Missouri college student accused of election-related threat

COLUMBIA, Mo. (AP) — A University of Missouri student who police say was upset over the results of the U.S. presidential election is accused of posting a threat on a social media app.

Columbia police say 23-year-old senior chemistry major Gregory L. Phipps was arrested Wednesday on suspicion of misdemeanor harassment. He later was released on $500 bond.

Police say Phipps was upset early Wednesday about Republican Donald Trump's victory when he posted under his own name on the app Erodr the message, "Some of you should be ready to die tomorrow." The message went on to say, "If you want to topple a country, prison is the least I can do to show you what you deserve."

A message Wednesday by The Associated Press to Phipps' campus email account was not immediately returned.

Election-related social media threat leads to arrest

Columbia police on Wednesday arrested a 23-year-old man on suspicion of harassment after he allegedly posted a threatening message saying “Some of you should be ready to die tomorrow” to the social media app Erodr.

Gregory L. Phipps was arrested on suspicion of misdemeanor harassment at 6:23 a.m. at 1115 Paquin St. He was released from the Boone County Jail at 1:32 p.m. after posting a $500 bond.

Columbia police were called at 2:35 a.m. for a threat posted to Erodr and were shown the message that Phipps posted under his own name, Officer Latisha Stroer said in an email. Stroer said the message read "I'll be in prison for a while. But that's okay I guess. Some of you should
be ready to die tomorrow. If you want to topple a country prison is the least I can do to show you what you deserve."

The post was tagged in Columbia. Stroer said the threat was not directed at a specific group of people and Phipps posted it because he was upset over the results of Tuesday’s presidential election in which Republican business man Donald Trump upset former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, a Democrat.

Stroer said Phipps admitted to police after his arrest to posting the message to Erodr, a social media app marketed to college students in which users can also post anonymously. **Phipps is a senior undergraduate chemistry student at the University of Missouri, according to MU’s online directory.**

His arrest was almost a year after messages threatening to kill black people at MU were posted on the anonymous social media app Yik Yak. Hunter M. Park of Lake St. Louis threatened on Nov. 10, 2015 to “shoot every black person I see” on MU’s campus and quoted a gunman responsible for a massacre at a community college in Oregon in October 2015.

Park’s posts were one day after demonstrations against racism on MU’s campus by the group Concerned Student 1950 resulted in the resignations of the system president and campus chancellor. He later pleaded guilty to a felony and was given a suspended sentence.

---

**Man arrested in Columbia for making threats on "Erodr"**

COLUMBIA — The Columbia Police Department made an arrest Wednesday morning after a man allegedly posted a threat on a social media site.

According to Public Information Officer Latisha Stroer, at around 2:35 a.m. officers were called to a complaint about a threatening post on the social media site "Erodr." Officers were shown a message posted by 23-year-old Gregory Phipps.
Officer Stroer said the message, which was posted under Phipps' name said, "I'll be in prison for a while, but that's okay I guess. Some of you should be ready to die tomorrow. If you want to topple a country prison is the least I can do to show you what you deserve."

Officers said that post was geo-tagged in Columbia.

Phipps admitted to making the post and was arrested at around 6:20 a.m. for harassment in the 1100 block of Paquin Street.

The uncertain future of Missouri one year after strikes rocked the school, team

COLUMBIA, Mo. -- **A year later, the University of Missouri has lost enrollment, revenue and -- some might argue -- its way.**

*It hasn't lost a reputation that rests proudly at the corner of Eighth and Elm streets. Lee Hills Hall is where professor Berkley Hudson met this semester with the eight freshmen in his Journalism and Social Justice class.*

They weren't scared away by arguably the most significant social upheaval on a college campus in decades. They came to Mizzou and its famous journalism school to cover it.

A year ago this week, a threatened boycott by Missouri's football team was largely responsible for the resignation of both system president Tim Wolfe and chancellor R. Bowen Loftin.

The Tigers' actions turned a campus protest over racial inequality into a national discussion. Their intentions have not been forgotten in the locker room, the administration building or in Missouri's fabled J-school.

"One of the students in the class chose between Northwestern, North Carolina and here," Hudson said, naming three well-known journalism schools. "This is the place to be. She knew they could be turning out stories right now."

And so they have. One of Hudson's students wrote 3,000 words on the issue for *Teen Vogue*. Then-student photographer Tim Tai became an industry legend for defying protestors' attempts to keep him from chronicling their Carnahan Quad tent city.
Somehow, the protestors didn’t understand the same reason he had a right to photograph them was the same reason they were able to protest in the first place: the First Amendment.

"For many students in journalism, this is the perfect place," Hudson said. "This is a laboratory for learning about the problems that America faces that have been articulated now in the current political campaign.

"It's an unwillingness to face one's own fears and misunderstandings. That's what is being made manifest in the country right now."

Missouri is many things at the moment, but it is not healed. Last fall, a group calling itself ConcernedStudent 1950 became frustrated at Wolfe's unwillingness to listen to their concerns over racial inequality. One of their own, a graduate student named Jonathan Butler, went on a hunger strike.

Some members of the football team met with Butler. They were so moved by his commitment that they took an unprecedented step of leveraging their athletic labor to seek change.

The players' historic tweet followed on a football Saturday night, Nov. 7, 2015. They decided to stop practicing and boycott the next week's game against BYU unless Wolfe resigned.

The sudden intersection of civil rights and football made it a national story. Two days after Mizzou's players threatened to withhold services, Wolfe stepped down.

Butler began to eat.

"The big picture, I feel like athletes are more empowered," said junior defensive end Charles Harris, one of the boycott leaders, on Monday. "That's something that can't go without notice."

"I guarantee you I wouldn't be here alive if the football team didn't step in," Butler said in the Spike Lee documentary on the topic "Two Fists Up."

You don't have to agree with what happened here, but you should prepare for more of it. What has followed is a tsunami of collegiate and societal change.

Colin Kaepernick’s national anthem protests filtered down to college. The NCAA is trying to keep one step ahead of the courtroom in terms of player compensation.

There is an ongoing mandate to lessen time demands put on athletes for their sports.

"The Missouri athletes were a spark," said Mizzou doctoral student Reuben Faloughi. "These national anthem protests in the NFL? I definitely think they were influenced by what happened here at Mizzou."

Faloughi, 25, played football at Georgia before transferring to Missouri to pursue his graduate degree in counseling psychology. Along the way, he became an activist, joining ConcernedStudent 1950. Faloughi said the Ferguson protests 2 ½ years ago changed his outlook.

"When Michael Brown happened, it was like a veil was lifted from my eyes," said Faloughi, who is African-American. "Suddenly, I realized I could be Michael Brown."
"You have a growing mass of athletes who understand this is just a game. We have a platform. There's this social responsibility we can't back away from."

There is no closure a year later. Big 12 commissioner Bob Bowlsby has predicted there will be a day "the popcorn is popped, the TV cameras are there, the fans are in the stands and the team decides they're not going to play."

"Our games will be the target of civil disobedience," Bowlsby said Monday. "Like in the Missouri situation, outside entities will put pressure on the players."

Faloughi echoed a complaint from the Missouri players during last year's protests. They're heroes on game day but second-class citizens the rest of the week.

"I tell people, 'You're a demigod on Saturday,'" Faloughi said. "White people want you to kiss their baby. But the six other days in the week, you're just a black person in America."

All of it shed light on a reputation of racial intolerance this city and campus has had to live down. Columbia's nickname is "Little Dixie." Lee filmed that documentary earlier this year chronicling the recent unrest.

Interim president Michael Middleton, an African-American, came to Mizzou on a music scholarship and played in the marching band. It was a tradition at that time, he said, to play "Dixie" at halftime while a Confederate flag was unfurled.

Former coach Woody Widenhofer was still being asked questions in the 1980s about his ability to recruit African-American players out of St. Louis.

After the unrest of last year, a Missouri state representative suggested football players lose their scholarships.

In September, the Delta Upsilon fraternity here was temporarily suspended after a group of African-American students said racial slurs were hurled their way by frat members.

"We're Little Dixie. Need I remind you?" Hudson said in the film. "We're a border state. Need I remind you? Dred Scott is here."

Hudson was chair of a Missouri race relations committee that recently presented its findings on the matter to the faculty council. He advocated for a "Mizzou Miracle" where the school becomes a local, regional and national leader in race relations dialogue.

