Nixon answers GOP critics over governor's role during University of Missouri protests

By Rudi Keller

Sunday, April 3, 2016 at 12:00 am

BOONVILLE — Republican candidates for governor who criticize his lack of a visible role when protesters camped on Carnahan Quadrangle don’t understand the office they seek, Gov. Jay Nixon said Saturday.

Speaking after ceremonies opening a portion of the Katy bridge, Nixon, a Democrat, said he didn’t want to inject himself into every dispute among the four GOP primary contenders. But he also said a governor can’t step into every dispute in the state, either.

“People can talk about that, but I don’t know exactly what they would want a governor to do,” Nixon said. “Go and tell people that were complaining about certain things that they should be quiet? That’s not the role of the governor.”

During the Boone County Lincoln Days banquet Friday evening, Navy veteran Eric Greitens said the Concerned Student 1950 protests created a “crisis at the University of Missouri” and that it had become “a national embarrassment.” Former U.S. Attorney Catherine Hanaway said Nixon should have been more forceful to stem “the lawlessness that has happened at Ferguson and at the University of Missouri.”

Their comments continued the criticism among Republicans that also has led to proposals to cut the UM state appropriation by $8.6 million. Legislation to force an independent review of the university, annual state audits and eliminate discretion in some administrative matters also are under consideration in Jefferson City.

The protests in October and November included a demonstration that blocked President Tim Wolfe’s car during the Homecoming Parade, a hunger strike by graduate student Jonathan Butler and a brief boycott of athletic events by the Tiger football team. Wolfe resigned Nov. 9 as international media attention intensified.

“Where was Jay Nixon when the University of Missouri was taken under siege?” Hanaway said. “Why didn’t he say to his curators that teachers should teach, scholarship athletes should play and Melissa Click should not be able to call in ‘muscle’ against students?”
The protests at MU were peaceful and there was no need to interfere, Nixon said Saturday.

“It certainly had some raw edges or nerves to it, but I don’t think anybody was hurt or in physical danger or anything of that nature,” Nixon said.

Attempts to tie the Concerned Student 1950 protesters to events in Ferguson fall apart under examination, Nixon said. The violence that erupted after the death of Michael Brown was rooted in mistrust and antagonism between the community and police, Nixon said.

“There was no shooting at the University of Missouri,” Nixon said. “They were talking about how they could move the university forward in a more diverse fashion. To me, they are entirely separate events.”
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University of Missouri forums start search for new system president

A forum is scheduled for each of the four campuses in Rolla, Columbia, St. Louis and Kansas City

BY MARÁ ROSE WILLIAMS
mdwilliams@kcstar.com

The University of Missouri Board of Curators this week will hold a series of open forums to gather input on criteria for the next system president.

A forum is scheduled for each of the four campuses in the system. The University of Missouri-Kansas City stop will be from noon to 1:30 p.m. Friday at the UMKC Student Union, Room 401BC.

All the forums are open to the public. Attendees will be given an opportunity to have a say on the characteristics and qualifications they believe should be sought in the next president.

Mike Middleton is leading the university system on an interim basis. Middleton was asked by curators to take the position after system president Tim Wolfe resigned amid controversy about race-related protests on the Columbia campus.
The tour will begin Monday at the Missouri University of Science and Technology in Rolla from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.

Other forums are from 3:30 p.m. to 5 p.m. Monday in St. Louis, at the Millennium Student Center, and from 10:30 a.m. to noon Wednesday in Columbia at the Reynolds Alumni Center, Great Room.

MU research fills in missing pieces on how plants 'see' light
BRIANNA STUBLER, Apr 2, 2016

COLUMBIA — Scott Askinosie likes to keep his plants in the dark.

The plants Askinosie grows in the basement of the Bond Life Sciences Center are small — they're related to mustard — but they play a big role in research that aims to unlock the secrets of how plants move in response to light.

“Plants can quite literally see,” Askinosie said. "They can’t put together images like we can, but in a lot of ways they can see light better. And they take cues from their environment in ways right now we can only imagine.”

The arabidopsis thaliana plants that Askinosie grows, like other plants with roots and flowers that reproduce, contain a protein called phototropin 1 around the border of each cell. Scientists are trying to understand how the protein moves in order to "see" the most light, Askinosie said, and what happens in between the plant sensing light and moving in response to it remains unknown.

