

I am a co-founder of the Princeton Open Campus Coalition (POCC), a non-partisan and ideologically heterogeneous group of undergraduates dedicated to protecting diversity of thought and the right of all students and professors to advance their academic and personal convictions in a manner free from intimidation. POCC believes that the fundamental goal of the liberal arts university is devotion to the principles of academic excellence and the search for truth. This consists of far more than mere knowledge. The successful university will equip its students with the skills to reconcile factual knowledge with human reason: rhetoric, debate, research, logic, writing, and analytical thought processes. It will provide its students with valuable experiences that enable intellectual maturation. Students will be exposed to the unknown, learn from their failures, and adapt to meet future challenges. Perhaps most importantly, the university builds character and virtues such as open-mindedness, honor, mental fortitude, perseverance, and tolerance for others' cultures, backgrounds, and opinions.

Discourse lies at the center of academic excellence. Indeed, it is through the discussion of reasoned arguments that students learn to develop and defend the merits of their own position and to scrutinize and criticize the flaws of opposing viewpoints. As such, the protection of free speech, restrained only insofar as reasonable time, place, and manner considerations necessitate, is vital to the academic flourishing of the university.

The Faculty of Princeton University wisely recognized the importance of the free flow of ideas in its adoption of the University of Chicago's free speech policy on April 6, 2015:

“In a word, the University’s fundamental commitment is to the principle that debate or deliberation may not be suppressed because the ideas put forth are thought by some or even by most members of the University community to be offensive, unwise, immoral, or wrong-headed. It is for the individual members of the University community, not for the University as an institution, to make those judgments for themselves, and to act on those judgments not by seeking to suppress speech, but by openly and vigorously contesting the ideas that they oppose. Indeed, fostering the ability of members of the University community to engage in such debate and deliberation in an effective and responsible manner is an essential part of the University’s educational mission.”¹

We are unfortunately living in an era of out-of-control political correctness in which ideas that are subjectively and sometimes unreasonably deemed offensive are considered dangerous and therefore deserving of restraint, suppression, or correction. Interestingly enough, it is students rather than university bureaucracies that are behind the latest movements to subdue speech on campus. Following similar protests at Yale University and the University of Missouri, Princeton students led by the Black Justice League (BJL) occupied President Christopher Eisgruber’s office in November 2015 and issued numerous demands, three of which will have especially chilling effects on academic discourse if implemented. In response to these demands and student desires to maintain Princeton’s vibrant intellectual culture, I helped found POCC, which has led the fight against these fundamental threats to Princeton’s robust and vibrant academic culture.

One of these demands calls for “cultural competency training for all staff and faculty.”² According to the BJL, “requiring cultural competency training for faculty

¹ This excerpt from Princeton University’s *Rights, Rules, and Responsibilities* section 1.1.3 is available online at <https://www.princeton.edu/~princetonschoolofpublicaffairs/sites/default/files/2015-05/Princeton%20University%20Rights%20Rules%20and%20Responsibilities%20Section%201.1.3.pdf>. The BJL articulated this demand in a petition (henceforth BJL Petition) online at <https://www.change.org/p/princeton-university-administration-occupynassau-meet-black-student-s-demands>.

is not imposing a particular doctrine onto Princeton's faculty."³ This could not be further from the truth. Cultural competency training programs at other universities seek to purge the classroom of the dissemination of perfectly innocuous ideas that are arbitrarily declared politically incorrect. Consider, for instance, a publication called *Diversity in the Classroom, UCLA Diversity & Faculty Development, 2014*. It contained a guide instructing faculty that the certain statements "communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative messages to target persons based solely upon their marginalized group membership." Examples of "hostile" statements included: "America is a melting pot," "I believe the most qualified person should get the job," and "Affirmative action is racist." It encouraged faculty to both refrain from espousing these views and to condemn students who do so.⁴ This inanity also surfaced in the University of New Hampshire's "Bias-Free Language Guide," (published in July 2015 but rescinded after public uproar) which in an effort to "invite inclusive excellence" employed social pressure to eliminate terms such as 'American' 'Senior citizen,' 'healthy,' 'rich,' and 'poor.'⁵ Cultural competency training seeks to eliminate terms and ideas that are wrongly considered harmful by the easily offended.

