. This campus, supposedly one of diversity, makes most of us feel uncomfortable in discussing our opinions. This isn’t a short-term problem — it is systemic and long-lasting. We have dealt with professors saying it’s OK to hate Republicans (http://inthesetimes.com/article/17426/we_cant_all_just_get_along); we have political protests — supported by the University of Michigan’s administration — fueling hate against a major political party and ideology. If I wanted to wear Republican apparel to one of my classes, there is probably a good chance I would be verbally or physically attacked. That type of ideological intolerance should not be condoned at a place that prides itself on intellectualism and diversity, no matter how strong the feelings we have for or against a certain candidate are.

For those with different political beliefs from those of Conservatives like myself, I understand your anger and fear. I get that a lot of what President-elect Trump says scares minority communities on this campus. Faced with slurs, inappropriate language and the talk of threatening policies, there has certainly been much hate. But if you look past his campaign rhetoric, most of the actual policies on immigration or LGBTQ issues, for example, are not radical at all — they are actually more moderate than what other
Conservative candidates proposed. I implore anyone who is upset at the outcome of the election and who feels scared for whatever reason to read the president-elect’s policies (https://www.donaldjtrump.com/policies/).

Hashtags such as “#NotMyPresident” not only represent denial and immaturity; they represent intolerance. As much as some may disagree with the president-elect, he will be our president. As Secretary Clinton said (http://www.cnn.com/2016/11/09/politics/hillary-clinton-concession-speech/), “Donald Trump is going to be our president. We owe him an open mind and the chance to lead.” While a similar campus movement by Conservatives titled “#NotMyCampus” — through which right-leaning students voiced their objections on the University administration’s bias against conservative students — exists, it is very different. Conservatives here have specific complaints about the school administration’s actions regarding political beliefs, whereas “#NotMyPresident” supporters are merely reacting to a loss by refusing to let go of controversial statements by the president-elect.

The campus administration would be wise to heed Secretary Clinton’s words. Those on both sides argue that campus leaders have a lot to do. Whatever solutions the University pursues, I hope it keeps students of all political backgrounds in mind. Those of all faiths, backgrounds, experiences and political beliefs have the right to be heard and the right to express their opinions. The problems on this campus are not one-sided — they are widespread and deeply rooted. There is a current culture among students of being afraid to voice their opinions, of not accepting each other for what they believe and feeling their environments are hostile. No matter one’s political opinion, people of all sides don’t feel like they can truly speak their minds — and the administration needs to help in an unbiased way.

Margaret Thatcher once said, “I always cheer up immensely if an attack is particularly wounding because I think, well, if they attack one personally, it means they have not a single political argument left.” As we move past the election, we should strive to return to political debates, not personal ones. In an election in which both sides sank to the lowest levels of political discourse, it is up to us to return to policy and ideas, not personality and labels. We need to forget this election, move on from the hate and work on ideas.

Max Rysztak can be reached at mrysztak@umich.edu (mailto:mrysztak@umich.edu).
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