What is known is that the movement facilitates two very important aspects of survival: positioning the leaves of the plant to most efficiently collect sunlight to make food and direct the roots to soil with more moisture to promote drought tolerance.
Askinosie envisions his research as laying a foundation for genetic modification or selective breeding of plants with enhanced phototropism — the ability to orient toward a light source — as a way to increase agricultural yields.

Phototropins, which belong to an array of proteins in plants that sense different qualities and quantities of light, are of particular interest because of their link to plant growth.

Phototropin 1 has a function similar to human eyes, Askinosie said, and is crucial in absorbing low-level blue light that's characteristic of shady environments.

“This photoreceptor is very important because it allows the plant to see where the most light is coming from so it can position itself to utilize the sun to make food,” Askinosie said. “Those are two things people don’t typically think of plants doing — seeing and moving.”

Askinosie exposes his arabidopsis thaliana to light under controlled conditions, which he calls “spying on the plants.” While exposing them to light, Askinosie uses a powerful microscope to watch the protein move within the cell.

“I like that I can actually see it moving, because it makes it real and tangible, especially compared to other forms of biology where you’re getting data,” Askinosie said.

His research builds from a body of science developed at MU since 1995 by Mannie Liscum, a professor of biological sciences. Liscum has been working with phototropin 1 since he identified its role in plant movement in 1995.

"I have worked with phototropin 1 and its related signaling since moving to MU in 1996,” Liscum said. At that time, his lab was one of two in the world to conduct such research, a number that has since risen to about 100.

Askinosie aims to advance Liscum's research by looking for a more complete picture of how the protein's movement causes a chain reaction that leads to plant movement and optimal orientation.
His research is one of five doctoral projects at MU that examine how plants respond and adapt to changes in light.

He also said proteins tell the plant where the sun is relative to its roots. The leaves will bend and move toward the sun, and the roots will do the opposite — move away from the sun, deeper into cooler soil, in order to find water that accumulates there.

Arabidopsis plants are used because they are inexpensive, require little space and mature quickly. Askinosie aims to apply his findings to other crop plants, such as corn and soybeans.

There are other students in the lab working in collaboration to figure out how plants respond to their environment. One, in particular, is taking Askinosie’s findings and applying them to soybeans.

MU's Faurot Field lights up blue for World Autism Awareness Day

COLUMBIA - The Thompson Center for Autism and Neurodevelopmental Disorders partnered with Autism Speaks Saturday for a World Autism Awareness Day event.

Many families and children who have visited the Thompson Center attended the event to promote awareness of autism and participate in the activities the Thompson Center planned.

The families were able to run around and toss footballs on the football field, and children could get their faces painted and make crafts. They could even take pictures with MU’s mascot, Truman.
A statement from the University of Missouri said MU buildings and locations around Columbia would also be lit with blue lights as part of the Light It Up Blue campaign.

Stephen Kanne, executive director and associate professor of the Thompson Center, said raising awareness starts with getting rid of misconceptions about autism.

"For years, people have misunderstood what it is, why it exists, the disorder itself, what the symptoms are, if there's a cure, if there's not," Kanne said. "So the whole idea of Autism Awareness month is to be able to have the public become much more aware of what autism is, and how it affects the kids, and how it affects the families."

Kanne said many people don't know there's an entire autism spectrum.

"You can have kids who are very verbal and talk, and are very smart, and work and do great in the real world," he said. "You have others that are much more affected and have trouble talking and need a lot more support."

Amy Longenecker came to Faurot Field with her 6-year-old son Carter, who is on the autism spectrum.

"For us to be able to come out here, and for him to see other kids and to see that he is normal. He's great the way that he is," Longenecker said.

Carter was diagnosed at the Thompson Center with autism almost a year ago.

"It doesn't define who he is. It's just a piece of him," she said.

Mark the calendar: Missouri and Illinois are prime spots for total solar eclipse next year

It's not too early to start thinking about Aug. 21, 2017, especially for those who are space and science nuts.

In 17 months, Missourians and much of the country will have the opportunity to see a total solar eclipse, an astronomical event that hasn’t happened in this state in centuries. Or in the U.S. since 1979 — and that total eclipse was only visible in a few states.
But the Great American Eclipse, as it’s been deemed, will stretch across the United States with a path that makes parts of Missouri and Illinois prime locations to see the moon coming between the sun and the earth, casting its shadow and creating darkness in the middle of the day. Depending on where you are, the length of the total eclipse varies — for example, it’s predicted to last about 20 seconds at the Missouri Botanical Garden; at the University of Missouri-Columbia, about 2½ minutes.