"We have no monopoly on any of this," Hudson said. "We just happened to be where all these forces and currents came together. It's giving us an incredible opportunity to learn about one another."

Still, it's hard to imagine any of this happening right now at places like Alabama, Northwestern, Texas or USC. Try to conceive of a group of protestors emerging out of a crowd to lock arms blocking the president's car in the homecoming parade.

It happened last fall at Mizzou. Wolfe sat stone-faced in the back of a convertible as ConcernedStudent 1950 protestors read off a litany of protests. At other places, it wouldn't have gotten that far. But Missouri has long been known for being more reactive than proactive.
CBS Sports requested comment from Middleton. On the one-year anniversary of one of the biggest events in the university's history, we were referred to a September video that contained Middleton comments.

Meanwhile, out-of-state enrollment is down 12 percent, according to reports. Tuition revenue is down $36.3 million. Much of it is attributed to fallout from the protests.

Coach Barry Odom sees no impact on recruiting where there is no honor among rivals in the best of times. Negative recruiting feeds off rumor, innuendo and flat-out lies. On this, opponents need only to hold up the headlines.

"I don't have it brought up much," Odom said of his recruiting visits. "But, also, I'm going to bring it up. There's nothing to run from."

Former athletic director Mack Rhoades left in July, trading his problems at Missouri for those at Baylor.

His replacement, Jim Sterk, arrived from San Diego State and quickly nailed down three sizable donations that will go toward a new $75 million football facility.

"I wanted to know really what kind of a place this was," Sterk said. "Everyone said the people are good, it's an inclusive place. Then I wanted to know how people felt now.

"In a difficult situation, they did as best they could. There wasn't anything violent."

A year later, ConcernedStudent 1950 has disbanded. Students have degrees to pursue. Lives to live. Some of their demands were met. Some weren't.

Butler has "dropped off the map," Faloughi said. The one-time face of a movement that sprung far beyond this campus only sometimes responds to texts.

What's left is social change, a damaged brand, athlete empowerment, financial downturn and some lingering uncertainty from it all.

"How do you make something beautiful out of our wounds?" Hudson wondered.

Mizzou Mayhem: One Year Later

Watch the story: http://mms.tveyes.com/PlaybackPortal.aspx?SavedEditID=a4705af6-b6be-4eb3-b729-df1131c26920

Columbia, Mo. - The University of Missouri is making efforts to rebuild it's image after the protests of November 9th, 2015 and the collapse of the leadership structure that same day.
One year later, ABC 17 News is investigating the state of the system to find out what has changed.

"The biggest price the University of Missouri-Columbia has paid with the events of last year is that it alienated people who love this institution. But, they just got so mad at how they handled the situation, from whichever side you sit. They were like, 'That was ridiculous!'" said Renee Hulshof, a member of the UM system review commission put in place by state lawmakers.

On November 2nd, 2016 Dr. Mun Choi was named the new system president, Tim Wolfe's replacement. You'll remember Wolfe resigned as system president November 9th, 2015. Today, there are fewer students, fewer football fans, and faculty still without permanent jobs. Hank Foley is one of those faculty members serving in interim as Mizzou's chancellor. Before he came to Mizzou, he was a leader at Penn State during the Jerry Sandusky child sex abuse scandal. There, he got a first hand lesson in dealing with a major campus image crisis.

"I think it was at Penn State where I learned aphorism, if you've got lemons, make lemonade," said Foley.

Foley says this experience may help him to try to turn around the sour situation at Mizzou. One of the biggest obstacles the University is up against is a drop in enrollment. Enrollment is down by 2,182 students this fall semester at Mizzou. This drop along with rising expenses and strategic investments cost the university to lose $24.7 million dollars. So, what's the strategy to turn this around?

"If you're gonna make money, you've gotta spend some money to get there," said Foley. That money is being spent on marketing the University.

"Everything from product placement on billboards and in major newspapers, new social media strategies... We're not going to restore enrollment by waiting for that to happen," said Foley. ABC 17 News was able to obtain the dollar amount the University has spent on advertising and marketing through a records request.

Two years before the protests (November 2013- November 2014) the University system spent $244,660 on marketing. The year before the protests (November 2014- November 2015) it spent $172,019.

In the year after the protests (November 2015- November 2016) there was a significant jump in spending. The total spent was $407,007.
A year after UM funding cuts, legislators reflect, talk future


COLUMBIA - **Protests rocked MU's campus in 2015, resulting in unprecedented funding cuts to the UM system in 2016. One year after protests garnered national and statewide criticism, one local lawmaker said he wants better results for the university in 2017.**

"I'm going to continue to be optimistic that we can move past it," said newly-elected State Senator Caleb Rowden, who was a state representative in fall 2015. "But, if we don't, we have to be ready to fight again."

But how did we get to this point? The frustration and anger toward the university grew as Concerned Student 1950 stole the national spotlight last fall. After many voiced their disapproval, lawmakers remembered when it counted, voting to cut funding for the UM system to the tune of $3.8 million.

Lawmakers on both sides of the aisle voted in favor of legislation that could have done even more damage. Rowden said he recalls a conversation he had with former UM President Tim Wolfe, where he realized just how damning last fall was to the university's relationship with lawmakers.

"I never remember, and I had never spoken to anybody who remembered a time where beating up on the University of Missouri was a politically expedient thing to do. And I think that changed last year," Rowden said.

Representative Steve Cookson, (R-Popular Bluff), said the university put lawmakers outside of Columbia in a tough spot.
"When we would come back home to our different areas, the questions we were being asked were, 'What kind of craziness is going on up there? And, what are their demands? And they're demanding things?''" Cookson said.

Cookson insisted race did not play a role in the funding cuts, despite the fact many of the lawmakers who voted in favor of the cuts hail from rural areas of the state.

"Everyone has to act in an appropriate way, regardless of what your race is," Cookson said.

Rowden said he does not believe the personal opinions held by Missouri lawmakers should ever dictate how much money the state's flagship university receives.

"It's not the job of the Missouri legislature to run the University of Missouri. It is our job, as the biggest benefactor who writes a $450 million check to the university every year, to make sure that money is being used well," Rowden said.

Representative Kathie Conway (R-St. Charles), who holds a seat on Missouri's select budget committee, also voted for the UM funding cuts. She said she's still unsure about the direction of the UM system as a whole.

"I'm not sure exactly what the university has done to correct the problem," Conway said in a statement. "My opinion is it starts at the top with the curators, and I feel they have been ineffective in leadership."

Despite being described as a champion of the university last fall, Rowden concedes there were some major issues.

"You don't get to a position where you have a hunger strike going on in the middle of your campus, and your football team is striking, your grad students are upset for a different issue, you don't get to that place without some things being done the wrong way," Rowden said.

Cookson said while he is optimistic about recent changes to the UM system, he and his colleagues need to see more before they will be convinced the university is headed in the right direction.

"We're optimistic, but, we're also cautious, because in the last year, it seems like, they're making the news a lot, and not always in a positive way," Cookson said.

Still, Rowden characterized last year's funding cuts as an unfair, bipartisan attack on one of the state's most valuable assets.

"There were a few screaming matches last year," Rowden said. "It wasn't unclear what the motivation was. It was a pretty transparent kick in the teeth to the university at a time when that was the last thing they needed."
Rowden said he believes many of the people who came out so passionately against the university had been waiting for years, if not longer, for an opportunity to hurt MU.

"It's no secret that there are folks from certain pockets of the state that just don't like the university. And they would love to see it brought down to a level of some of the other schools in the state," Rowden said.

He said the mood is different heading into this years session, pointing to time as the key healing factor.

"I don't think that this year there is going to be quite the desire for beating up on the university to be a top priority. I just don't see that happening. I think we're far enough removed from some of those issues, and enough changes have been made."

---

**MU campus quiet on one year anniversary of protests**


COLUMBIA - **The MU campus was relatively quiet Wednesday, the anniversary of Tim Wolfe resigning and the end of the hunger strike.**

The protests erupted in fall 2015 after a series of racial incidents.

Many students on campus Wednesday were more focused on the election results from Tuesday, but some still shared their thoughts on the current campus climate.

"It's not as tense as it was last year amongst the students. So I think him resigning just made everyone at ease," MU student Jocelyn Jones said.

“It’s definitely much calmer than it was before. You never really hear about that anymore. The news has kind of died down on it,” MU student Scott Winfrey said.
In passing, another student mentioned he thinks there is still a lot of work to do and the campus climate is still tense.