Cities along what’s called the path of totality — where the moon completely covers the sun, leaving a glowing ring from the sun’s corona — are already preparing for what’s predicted to be a huge influx of people who don’t want to miss the memorable event. Estimates range from 30,000 visitors to 400,000 depending on the location. There’ll be pre-eclipse tailgating, scientific presentations and data collection, music and other festivities.

A columnist at Astronomy Magazine has called for Missouri officials to declare it a state holiday.

Bottom line from those who have seen a total solar eclipse: it’s an experience not to be missed.

“It’s breathtaking. It’s like nothing you’ve seen before,” said Bob Baer, a physics professor at the Southern Illinois University Carbondale who recently traveled to Indonesia to see one for the first time.

“I’ve heard other people say ‘life-changing event,’ and that’s pretty close to what I would say.”

‘A hole in the sky’

A total solar eclipse differs from an annular solar eclipse, during which the moon is directly in front of the sun but doesn’t totally cover it. (There was an annular solar eclipse in May 1994 in St. Louis.) A lunar eclipse happens when the Earth is between the moon and the sun.
The darkness comes on pretty quick, said Baer who went to Indonesia with one of five teams funded by NASA to track the eclipse. Insects get louder, confused birds fly back to their roosts and the temperature drops a bit, he said.

“You have all these things going on telling you something is about to happen. Once totality hits, it takes about three seconds for it to go from being kinda dark to the sun just completely blocked out,” Baer said. It looks like there is a hole in the sky where the sun used to be, and a big, bright halo or ring in its place. The sun’s corona streams out like a bright light on the sides.

“It really kind of sinks in how the solar system works.”

The path of totality will be about 67 miles wide, experts say. So, while people in Festus will see a total eclipse, those in Ferguson, just outside the path, will only see a partial. The St. Louis Science Center is just out of the path for a total eclipse as well. Webster Groves will see totality for about a minute.

Calculations by experts at NASA show that just south of Carbondale will be the point of greatest duration of the total eclipse at about 2 minutes, 40 seconds.

**Years of planning**

Baer and others at SIUC have been working on plans for eclipse events there for nearly two years. Along with the festivities, they’ll also have an area dedicated for more serious eclipse chasers who want to get more involved in photographing and tracking it for scientific purposes.

On the Carbondale campus, the total eclipse will happen about 1:21 p.m. Partial phases of the eclipse start at 11:52 a.m. and are expected to end at 2:47 p.m.

There could be 30,000 to 50,000 additional people on campus that day — double or triple the amount of undergrad students, Baer said. Several thousand sets of eclipse glasses, to protect eyes during the partial phases, have been ordered, and more will be coming, he said.
Aug. 21, 2017, which falls on a Monday, also happens to be the first day of class at SIUC. Same for Mizzou, another eclipse hot spot.

Columbia organizers are expecting an even bigger turnout than Carbondale because of the city’s location in the center of the path, which runs across the country from Oregon through South Carolina.

Angela Speck, director of astronomy at Mizzou, predicts families from Minnesota will come down with their children where the state mandates a post-Labor Day school start date.

Columbia’s size and the number of hotel rooms available also make it a draw. Officials are approaching the event as though it’s a football Saturday, when as many as 70,000 fans come to watch the college’s team. But it could be more.

“It’s hard to tell. This is something you know is coming, you have to prepare your community for, but you have no idea what to expect,” said Amy Schneider, director of the Columbia Convention and Visitors Bureau. “Overpreparing is better than underpreparing.”
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Readorama: How Lloyd Gaines’ fight to end segregation at Mizzou in 1930s set a precedent

The University of Missouri declined to admit Lloyd Gaines in 1936
Attorneys for the African-American student took his case to the U.S. Supreme Court

Then Gaines disappeared, but his case set a precedent

BY BRIAN BURNES
The Kansas City Star

In 1935, Lloyd Gaines of St. Louis applied to enroll in the University of Missouri School of Law.

Gaines was African-American.

The university’s Board of Curators denied his application. They approved a resolution describing the school’s practice of providing scholarships for black applicants to study in adjacent states if comparable courses were not available at Lincoln University, the state college for African-American students in Jefferson City.

In 1936, a Boone County judge refused to issue an order compelling the university to admit Gaines.

But in 1938, the U.S. Supreme Court declared the university’s out-of-state tuition scholarship practice a violation of the 14th Amendment’s equal protection clause.

Gaines had won. Then he vanished.

The complicated legacy of the Gaines litigation is detailed in “Lloyd Gaines and the Fight to End Segregation,” by University of Missouri faculty members James W. Endersby and William T. Horner, just published by the University of Missouri Press.