Concerned Student 1950 spoke out on twitter.

In a CNN article from November 2015, Donald Trump said, "I think it's just disgusting. I think the two people who resigned are weak, ineffective people. When they resigned, they set something in motion that's going to be a disaster for the next long period of time."

Trump also called Concerned Student 1950's demands crazy in that article, "Many of those things are like crazy."

KOMU 8 News reached out to Concerned Student 1950 to see if there would be a rally or gathering Wednesday, but did not hear back.

---

One year later: How MU leaders have worked to address diversity issues

COLUMBIA - The University of Missouri has taken several steps to address the demands issued by Concerned Student 1950 a year ago. Those demands and student protests, including a hunger strike by graduate student Jonathan Butler and a boycott by the football team, led to the resignations of multiple university leaders and national attention.

The list of demands below is followed by how university officials have reacted.

I. We demand that the University of Missouri System President, Tim Wolfe, writes a handwritten apology to the Concerned Student 1-9-5-0 demonstrators and holds a press conference in the Mizzou Student Center reading the letter. In the letter and at the press conference, Tim Wolfe must acknowledge his white male privilege, recognize that systems of oppression exist, and provide a verbal commitment to fulfilling Concerned Student 1-9-5-0 demands. We want Tim Wolfe to admit to his gross negligence, allowing his driver to hit one of the demonstrators, consenting to the physical violence of bystanders, and lastly refusing to intervene when Columbia Police Department used excessive force with demonstrators.
II. We demand the immediate removal of Tim Wolfe as UM system president. After his removal a new amendment to UM system policies must be established to have all future UM system president and Chancellor positions be selected by a collective of students, staff, and faculty of diverse backgrounds.

III. We demand that the University of Missouri meets the Legion of Black Collegians’ demands that were presented in 1969 for the betterment of the black community.

IV. We demand that the University of Missouri creates and enforces comprehensive racial awareness and inclusion curriculum throughout all campus departments and units, mandatory for all students, faculty, staff, and administration. This curriculum must be vetted, maintained, and overseen by a board comprised of students, staff, and faculty of color.

V. We demand that by the academic year 2017-2018, the University of Missouri increases the percentage of black faculty and staff campus-wide to 10%.

VI. We demand that the University of Missouri composes a strategic 10 year plan by May 1, 2016 that will increase retention rates for marginalized students, sustain diversity curriculum and training, and promote a more safe and inclusive campus.

VII. We demand that the University of Missouri increases funding and resources for the University of Missouri Counseling Center for the purpose of hiring additional mental health professionals? particularly those of color, boosting mental health outreach and programming across campus, increasing campus-wide awareness and visibility of the counseling center, and reducing lengthy wait times for prospective clients.

VIII. We demand that the University of Missouri increases funding, resources, and personnel for the social justices centers on campus for the purpose of hiring additional professionals, particularly those of color, boosting outreach and programming across campus, and increasing campus-wide awareness and visibility.

The group reissued the demands with more detail in February 2016. While Interim UM System President Mike Middleton responded to the February list by saying the time for demands is over, many university initiatives do address the concerns expressed.

The first two demands on the list, an apology and resignation of former President Tim Wolfe, happened on November 9, 2015.

Other ways the university has responded include a new racial awareness and inclusion curriculum and increased funding for counseling services.

"In an effort to strengthen outreach efforts to diverse populations on campus, the MU Counseling Center hired two psychologists of color, a post-intern of color and an additional intern of color," Kevin McDonald, UM System Chief Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Officer, said.
Another demand was 10 percent black faculty and staff by the 2017-2018 school year. While the university does not plan to meet this, it has set a goal of doubling the percentage of historically underrepresented minority groups to 13.4 percent of the faculty in the next four years.

"It's going to have to be a significant number. It's going to have to be around 30 percent. It's going to have to be higher than our average right now. Maybe 50 percent some years," Interim Chancellor Hank Foley said when asked how many minorities the university would have to hire to meet its goal.

At a news conference in September, MU leaders reiterated they are committed to working on issues of diversity and inclusion, and they announced more than a million dollars would go toward efforts to meet minority hiring goals.

**One Year Later: Concerned Student 1950 member, other students speak out**


COLUMBIA - **One year ago, students and staff gathered at Carnahan Quad on MU's campus to protest the UM system and its handling of racial incidents and events.**

**Concerned Student 1950 reaction**

Marshall Allen, the original organizer of Concerned Student 1950, spoke with KOMU 8 News exclusively, and said, although there have been changes made in the UM systems, some students still have the same mindset.

"There's still a lot of talk, still a lot of speculation about we don't really know what to do and stuff like that and I think that has not changed. The what can you do? How do we move forward?" Allen said.

Marshall said what was going through his mind a year ago is very different as to what's going through his mind now.
"A year ago it was 'this is happening,' and now it's like, 'where's the change?'" Allen said. "Are we really going to move forward to elevate the sense of unity and togetherness on a campus such as this one?"

The protests last year did not stop more racial incidents from happening on campus.

In September, The Legion of Black Collegians, a student organization at the University of Missouri, reported two of its members were racially harassed near a fraternity.

"It's still happening. It's still small stuff like that that really twists and turns in the back of your head. Especially as student of color," Allen said. "The University did expel them but it's still happening and that's showing how the overall decisions and thought processes behind students has not changed."

**MU Student reaction**

Malika Hill, a junior at MU, said she feels there's still a racial tension.

"There's just unspoken tensions. We know that it's there, but nobody ever speaks about it really," Hill said.

Hill said the incidents that happened since the protests are disappointing to her.

"It was like a 'not again' type of situation. You would've thought that something would've changed and there would've been more of a conversation in the fraternities on campus but apparently there wasn't any conversation and it was shown that night," Hill said.

Jessica Porter is also an MU junior and said she feels like the overall campus climate has gone back to normal.

At the homecoming parade, she said she doesn't think there's a need for a protest one year later.

"There's progress kind of that has been made and so I feel like people are starting to move forward," Porter said.

Allen said he believes MU will one day change.

"You know the fight song and stuff like that, what it really means to come together as one body, one institution. When I graduate and I look back I expect to see that that's what I hope to see," Allen said.

**Twitter**

On the anniversary of the protests, Concerned Student 1950 took to Twitter to make their voices heard and comment on Donald Trump's election as president.
WASHINGTON • Americans fight like cats and dogs in their elections, then act like puppies the next day — even with the aftershocks of an earthquake moving the ground beneath them.

This ritual played out in full constitutional benevolence Wednesday, led by President Barack Obama, whose legitimacy as an American was put into question by the man who will succeed him.

Obama offered an olive branch, just as he said George W. Bush gave him eight years ago, and a pledge of full cooperation to President-elect Donald Trump.
“We are all now rooting for his success in uniting and leading the country,” Obama said from the Rose Garden, 71 days before he will relinquish the presidency. “The peaceful transition of power is one of the hallmarks of our democracy and over the next few months we are going to show that to the world.”

Minutes earlier, Hillary Clinton had fought through what she said will be pain that will last for a long time, in a concession speech that alternated between healing and subtle defiance.

“Donald Trump is going to be our president,” Clinton told supporters in New York, some of whom were weeping. “We owe him an open mind and a chance to lead. Our constitutional democracy enshrines the peaceful transition of power, and we don’t just respect that, we cherish it.

“It also enshrines other things,” Clinton said, in an obvious reference to Trump’s campaign attacks on Mexican immigrants, Muslims, and the press. “The rule of law. The principle that we are all equal in rights and dignity. Freedom of worship and expression. We respect and cherish these values, too. And we must defend them.”

Beneath these fleeting expressions of harmony are cracks in the American bedrock. The 2016 presidential campaign seemingly ended two political dynasties of the last 30 years, the Clintons and Bushes. The election damaged Obama’s legacy, with frontal assaults on his signature issues — Obamacare and policies to confront climate change among them — certain to be on the legislative agenda of a Republican House and Senate.

The election gave us a new president who won the Electoral College but apparently lost the popular vote, a reminder of the deep divisions still confronting the country.

Some see, in Trump, a door opener to a new political course that will have competing guides, including within his own Republican Party. He has grandiose promises to live up to — building a wall on the southern border and making Mexico pay for it, for starters — that many Republicans, including those in key positions in Congress, think are bridges way too far. He disagrees with many congressional Republican colleagues on foreign trade deals.
And Democrats, while they did not gain control of the Senate as they had hoped, still have the threat of filibuster to gum up the works. And they’d have the Republican congressional playbook of eight years under Obama — do everything possible to make him an unsuccessful president — to cite as precedent.

“Trump does not have a mandate,” University of Missouri political scientist Alasdair Roberts said Wednesday. “People are clearly unhappy with the status quo, but Trump does not have a well-defined program, and his supporters had many different reasons for supporting him.

“There are also deep divisions within the Republican camp on key issues,” Roberts said. “In fact, we are heading into a period that will be marked by turbulence but also creativity, as politicians in both parties struggle to create new policy agendas and coalitions. Trump is a transitional figure: he shattered the old paradigm, but he is not the person who will define the new paradigm.”

Agree or not, one thing is certain: The next Congress will be busy.

Republicans have campaigned to repeal Obamacare since 2010 but have always had the threat of an Obama veto making it impossible. There will be attempts to peel back environmental and energy initiatives Obama put into place to combat climate change, and on regulations instituted after the 2008 financial meltdown.

“After years of a barrage of regulations, an economy on the wrong track, and the negative effects of Obamacare, millions of Americans went to the polls to make a change,” said Rep. Blaine Luetkemeyer, R-St. Elizabeth, Mo., who serves on a House committee that is likely to go after Obama-era regulations on banks and financial advisers.

Other initiatives that could split the country are likely in the new Congress. With the open Supreme Court post held by the late Antonin Scalia to fill, and with two justices in their 80s and another who turned 78 this year, Trump could have multiple choices for the high court.
Abortion-rights advocates are bracing for a fight on new restrictions on abortions. Unions are preparing for a spate of anti-organized labor initiatives.

In his victory speech, Trump said “that he would bring the country together — something that is essential, given the bullying and bigotry unleashed in this election,” said American Federation of Teachers President Randi Weingarten.

“And as unionists, we will work tirelessly to ensure that all people can reach for their dreams, economically, educationally and otherwise.”

Trump was gracious and charitable in his early morning acceptance speech. He praised Clinton and her family for their service.

“Now is the time to bind the wounds of division,” Trump said.

But the reality is that many politicians, including some in Missouri, owe their political survival to that division.

Trump got over 200,000 more votes than incumbent Republican Sen. Roy Blunt did, in Blunt’s narrow re-election over Democratic Secretary of State Jason Kander.

That means that some number of Missourians voted for Trump and Kander, the outsiders in their race. Blunt survived as a Republican in a Republican state, and by tying Kander to Clinton, who proved to be very unpopular in Missouri.

And after years of electing Democratic governors and, half the time, senators, Missouri Republicans swept the top of the ticket, led by Trump, Blunt and governor-elect Eric Greitens, who beat Democratic Attorney General Chris Koster.

Clinton’s unpopularity in the state cannot be overlooked in that sweep. Even Kander’s ad showing him assembling a military rifle while blindfolded, which drew much national attention, was not enough to overcome it.
“The extent of this blowout was a surprise,” said Jeremy Walling, a political scientist at Southeast Missouri State University. “However, the perceived connection between Koster and Kander to the Clinton campaign cannot be ignored. If voters saw her as toxic, it’s guilt by association, despite how well you can assemble a gun blindfolded.”

David Robertson, head of the political science department at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, agreed.

“We didn’t fully appreciate that Hillary was better at unifying and turning out Republicans than she was at turning out Democrats,” he said.
Alitr was shocked that the president-elect has promised to restrict the immigration of Muslims to the United States and end the country’s Syrian refugee program. To his confusion, the Americans he has met are open and welcoming, nothing like those who seemed to buy into the idea that Muslims are dangerous.

He and many supporters of Hillary Clinton were upset and confused Wednesday about Trump’s victory. They’re in disbelief that the next president is a man who retweeted white supremacists, who was recorded speaking about groping woman in crude and unapologetic terms, and who was accused by 10 women of sexual assault.


On Wednesday, protests against Trump broke out at several universities. Social media was awash with individuals offering support to the LGBTQ community, Muslim Americans, refugees, immigrants, people of color and others.

Many of those concerned asked: How seriously should they take Trump’s campaign rhetoric? More importantly, how seriously would Trump take his own campaign promises that targeted specific classes of people?

“Was he serious about everything he said in the past, or did he just say that to win?” asked Abdullatis Aljoufi, a 27-year-old Muslim student at Park University. “I hope he was joking about what he has said in the past. I hope he just said that to win, and he has another plan.”

Gilbert Guerrero, vice president of the Guadalupe Centers in Kansas City, said he spent much of Wednesday morning talking with worried Hispanic friends.

“Everyone is scared. In my community, they’re scared,” he said. “I don’t want to make it overly dramatic, but I’m a student of history. And I feel like how a Jew in Germany might have felt” in the 1930s.

Several people who spoke to The Star expressed anxiety about whether Trump would make good on promised initiatives that could affect certain civil rights.

Trump has indicated he would appoint Supreme Court justices who would consider revoking same-sex marriage and has said he would sign the Freedom of the First Amendment Defense Act — proposed federal legislation that LGBTQ advocates say would permit discrimination against gay people in the name of religious liberty.

In a presidential debate, he brought up the idea of reinstating “stop and frisk,” a policing technique that studies show has in some areas disproportionately targeted people of color.
He has vowed to swiftly deport illegal immigrants from Latin America and build a wall cutting Mexico off from the United States.

The American political process has long existed on candidates making campaign promises they don’t keep in office. But Trump’s campaign also broke the rules of political civility and crossed over into language that threatened human rights.

What those baffled by Trump’s success didn’t realize, The Washington Post’s media columnist Margaret Sullivan wrote Wednesday, is that for many, his campaign was never about the specifics, but an (albeit inflammatory) commitment to a new direction.

In the column, Sullivan quoted billionaire Peter Thiel making a point about something he said journalists across the country missed — Trump supporters take Trump “seriously but not literally.” Thiel said didn’t he believe Trump really plans to build a wall, for example.

“What they hear is, ‘We’re going to have a saner, more sensible immigration policy,’ ” Sullivan quotes Thiel as saying.

The disconnect has led to some confusion as to just what Trump exactly plans to do in office.

“Personally, I don’t really know where he stands on LGBTQ issues,” said Michael Lintecum, director for the Mid-America Gay & Lesbian Chamber of Commerce. “The rhetoric came out so dark against particular classes of people and minorities and all that. I’m not sure I heard a lot of inflammatory language against gay people.”

Lintecum said the chamber would continue its mission to promote diverse workplaces, and would not let up on improving diversity locally for Kansas City businesses.

“I don’t know what (the rhetoric) is all about,” Lintecum said. “He was appealing to a particular constituency that I guess needed to hear that.”

Guerrero, with the Guadalupe Center, was born in the United States and wouldn’t personally be affected by any of Trump’s immigration policies. But Guerrero said he and his friends worry about what will happen to the so-called Dreamers, undocumented youths and others who have been allowed to stay in the U.S. under current policies.

“I was so happy when Obama made the DREAM Act,” Guerrero said, referring to President Barack Obama’s 2012 move granting work permits and other benefits to millions of undocumented immigrants whose parents brought them here while they were minors.

“Trump says he’s going to cancel those. The danger also, the government’s got their names,” Guerrero said. “There’s so much damage that’s going to be done to our community.”
While anti-Trump protests hit various universities, it was quiet Wednesday at University of Missouri’s Columbia campus on the one-year anniversary of racially charged protests that forced out the system president and university chancellor.

Stephanie Shonekan, director of the Black Studies Department, invited students and faculty who were disturbed by the election to stop by her office “and talk over tea and calm their nerves,” she said. She saw a steady stream.

Aljoufi, the Park University student, said he was confused by the association Trump drew between Muslims and terrorism.

In Saudi Arabia and other places in the world, he pointed out, Muslims are also the targets of terrorists. Even though he believes that Trump likely exaggerated his beliefs to gain more attention from the media and boost his popularity with his supporters, he’s observed the uncertainly people at his campus have for the future.

“A lot of people are sad. A lot of people are shocked,” he said. “They still think it was like a dream. They are waiting to wake up and they are wondering: What’s the future going to be with Trump?”

Nancy Levit, a law professor at the University of Missouri-Kansas City, thinks she knows.

On Wednesday, her daughter sent her a picture of two men in Klan robes walking on the campus of Lawrence University in Appleton, Wis. They were holding a Trump sign and a Confederate flag.