The story, which the authors believed played a role in changing race relations across Missouri and the country, is bigger than the mystery of whatever happened to Gaines, whose fate has remained unknown since he last was seen in Chicago in 1939.

Still, what happened to Gaines? Some wondered if he had met with foul play.

“What seems most likely is that the pressure of being involved in this landmark case simply became too much to bear,” Horner said. “It is our opinion that he most likely relocated to a life of anonymity, which was much easier to do in the 1930s than it is today.”

Yet even with Gaines’ disappearance, the authors believe the case influenced subsequent litigation that led to the Supreme Court’s 1954 decision in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, which declared unconstitutional separate public schools for black and white students.
“While Brown might have happened without Gaines, Gaines certainly set the table and is a key precedent,” Horner said.

“Had Gaines not disappeared, we feel that the Gaines case could have been something very much like the Brown case, though for higher education.”

The authors describe the initial Gaines trial in Columbia. Given the heat in the summer of 1936, the judge and lawyers agreed to work in shirt sleeves. Sometimes drought-ravaged farmers seeking government relief in the Boone County courthouse wandered in, wearing their overalls.

As the authors detail, although much of the litigation took place in Columbia, St. Louis and Kansas City residents were key players.

St. Louis lawyers Sidney Redmond and Henry Espy represented Gaines.

Kansas City attorney William Hogsett, who a few years later would coordinate various political factions allied against Kansas City’s Pendergast machine, served as the university’s lead attorney.

The national public relations campaign in support of Gaines’ legal team was coordinated by Roy Wilkins. He was born in St. Louis and had worked as a reporter and columnist for The Call, a Kansas City weekly newspaper for the black community, before leaving to serve in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People’s national office.

Chester Franklin, Call publisher, championed the Gaines case in his newspaper. When NAACP attorney Charles Houston stopped in Kansas City to meet with Franklin, the publisher asked Houston to address the newspaper staff.

That might have been when Houston met Lucile Bluford, a Call journalist.

During the late 1930s and early 1940s, Bluford, represented by Houston as well as future U.S. Supreme Court Associate Justice Thurgood Marshall, applied for admission to the University of Missouri’s graduate journalism program 11 times. The university, the authors write, refused her every time.

“Lucile Bluford’s efforts were important to maintain pressure on the university and the state to comply with the Supreme Court’s decision in the Gaines case,” Endersby said.

Both Houston and Marshall, Endersby added, thought Bluford “was a more reliable plaintiff and had an even stronger case than Gaines.”

The authors will speak April 23 during the Unbound Book Festival in Columbia. Find more information at UnboundBookFestival.com.
'Enough Is Enough'

No MU Mention
Vice provost at U of Wisconsin makes an unusually frank video in response to a racial incident -- and attracts attention most university statements never receive.

You know the drill. A racial incident on campus is followed by a statement from a campus leader denouncing what has happened, talking about how there may be a "teachable moment," maybe organizing an open forum. And relatively few people read the statement or remember it a few days later.

At the University of Wisconsin at Madison last week, Patrick Sims didn't follow the normal pattern. Sims, vice provost for diversity and climate at Madison, made a video that was unusually frank in describing what had happened and showing how frustrated he was. He visibly struggled for words about how to describe what he eventually termed "a cowardly act."

Sims didn't say an offensive note had been slipped under the door of a student's room. He read the note (warning -- strong language follows): "You fuck with Bucky. You fuck with us. Fuck you nigger bitch."

He said he wanted to describe the act as "punk ass," even if he acknowledged that vice provosts normally aren't expected to use such language.

And Sims said "no letter from the provost" will prevent such acts. Only students looking out for fellow students would make a difference, he said.

To whoever slipped the message under the student's door, Sims said he couldn't believe the person "has such a lack of respect for human dignity." And he didn't mince words in describing the atmosphere created by such actions. He said the university was experiencing with an incident like the note "the kind of hatred we haven't seen since Jim Crow."

"Enough is enough," he said. "This has got to stop."
With many on campus talking about the video (which is attracting considerable praise), Sims posted another one Friday in response to many asking him what they should do now. He said he was open to ideas but focused on the responsibility of students. He urged all students to talk to one another about racial issues on campus, and he particularly called upon "majority students" to do so. He said they needed to "take ownership" and not expect the victims of discrimination to do all the work.