Her son, an Indiana resident and a lawyer, told her that someone egged the home of a Muslim acquaintance of his law partner. “White Power” was written in chalk on the driveway.

“Perhaps these two very small vignettes indicate why unity may be difficult when a country chooses as president someone who has not held elected office and who has demonstrated racist, sexist, and sexually predatory behavior (giddily confessing to kissing women who have not consented and proclaiming that he grabs them by the genitals),” Levit wrote to The Star. “The results of this election have already seemed to empower racist and ethnocentric behavior.”

She said that in the future, she fears “ill-considered judicial appointments, impulsive foreign policy, and crony capitalism,” but hopes she is wrong.

Others she knows don’t want to take the chance.

Levit’s oldest son’s wife is a Canadian citizen, and is expecting a child on Saturday.

After the results came in Wednesday, Levit said, the family made a decision to leave for Toronto.
Donald Trump’s victory leaves political class scratching their heads

BY DAVE HELLING

dhelling@kcestar.com

Throw out the book, or whatever device you use to store and retrieve information.

By every classic political measure — money, advertising, organization, early voting — Donald Trump was in worse shape than Hillary Clinton heading into Tuesday’s presidential election. She led in public polls, had more endorsements, better surrogates, up-to-the-minute campaign software, more staffers in more states, the works.

It wasn’t enough. Trump ignored those tools of classic politics — and more — and still won a stunning victory, turning long-held campaign truths upside down.

“These campaigns are clearly changing,” said John Hancock, chairman of the Missouri Republican Party.

Although experts broadly agreed with that claim, they argued over why it happened, and what it means. Several said Trump prevailed without typical campaign strategies because he’s a unique figure in American politics, a one-of-a-kind salesman locked in on a disgruntled electorate.

“We really haven’t seen a candidate like Donald Trump before,” said Marvin Overby, a political science professor at the University of Missouri. “No one with that celebrity status, that much of a showman. No one who has spoken as bluntly and crassly as he does.

“Whether other people can pull this off,” Overby said, “remains to be seen.”

Others said something more fundamental might be at work. Voters, they said, have now grown deeply distrustful of big media, political parties, education elites, government. That distrust, they believe, has led to the collapsing influence of those institutions, leaving an opening for candidates to speak directly to those threatened by economic change.
Social media channels and competitive cable news outlets with lots of time to fill make it even easier.

“They figured out there was a different way to do it,” said Peter Goelz, a consultant and veteran of several local and national campaigns here and across the country. “And they did it.”

That fundamental change isn’t limited to the United States, either. In Britain and other western European countries, voters continue to disregard perceived elites to focus on disruptive messages from outsiders.

“It’s the little people, it’s the ordinary people, rising up against an establishment that has done them down very badly over the course of the last couple of decades,” Brexit leader Nigel Farage told Skynews on Tuesday.

Several experts said Wednesday the phenomenon was clear in the spring, when Sen. Bernie Sanders rode a similar anti-institution wave to victories in several Democratic primaries.

“It was very clear there were people in both parties who were extremely anti-establishment,” said Bill Lacy, director of the Dole Institute of Politics at the University of Kansas and a veteran of presidential campaigns.

To be sure, Trump’s approach to the campaign seems brilliant largely in hindsight. Had a few thousand votes been different in battleground states, the lessons from campaign 2016 would be quite different.

But Tuesday’s outcome revealed profound problems with tools and institutions politicians have relied upon for decades. Consider:

- Polling. Clinton led in virtually every publicly available poll in the hours leading up to Tuesday’s vote, and enjoyed a year-long lead in most polling averages. A private poll in Missouri, taken over the weekend, showed Trump winning the state by 9 percent. He won by 19 percent.

Inaccurate polls can affect turnout and candidate enthusiasm.

“America was duped by unreliable polls that didn’t come close to the actual results on Election Day,” columnist Brian Flood wrote.

As is typical when polls are off the mark, poll-takers are defensive about their work.

“This was the most difficult electorate to study in history,” said Titus Bond, director of the Remington Research Group, which correctly called several battleground states Tuesday.
“Still, there is no excuse for pollsters to miss their mark so badly and broadly,” he said. “The manipulation of raw data by public polling firms needs to stop in order for the industry to regain the trust of the public.”


“I’ve believed in data for 30 years in politics, and data died tonight,” GOP consultant Mike Murphy tweeted Tuesday night. “I could not have been more wrong about this election.”

- Media endorsements. Virtually every major newspaper in the United States endorsed Clinton, even newspapers with a long history of backing Republicans.

Yet those endorsements seemed to matter less than ever before. Voters can get messages directly from candidates, through social media, and are less reliant on traditional media for political cues.

“Politics has become more and more a marketing game, rather than ideology,” said Pat O’Neill, a Kansas City political consultant and veteran of many local campaigns.

- Political parties. Perhaps no institutions have slumped as much as the Democratic and Republican parties. Trump ignored complaints from leading figures in his party, while Democrats lost down-ballot races and are increasingly unable to mobilize voters in sufficient numbers to win.

“The political parties play very little role,” Goelz said. “The internet really allows people to pick and choose where they get their information.”

Hancock, the Missouri GOP chairman, said pressure may grow for non-party elections, where the top two vote-getters in a primary proceed to a runoff election in the fall. Some states have already enacted that process.

That would further reduce the relevance of traditional political parties, and could give more power to third- and fourth-party efforts.

- Money. Trump raised $247 million, roughly half as much as Clinton’s $497 million. She hired 800 staff members; he had less than half that on his payroll. He spent money on campaign events and hats. She aired thousands of TV commercials in battleground states, to lesser effect.

Some of the biggest outside spenders — the well-known Koch brothers, for example — contributed little to the Trump effort. Trump won anyway.
• Get-out-the-vote. Republicans insisted Wednesday that Trump and the party had a better get-out-the-vote operation than reporters and consultants knew. And there was evidence Wednesday that Clinton’s so-called “ground game” was less than advertised, particularly in urban areas.

In Jackson County and in St. Louis, turnout was down significantly from 2012, while it was up in rural Missouri. Anecdotally, enthusiasm in inner-city precincts was hard to find Tuesday.

Some Democrats wondered aloud Wednesday if the results will bring a new examination of another institution — the Electoral College. For the second time in 16 years, the popular vote winner will apparently trail in the Electoral College vote.

But most said Republicans are unlikely to take up the issue anytime soon.

Consultants and candidates are now studying these and other outcomes from Tuesday, trying to understand what lessons they can take from the results.

Most agree their world is changing. Most believe it will take some time to understand what that means.

“I think it would be a mistake,” Lacy said, “to read this as being (just) distrust of institutions, and the establishment. It’s more complicated than that.”

**MISSOURIAN**

**Republican lawmakers in 'full control' following election sweep**

TYLER WORNELL AND THOMAS FRIESTAD, 11 hrs ago

COLUMBIA — With Republican candidates sweeping Missouri's statewide races and maintaining the party's grip on the legislature, analysts and others forecast that partisan powder keg issues including right to work and anti-abortion rights will likely resurface.

Republicans won all five statewide races — governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, treasurer and attorney general. Both chambers in the Missouri legislature maintained a Republican super-majority.
Peverill Squire, an MU political science professor, said Republicans will have nearly free reign over what bills become law during the next state legislative session.

"Republicans will be in full control in Jefferson City and can push through anything the House, Senate and governor can agree on," Squire said.

Squire said he thinks "right-to-work" laws, which would eliminate required union fees, will be a priority for Republicans in the next session. Greitens supported right-to-work during the campaign. It's difficult to predict what other issues he will prioritize, Squire said, since Greitens has not outlined what issues he considers most important.

In terms of policy expectations, Justin Dyer, an associate political science professor at MU, said Greitens may chafe with General Assembly Republicans on a few issues, such as whether to support potential "religious liberty" laws, but will likely support policies along the lines of his campaign promises.

Samuel Lee, president of anti-abortion rights lobbying group Campaign Life Missouri, said he hopes to have discussions with Greitens' administration that will produce "positive" results.

Lee also mentioned a list of possible bills for the next legislative session that would restrict abortion services. Those include renewing this year's exclusion of Planned Parenthood from Medicaid funding and requiring a second parent to be notified before a minor can get an abortion.

Political scientists are closely analyzing what the Republican sweep, and Donald Trump's presidential victory, will mean.