Madison365, a local news outlet, reported that a first-year student, Launa Owens, has identified herself as the recipient of the note. She said she believed she became a target because she was photographed with a sign that depicted Bucky Badger, Wisconsin's mascot, in a Ku Klux Klan robe. She said this was part of an effort to draw attention to the racial climate on campus.

Missouri House committee votes to reverse guns-on-campus ban

JEFFERSON CITY, Mo. (AP) — A House committee has passed a bill that would allow concealed guns on college campuses.

The Columbia Daily Tribune (http://bit.ly/1Y3S5Og) reports that the House Emerging Issues Committee passed the bill with an 8-3 vote Wednesday, winning unanimous support from Republicans.

The bill, sponsored by Rep. Jered Taylor, R-Nixa, would repeal the current guns-on-campus ban and replace it with language allowing people with concealed weapon permits to have firearms on campus. The bill includes some restrictions.

Taylor says guns wouldn't be allowed in residence halls, classrooms educating preschool, elementary or high school students or in laboratories where an accidental discharge could ignite volatile chemicals. He adds that students who would want their
weapons with them at school could opt-out of any requirement that they live in a dormitory.

"I would prefer it to be allowed in dorms, for them to find a safe way to store it while they are in the dorms, but this is a way to move the bill forward," Taylor said.

Paul Wagner, executive director of the Council on Public Higher Education, said that public, four-year universities still oppose the bill despite changes that were intended to resolve some of their concerns.

The Select Committee on General Laws will review the bill next. The chairman of that committee, Rep. Caleb Jones, R-Columbia, said that he is inclined to support the bill.

Time is running out to move the legislation through as lawmakers adjourn in six weeks and already have dozens of bills ahead of Taylor's on the agenda.

THE CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

What Students Think About Free Speech

No MU Mention

Although it is foolhardy to generalize about a generation of college students, their understanding and attitude about freedom of speech was strikingly different from what we, two baby-boomers, expected when we began teaching a course on free speech on college campuses to 15 freshmen at the University of California at Irvine.

In the course we studied the basic principles of freedom of speech, including its history through Supreme Court decisions addressing restrictions on speech during World War I, World War II, the McCarthy era, the civil-rights movement, and the
Vietnam War. We discussed categories of speech that have been traditionally considered outside of First Amendment protection — such as incitement, fighting words, true threats, harassment, and defamation. We also looked at all of the decisions on student speech and focused a great deal of attention on recent controversies on college campuses.

At the very beginning of the course we discussed the story of the Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity members at the University of Oklahoma who had been videotaped chanting racist slurs aboard a bus. We had the students consider a hypothetical scenario in which one of the expelled students sues the university, claiming a violation of First Amendment rights. When asked to vote whether the student or university should win the lawsuit, our students voted unanimously in favor of the university and against free-speech rights. We concluded the course by polling them again on the same problem, and then the students split almost evenly. The difference in the discussion was remarkable; the instinctive desire to eradicate racist speech was replaced by all of the students seeing the need to strike a balance between free speech and creating a positive learning environment for all on campus.

Still, despite some evolution in their thinking, our students were skeptical of well-established precedents for the protection of offensive or hateful speech. Why? Here’s what we learned from them:

This generation has a very strong and persistent instinct to protect others against hateful, discriminatory, or intolerant speech, especially in educational settings.

This is the first generation of students to be educated, from a young age, not to bully. For as long as they can remember, their schools have organized "tolerance weeks." Their teachers and coaches are (thankfully) less likely to mock or shame students for poor performance. Compared to when the two of us were in middle and high school in the 1960s and ’70s, there are much greater efforts to avoid making young people feel bad about themselves.
Our students often related personal stories of how bullying at school and on social media had affected people they cared about. They are deeply sensitized to the psychological harm associated with hateful or intolerant speech, and their instinct is to be protective. We realized that common descriptions of this generation of college students too often omits this sense of compassion and the admirable desire to protect their fellow students.

Additionally, arguments about the social value of freedom of speech are very abstract to today’s undergraduates because they did not grow up at a time when the act of punishing speech was associated with hurting people and undermining other worthwhile values. Our students knew little about the history of free speech in the United States and had no awareness of how speech often had been directed to helping vulnerable political minorities: anti-imperialists, workers’ rights advocates, and progressives in the 1910s and ’20s; religious minorities during World War II; leftists during the McCarthy era; civil-rights advocates; anti-war protesters during the Vietnam War; student free-speech advocates.