Marvin Overby, an MU political science professor, called the sweep "a Republican tsunami." Overby said many political scientists were surprised by the results, since polls indicated that several Missouri races would be close.
"That just didn't happen," he said. "Republicans seemed to return home and vote (straight ticket), which gave us the results we got."

Dyer, who also is director of the Kinder Institute on Constitutional Democracy, said he had breakfast Wednesday morning with George Hawley, who presented on the Future of the American Right on Tuesday afternoon before the election results were announced. Even after Trump's victory, Dyer said both he and Hawley were still trying to figure out "what was going on last night."

"Trump had a tall order to fill in terms of winning key states Republicans haven't won for a long time, and he did," Dyer said. "It's fascinating, and we'll be analyzing the data for weeks to come to see what made it possible."

Dyer said predicting the Missouri General Assembly's course of action in the next legislative session is difficult, because this year's candidates were unconventional. Greitens is a former Democrat, Koster is a former Republican.

"It's hard to predict with any confidence what this means for state policy now, and I think everyone's a little chastened by national results in making predictions at all," Dyer said.

Dyer said Tuesday's results indicated that voters were trying to buck "the establishment."

"Because of the Democratic control of the White House, the Democratic brand is the establishment brand in many voters' minds," Dyer said.

Overby agreed, though he said this new focus could come with costs of its own.

"It was definitely an anti-establishment year," Overby said. "You saw that at the national level with Trump and at the state level with Greitens. To what extent the public understands the implications of that, we're going to see. It's one thing to claim in a campaign that the problems are because of career politicians, but it's different to fight those problems in the legislative arena."
Overby was skeptical that both Greitens and Trump have the political know-how to work effectively in their respective positions, though he left the door open for the possibility that they would.

"It may turn out that they have innate skills that will translate well, but there's a reason we don't often elect people who have never held elected office," Overby said. "There are things you learn in office that will make you better at the job."

Overby said both Greitens and Trump may find themselves on the hot seat with Republican voters should any campaign promises fall through.

"Both men will face natural enemies, and it's a life lesson that friends come and go, but enemies accumulate," Overby said. "Both Greitens and Trump have proven to be big campaigners, but when you make a lot of campaign promises, you can't follow through on all of them, and as soon as you stop following through, you start accumulating enemies."

The results of Tuesday's election, both statewide and nationally, left some interest groups concerned.

In a statement, Planned Parenthood Great Plains Votes wrote that its members were "deeply disappointed," vowing that the organization will "roll up its sleeves and get back to work" providing its services to its patients. The Missouri AFL-CIO labor union, which opposes right-to-work, also published a release, stating that Eric Greitens' election as governor against Democratic Attorney General Chris Koster marked "a sad day for working Missourians."

Others were triumphant. Matt Blunt, the son of Sen. Roy Blunt, who won re-election against Democrat Jason Kander, took to Twitter to express his joy. He published 16 tweets and re-tweets after Roy Blunt's win was announced, congratulating his father and praising his campaign staff for their efforts.

"Like their candidate, (Roy Blunt's) winning campaign team worked incredibly hard to earn this victory," Matt Blunt said in a tweet.
Lee said he is confident in Missouri’s elected leaders and Trump.

"The operative word here is change," Lee said. "I think this is a mandate for both our governor and our president to change how government works, and I think they’re both committed to that."

Court challenges likely for photo ID, campaign contribution amendments approved by Missouri voters

By Celeste Bott St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 17 hrs ago

JEFFERSON CITY • Perhaps fitting on a night defined by Donald Trump’s largely self-funded presidential win, Missouri voters overwhelmingly approved a change to the state constitution that will reinstate campaign contribution limits.

In Missouri – known for having some of the most lax campaign finance laws in the country – donors can spend millions to elect their chosen candidates, which some argue leads to those officials being beholden to their financial backers over their constituencies. But that’s about to change.

Supporters of the amendment hailed their win Tuesday, saying it will help keep elections from being influenced only by the wealthy. And in Missouri elections without limits, candidates do raise significantly more money, but from fewer donors – indicating their contributors have deep pockets – and raise more money out of state.

But those against the cap argue that it prohibits free speech through political expression, that donors should be able to spend what they like on candidates so long as they disclose their contributions to the Missouri Ethics Commission.
They also contend that limits will actually lead to less transparency, as donors will merely shuffle money through political action committees that will eventually make its way to their chosen campaigns, behind closed doors and without oversight.

Amendment 2, which was approved by 70 percent of Missouri voters on Tuesday, sought to avoid some of those loopholes by not just limiting how much money donors can spend, but by barring money moving between candidate committees and prohibiting donations from out-of-state PACs, donations intended to conceal the source of the money, and direct contributions from corporations or labor unions.

Committees unaffiliated with a party or candidate can still spend freely for or against ballot issues and candidates, as well as received unlimited donations.

While advocates say the amendment’s victory will allow average voters to “take back their government,” some experts question how far the amendment will really go to stem the flow of big money into Missouri races.

“Money is like water in politics – it will find its way,” said Richard Reuben, an expert in campaign finance law at the University of Missouri, who said limits often prevent the appearance of corruption without stopping corruption itself.

“There are other vehicles that will enable you to get around them,” Reuben said.

More than 63 percent of voters on Tuesday also signed off on a proposal to change the state’s constitution and mandate voters present photo identification before casting a ballot, making Missouri the 18th state to implement the controversial requirement.

According to the state constitution, ballot initiatives that change the constitution take effect 30 days after the election. In the case of photo IDs for voting, the referendum was tied to a law muscled through in the most recent legislative session by Republican legislators who argue the proposal will prevent voter fraud.
Now that voters have approved the change, the law passed by the legislature will take effect in 2017. That legislation lays out guidelines for the requirement, including a provision that will allow those without photo identification to sign a sworn statement affirming their identity before voting.

Democrats insist rampant voter fraud is a nonexistent problem, and that the requirement disenfranchises certain voters, including senior citizens, the poor and people of color.

Opponents sounded off after its approval Tuesday, saying Republicans pushed for a constitutional change because it would be harder to challenge in court. In September, Senate President Pro Tem Ron Richard, R-Joplin, admitted they “went the extra mile” by putting the policy before voters in November.

“Legislators pushed forward the effort to pass a confusing amendment in order to implement a restrictive photo ID law they knew was unconstitutional,” said Missouri State Conference of the NAACP President Nimrod Chapel.

Voting rights advocates, including the American Civil Liberties Union of Missouri, said they are examining how the law can be challenged. Courts in North Carolina, Wisconsin and Texas have tossed similar laws on the grounds that they unfairly target voters of color.

The cap on contribution limits is also likely to be challenged in court, though the Missouri Supreme Court ruled in September that voters deserved the chance to consider the proposal.
MU political science professors explain presidential results

Watch the story: http://mms.tveyes.com/PlaybackPortal.aspx?SavedEditID=5c2794e6-d76e-466d-beec-d8955ee5bfc6

COLUMBIA - Amid confusion, elation and surprise over Tuesday's Election Day results, some people are looking for answers and understanding after a close 2016 presidential election between now president-elect Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton.

"Well, certainly the outcome was unexpected," said University of Missouri political science professor Peverill Squire. "Most of the information we had suggested that Clinton would win, although it did appear to be tightening the last couple of days."

With numbers, surveys and data still being processed, it will be awhile before we understand how neither candidate received 50 percent of the vote.

Another political science professor said he expected Clinton to prevail.

"I thought it would be close, but I thought it would be close in the other direction," Marvin Overby said.

Overby said American elections tend to be tight, and both presidential candidates in this election were flawed. He said it's difficult for a political party to retain control of the White House three terms in a row.

Squires said the election had some resemblances to that of the 2000 contest between George W. Bush and Al Gore.

"It's also important to keep in mind that, in terms of the national vote, Clinton actually does appear to have gotten more votes than Trump," Squire said.

However, electoral college votes made Trump the winner. Until further data and analysis come out, Squires suggests Americans take time to process the 2016 presidential election.
"I think it's going to take awhile for all of us to try to figure it out, and I don't think anybody in Washington was prepared for it either," Squire said. "I think in terms of explanations, we're all going to be scrambling and in terms of what it means going forward we'll just have to wait and see."

**Trump, Greitens win, markets react**

COLUMBIA, Mo. - The United States and global stock markets went on a roller-coaster ride following the election of Donald Trump as president.