The two of us grew up during the time of civil-rights and anti-Vietnam War protests. Much of the speech that was considered important to protect was raucous and even profane. Protesters burned draft cards, flags, and bras; cities prosecuted people who wore T-shirts that expressed obscene sentiments about the draft; authors, publishers, and even comedians risked jail by pushing against historic prohibitions against indecency or obscenity. We saw firsthand how officials attempted to stifle or punish protesters by claiming that they were defending community values or responding to threats to the public peace. We also saw how stronger principles of free speech assisted the drive for desegregation, the push to end the war, and the efforts of historically marginalized people to challenge convention and express their identities in
new ways. In our experience, speech that was sometimes considered offensive, or that made people uncomfortable, was a good and necessary thing for progress.

For today’s students, the historic link between free speech and the protection of dissenters and vulnerable groups is outside their direct experience, and too distant to affect their feelings about freedom of speech. As a result, their initial instinct was to be more trusting of the government and other public institutions, including the university, to regulate speech to protect students and prevent disruptions of the educational environment.

As the course went on, our students gained a deeper understanding of the potential for the abuse of power when officials are authorized to restrict unpopular speech. However, they continued to be concerned that the court’s categories of unprotected speech were not broad enough to deal with certain harms that concerned them. For example, they worried that the definition of "incitement" was not broad enough to allow the government to stop international terrorists from using the Internet to recruit converts and help those recruits plan terrorist attacks.

They supported the rights of Westboro Baptist Church protesters, known for staging antigay protests at military funerals, among other spectacles, even though that speech was deeply offensive and inflicted emotional harm. But in educational settings, they wanted officials to do all they can to create a supportive learning environment. There was no support among our students for the right of a faculty member to resist a university requirement to include "trigger warnings" on syllabi. They acknowledged the right of a faculty member to criticize such a mandate, but as was the case with their K-12 teachers, they thought the main role of the faculty member was to create a nurturing learning environment, not to be confrontational. They were not used to teachers who believed that learning could take place in an environment where students
were made uncomfortable, or were forced to reflect on disturbing topics, or had their views challenged rather than always validated.

Studying free-speech law made them much more nuanced in drawing distinctions as to what speech to allow and what to punish. Some drew a distinction based on whether the hateful speech was directed to others or expressed more generally. This accounts for some of the change in votes regarding the Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity example. But they worried that if the university only restricted speech that amounted to "harassment" or "true threats," there would still be too much room for exclusionary, discriminatory, or insulting speech by people on campus.

The students came to recognize that campus officials should not protect people from being made uncomfortable by the expression of strongly-held political or religious views. They agreed that campuses should not be cleansed of all controversial opinions or all expressions that some might consider offensive.

Still, they remained skeptical of the value of defending hateful or discriminatory speech that was not clearly tied to deeply held beliefs about religion or politics. Divisive ideas that were sincerely held seemed like a different thing than being mean, trying to make people feel bad, or other speech acts that seemed to have no social value worth protecting. The on-campus presence of people who had hateful or judgmental opinions — even if those opinions were expressed off campus or online — was a serious matter of concern. Our students acknowledged that one could decide to deal with this problem with more speech rather than restrictions or punishments, but they were not sure this was enough to protect their peers from psychological distress.
Finally, we realized that current debates about the appropriate boundaries of campus free speech will not be a mere replay of 1990s battles over campus "hate speech" codes.

We found what has recently been reported by the Pew Research Center to be true: Millennials are much more supportive of censoring offensive statements about minorities. They are also much less amenable to being persuaded by countervailing arguments about the need to protect hateful speech. This is not just a matter of not being exposed to pro-speech arguments or not taking them seriously. These were bright and thoughtful students at a leading research university, and they are thinking about these issues in fresh ways.

As debates continue about the appropriate boundaries of free speech on college campuses, strong free-speech advocates — and we consider ourselves in this category — cannot assume that the social benefits of broad free-speech protections will be automatically appreciated by a generation that has not lived through decades-long struggles against censorship and punishment of protesters, dissenters, and iconoclasts. As American history has demonstrated, there is no natural or inevitable instinct to support speech that many people consider disruptive, offensive, or even countercultural. The country has a much longer history of suppressing unpopular speakers than protecting them. The pro-free-speech case needs to be made anew, and it is not the responsibility of incoming students to have already internalized the arguments.

In making the case, pro-speech advocates will not win any new friends if they are dismissive of this generation’s expectation that we care about the psychological impact that hateful and intolerant speech has on its victims. The necessity of creating supportive and nondiscriminatory learning environments must be acknowledged, and
advocates will need to be explicit about how broad protections for speech — including offensive and hateful speech — can be reconciled with this commitment.