The U.S. market opened down, but was back up by mid-morning. Marvin Overby, a professor of political science with the University of Missouri said a dip in the market is normal after an election.

"Especially when you have an election of a candidate the market is not all that fond of," Overby said.

Overby said he felt the conventional wisdom of a Hillary Clinton victory was "a little overstated" and he always felt the race was going to be a close one.

"But the markets pegged [Clinton] as the winner and the markets just don't like uncertainty," said Overby. "So when you get this uncertain election night surprise, if you will, then you get this situation when the market bounces down."

World market analysts agreed with the "unpredictability" factor of Trump.

"He's unpredictable and markets don't like unpredictability," said Michael Hewson, chief market analyst at CMC Markets.

According to reports, the projected market was expected to have dramatic sell-offs. Trump's victory initially sent money into safe stocks like gold and currencies, but the global markets quickly recovered as the morning went on.

"We have a big, resilient economy," Overby said. "Donald Trump is not an unknown to the economy, he has a business background. So I think nerves stabilized pretty quickly on that."

Trump's brash personality has been a stable of his campaign. But Overby said campaigning and governing are two different things and Trump will have to learn to tone it down while in office.
"As a campaigner, you can say things that don't necessarily have direct repercussions," Overby said. "You say those same things in the Oval Office and troops get mobilized and markets take a dive and you start getting red phones buzzing around the world."

Overby said he believes Trump is capable of learning how to handle the international political audience, but he does have a steep learning curve.

"Essentially his first political job is president of the United States," Overby said. "There's a reason why we don't elect people oftentimes whose first political job is president of the United States. There's skills you learn in the state house, or the governor's mansion, or in Congress that translate pretty well I think into the Oval Office."

Trump isn't the only winner from Tuesday night that had no prior political experience.

Missourians elected Eric Greitens to lead the state for the next four years. Greitens is a former Navy SEAL and has previously run a veterans charity. Greitens narrowly won the race over Democratic candidate Chris Koster by about 163,000 votes. Koster is currently serving at the Missouri Attorney General.

Both Trump and Greitens are also former Democrats turned Republicans.

"We're in some way a sort of a new era, I think," Overby said. "We're certainly in a new era where a lot of the traditional expectations don't seem to be in play any longer. The extent to which that is a function of the particular character and particular people here, I think that's the interesting question. Are we in a different place because we have a Donald Trump and Eric Greitens? Or do we have a Donald Trump and Eric Greitens because we are in a different place?"

Overby said he felt Trump also benefited from running against Clinton in the general election. He said many people felt Clinton was an extension of President Obama and a "Clinton from the '90s".

"He just looked more dynamic on the stage than she did," Overby said. "A lot of that was bravado. A lot of that has not much substance behind it. He certainly doesn't know as much as she does. He's not as experienced as she is. But he benefited from the fact that he was running against a candidate that had these flaws."

Overby also talked about how the "career politicians," who Trump and Greitens campaigned against, will now have to work with the newly elected president and governor, respectively.

"You heard it from Trump, you heard it from Greitens, 'corrupt-career-politician'," Overby said. "Many of them are Republicans and leaders in their own party. That's going to cause certain tensions in both Washington and Jefferson City."

"We're going to see if this is a one-off; if this Trump-Greitens is a one-of-a-kind or if it's the beginning of a new era," said Overby.
Obama-to-Donald Trump Transition Could Affect Higher Ed

Donald Trump provided relatively few clues to what he might do as president, but he'll probably try to reverse some of President Obama's priorities, rolling back regulations, creating new political opening for for-profit colleges and curtailing collective bargaining rights.

No MU Mention

To anticipate the higher ed priorities of a Trump administration, look to policies already proposed by Republicans in Congress. That's the consensus of many observers of federal higher education policy when asked to gauge what kinds of policies President-elect Donald J. Trump is likely to pursue early in his administration.

During much of the presidential campaign, Trump's higher ed positions remained a mystery, except for comments from a surrogate unearthed by Inside Higher Ed. While Democrat Hillary Clinton made higher ed policy a core element of her campaign with a proposal to make public higher education debt-free, and then tuition-free for most students, the Republican candidate was largely silent until an Oct. 13 speech in Cincinnati, when he made remarks criticizing unaffordable student loan debt, “tremendous bloat” in campus administrations and large university endowments. But his plans remained vague.

After a surprising election night win, it's no more clear what exactly his higher education agenda will consist of.

But policy analysts say Trump is likely to act in at least a handful of areas over which Democrats and Republicans have sparred -- and particularly areas in which the change in administration provides opportunities for agencies under new leadership to roll back initiatives started by their predecessors. And in many cases, they say, Trump will be likely to support priorities of the reinforced Republican Congress that also emerged from Tuesday's election.

These include the Obama administration's aggressive enforcement of for-profit colleges, its intensified focus on sexual assault on college campuses (see related article) and its efforts to strengthen labor unions and other worker benefits.

For-Profit Higher Education
President Obama and his aides in the Education Department spent several years toughening rules weakened during the preceding administration of President George W. Bush and creating even tougher new ones.

It is expected that the ambitious set of regulations rolled out as part of a crackdown on the for-profit college sector could wither away under a Republican-led Department of Education. Gainful employment rules sought to hold vocational programs accountable when graduates did not make enough in salary to pay back their student loans and primarily applied to for-profit institutions. Borrower defense rules, finalized this fall, established a federal standard for student borrowers to seek discharge of their loans if they were defrauded by their institution. A Trump Education Department could choose not to devote resources to enforcing the rules. Or the Republican-controlled Congress could eliminate them through the Congressional Review Act.

Steve Gunderson, president and CEO of Career Education Colleges and Universities, said before the election that the industry might not survive a Hillary Clinton administration. On Wednesday, he said the election results meant that the for-profit sector would be able to reintroduce itself “in a positive and constructive way.”

“Providing career education is essential to the economic growth that President-elect Trump is talking about,” Gunderson said. “The big difference is that we will be able to actually have conversations with the administration and department and try to resolve problems in a mutual way.”

Two major for-profit college chains -- Corinthian Colleges and ITT Technical Institute -- failed in the last two years. Many former Corinthian students have claimed they were defrauded by the institution and have gone on a debt strike, refusing to pay back federal student loans they received to attend their institutions.

The borrower defense rules were drafted in response to those failures in the sector.

Alexander Holt, a policy analyst in the Education Policy Program at New America, said a pause on implementation of those rules would probably happen under a Trump Department of Education.

“There’s a high likelihood that that one is not long for this world,” he said.

Congressional Republicans could try to renegotiate those rules or wipe them out entirely, he said.

**Other Financial Aid Policies**

Trump has also expressed an interest in basing student loans on graduates’ incomes -- an existing part of federal policy that he endorsed in that Ohio speech -- and refinancing student loan debt, an idea criticized by policy experts but
supported by lawmakers from both parties. He has also said he supports risk-sharing proposals, which would hold colleges accountable for student outcomes. Risk sharing would put colleges on the hook financially when their graduates are unable to pay back their student loans. Such proposals have begun to gain bipartisan momentum in Congress.

“If you want to have the best guess of what Republicans are going to do on higher education, you need to look at what Republicans in Congress have proposed on higher education. That’s where the best answers lie,” Holt said. “The expertise now is in Congress. That’s not unusual in a Republican administration, but I think it’s especially true of Trump.”

While the administration’s regulatory accomplishments are in danger, the 2010 switch from federally backed student loans to federal direct lending -- another position staked out by the Trump campaign in public comments on higher ed policy -- may be harder to reverse.

The administration made the switch through the legislative process, creating $6 billion in annual savings that went toward increasing the Pell Grant and other purposes. Mark Huelsman, a policy analyst at the progressive think tank Demos, said returning to federally backed loans would be a costly giveaway to banks with no impact on college access or affordability.

He said returning to private guaranteed loans was a priority of the Mitt Romney campaign in 2012 and was part of the Republican platform this year.

“There’s definitely some enthusiasm among congressional Republicans for bringing back banks as the middlemen for federal lending,” Huelsman said.

But Vic Klatt, a principal at the Penn Hill Group and a former House GOP education staffer, said reverting to the old system would be a tall order in a divided Congress because of the costs involved.

Klatt said that while Clinton’s free college plan obviously won’t be happening, he doesn’t expect the president-elect to push for cuts to funding of higher education, either. He added that Trump would quickly learn that the way to get things done in Congress is to make deals with members of both parties.

Tennessee Republican Lamar Alexander, the chairman of the Senate education committee, is expected to play a key role in shaping the next administration’s approach to higher education. His Democratic counterpart on the committee, Washington Senator Patty Murray, also returns to the Senate after winning re-election Tuesday.

"The rules of the Senate did not change in this election -- there’s still the 60-vote threshold,” Klatt said. “There’s still the need to be bipartisan. That hasn’t changed at all.”

Labor Relations
Another way in which the Obama and Trump administrations are likely to diverge significantly is in their views of labor and management.

The National Labor Relations Board is one of the federal entities that is shaped over time by whichever party holds the White House, and as a result, the board -- which is responsible for adjudicating the federal law that guides employees’ rights to organize and bargain collectively -- frequently bounces back and forth on key issues.

The Obama administration got off to a slow start on fulfilling the hopes of the labor unions that helped elect him in 2008, because his efforts to remake the NLRB were delayed by intense partisan battles and blocked nominees.

But in a series of rulings in recent years, the board has strengthened the hand of unions representing graduate student workers and faculty members at private colleges, to the delight of those groups and the dismay of many college and university leaders. A December 2014 NLRB ruling rejected the claims of Pacific Lutheran University that its full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members are managerial employees and thus are not entitled to collective bargaining, partially challenging the board's 1980 ruling known as the Yeshiva decision.

And in August, the board overturned a 2004 ruling -- made by a George W. Bush-crafted NLRB -- that denied collective bargaining rights to graduate teaching and research assistants.

President-elect Trump would be able to start remaking the NLRB in his own image immediately, as two of its five slots are vacant. Another member’s five-year term will expire next December, which could give him a majority by then. Cases would have to be brought before the board for it to take them up, so the process of potentially overturning those rulings would take some time. But opponents of unionization are likely to pursue it.

The new administration could act more swiftly to change some other labor-related actions of the current one. Colleges and other employers are preparing for the Dec. 1 implementation of new federal rules promulgated by the Department of Labor that dramatically increase the number of workers eligible for overtime. The regulations exempt several groups of higher education employees, notably those who are primarily teachers, but are likely to result in increased wages for many workers (and, by extension, higher costs for many institutions).

Those rules will take effect before Trump takes office unless pending a legal challenge blocks them. But that legal challenge is one of several ways in which a Trump administration could seek to stymie or overturn the new rules, says William A. Herbert, executive director of the National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions at the City University of New York's Hunter College. A Trump-led Labor Department, for
instance, could decline to defend itself against the challenge, forcing the agency to reconsider the rules, Herbert said.

**Referenda and Higher Ed**

Voters in many states weren't exactly thrilled with the notion of raising taxes to fund higher education.

**No MU Mention**

**Alabama**

- Amendment 1 passed with 76 percent of the vote. In an attempt to increase diversity on Auburn University’s Board of Trustees, this amendment adds two additional members. Currently, there are 14 members, 12 of whom are men and 13 of whom are white. The new seats have no race or gender requirements. The amendment also ensures that no more than three members of the board have terms that expire in the same year.

**Alaska**

- Ballot Measure No. 2, which would have amended the state constitution to let Alaska issue bonds for postsecondary student loans, was rejected by 56 percent of voters. The law continues to allow state debt only for capital projects, housing loans for veterans and military defense.

**Arkansas**

- Issue 6 passed with 56 percent of the vote, legalizing medical marijuana. Tax revenue from marijuana sales will be allocated to technical institutes, vocational schools and work force training.

**California**

- Proposition 51 was approved by 54 percent of voters, creating a School Facilities Fund -- funded by the sale of bonds -- that will give $2 billion to the California community college system to construct and renovate facilities (along with another $7 billion for K-12 schools).

- Proposition 55 passed with 62 percent of the vote, extending personal income taxes for community colleges (and health care and public K-12) after funding was lost in the recession. The tax applies to single tax filers who make at least
$263,000 in taxable income and joint filers who make at least $526,000 in taxable income. It's predicted that the tax will generate between $4 billion and $9 billion in revenue each year.

- Proposition 56 passed with 63 percent of the vote, increasing tobacco taxes an additional $2 per pack; $40 million from the California Healthcare, Research and Prevention Tobacco Tax Act of 2016 Fund will go to the University of California to fund medical education. The ultimate goal is to increase the number of primary care and emergency physicians trained in California.

- Proposition 64 passed with 56 percent of the vote, legalizing marijuana. The state will use part of the money it earns from marijuana taxes ($10 million per year) to fund research about the “implementation and effect of the Control, Regulate and Tax Adult Use of Marijuana Act.”

Colorado
- Amendment 72 was rejected by 54 percent of voters. The measure would have increased the tobacco tax from 84 cents to $1.75 per pack. The tax was intended for a fund for student loan debt repayment and professional training tracks targeted at medical professionals.

Louisiana
- Amendment 2, which would have allowed boards of the public higher education systems to determine tuition and fees without permission from the state Legislature, was defeated, earning only 43 percent of the vote.

Missouri
- Constitutional Amendment 3, which would have raised tobacco taxes and dedicated the money to early-childhood education, smoking-cessation programs, and hospitals and health clinics, failed, with 59 percent voting against the proposal. Among the amendment's opponents was Washington University in St. Louis, which would have benefited from the money the tax generated going to hospitals and clinics affiliated with the university's medical school. But the law also would have banned any funding being used for abortion services or “human cloning or research, clinical trials, or therapies or cures using human embryonic stem cells.”

New Mexico
- Bond Question C passed with 63 percent of the vote. It concerns the 2016 Capital Projects General Obligation Bond Act, which will issue $142 million in spending on higher education, special schools and tribal schools.

Oklahoma
- State question 779, the One Percent Sales Tax, was rejected by 59 percent of voters. It would have created a limited-purpose fund for public education by
increasing the state sales tax from 4.5 percent to 5.5 percent. It was estimated that this tax would have generated $615 million per year in revenue.

Oregon

- Measure 95, to allow investments in equities by public universities, which is currently prohibited, passed with 70 percent of the vote.
- Measure 96 was approved by 83 percent of voters. It will dedicate 1.5 percent, or a predicted $9.3 million annually, of the state's lottery earnings to veteran support services -- part of that fund will support veterans' education.
- Measure 99, to use state lottery money to create the School Outdoor Education Fund, passed with 66 percent of the vote. Much of the money will go to fifth and sixth grades, but some will go to Oregon State University "to administer and fund outdoor school programs statewide consistent with current law’s grant program criteria."

Rhode Island

- Question 4, which was approved by 59 percent of voters, will issue $45.5 million in general obligation bonds for the University of Rhode Island. When broken down, $25.5 million will go to building renovations and $20 million to funding business collaborations between an innovation campus and the university.

South Dakota

- Amendment R narrowly passed with 50.6 percent of the vote. Previously, all postsecondary schools funded by the state were governed by the Board of Regents. After the passage of this measure, postsecondary technical institutions will no longer be governed by the board, but in a manner to be determined by the Legislature. The institutions affected are Lake Area Technical Institute, Mitchell Technical Institute, Southeast Technical Institute and Western Dakota Technical Institute.

Local Measures

Among county races, bond measures were the primary issue affecting higher education. Here are a few of them:

In California, 64 percent of voters in Butte County decided to issue $190 million in bonds for facilities maintenance at Butte-Glenn Community College. Ballot counting continues in Butte and Yuba Counties, which voted on whether to issue $34 million in bonds for facilities maintenance at Yuba Community College.

Voters in San Diego County rejected Measure X, which sought to issue $348 million in bonds for repairs to classrooms and facilities, constructing a Workforce Training Center, and providing educational support to veterans. The measure needed a 55 percent supermajority but got only 52 percent of the vote.
The county passed, with 62 percent of the vote, Measure MM, regarding $455 million in bonds for upgrading facilities and providing joint training support to veterans at MiraCosta Community College. And with 69 percent of the vote, Measure Z passed, issuing $400 million in bonds for upgrading community college campuses and providing job support for students and veterans.

San Francisco County voters approved with 80 percent of the vote Proposition B, which renews a parcel tax of $99 per year for 15 years; revenue will benefit City College of San Francisco.

In Maryland, Baltimore County residents passed with 68 percent of the vote an ordinance that will allow the county to borrow $15 million for community college projects, including construction and renovation of campus buildings.