The second of these demands was that "classes on the history of marginalized peoples (for example, courses in the Department for African American Studies) be added to the list of distribution requirements."⁶ If accepted by the University, this demand will provide immense power to curriculum-designing committees and to the

³ The BJJ defended cultural competency training in an editorial in the *Washington Post* (henceforth BJJ WaPo), available online at <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2015/12/04/princeton-protesters-why-we-need-safe-spaces-and-why-honoring-woodrow-wilson-is-spitting-in-our-faces/>.

⁴ The guide is available at http://advance.uci.edu/ADVANCE%20PDFs/Climate/Microaggressions_Examples_2014_11_19.pdf

⁵ See <http://campusreform.org/?ID=6697>.

⁶ BJJ Petition

professors who will teach these mandatory classes. Firstly, the committee must grapple with the highly political question of which peoples are marginalized. There is no societal consensus on this issue, and any determination by the committee will impose the subjective findings of (predominantly leftist) ivory-tower theorists as objective fact. These classes would be taught by already politicized departments such as the Department of African American Studies and the Program in Gender Studies, thereby promoting groupthink and the imposition of liberal orthodoxies. Even if such classes were taught by fair and objective professors, their very premise that some demographic groups are marginalized and oppressed by American society serves to indoctrinate students as to the truth of what is at best a dubious presupposition and at worst highly biased propaganda. This, of course, raises the question of what will happen to the students who oppose the University-sanctioned narrative and deny the marginalization of “marginalized” peoples. Grading bias and derision from professors very real possibilities.

The third of these demands called for a “cultural space on campus dedicated specifically to Black students.”⁷ With no consultation of the student body whatsoever, the University has already surrendered to this demand and assigned “temporary affinity rooms” to black, African-American, Latino, Asian, Asian-American, Arab, and Middle-Eastern students.⁸ The assignment of these rooms is in itself questionable (e.g. all of Asia’s diverse cultures are represented in a single room, why do Arabs get a room when Indians do not?). In theory, the rooms are spaces dedicated to the celebration of minority and foreign cultures and will offer a

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ The *Daily Princetonian* reported on the creation of these rooms: <http://dailyprincetonian.com/news/2016/01/temporary-affinity-rooms-assigned-at-fields-center/>.

refuge to students who feel marginalized and oppressed by mainstream campus life. In reality, they are but safe spaces that will insulate students from ideas. The proponents of these rooms claim that all students will be welcome. If we buy into this, we must ask how students with dissenting opinions will be treated. What will happen when a white student, in an effort to meet Arab peers and learn about Arab culture, enters the room and respectfully condemns certain aspects of said culture? What will happen to a black student who enters the black affinity room and tells her peers that they are neither oppressed nor marginalized? To ask these questions is to answer them. Certain ideas will be unwelcome in these rooms, which will undermine the University's commitment to facilitating dialogue on society's most important issues.

Similarly, BJJ has also demanded affinity housing for students interested in black culture. The same problems abound. Affinity housing would be de facto racially segregated and would thus balkanize the University. Students who deny the institutionalized narrative of black students as marginalized and oppressed will be accused of invading their peers' home with the intention of bullying or intimidating them. Affinity housing undermines the University's commitment to diversity and will create a community that is ideologically and politically heterogeneous, thereby decreasing the likelihood that students will develop their skills and character via exposure to those who disagree. This is anathema to the core mission of the University. POCC believes there should be no space at a university in which any member of the community is "safe" from having his or her most cherished values

challenged. It is the very mission of the university to seek truth by subjecting all beliefs to critical, rational scrutiny.

POCC opposes each of these demands, as they will either create a University-sanctioned orthodoxy or will create zones in which certain ideas will not be tolerated. While none of these policies would lead to outright censorship or punishment of those who advance “offensive” ideas, they nevertheless would produce immense social pressures to conform to a certain narrative of race in America. Students would be afraid to speak out for fear of being slandered. POCC has already witnessed this both at Princeton and beyond (see Attachment 1), as numerous students have confided in us that they oppose the BJJ’s demands but are afraid of publicly taking a stand for fear of being labeled a racist.

Members of POCC have been subjected to senseless ad hominem attacks that would effectively silence many members of the campus community. Josh Freeman, a liberal, black POCC co-founder, was excoriated in a public Facebook comment (Attachment 2) after condemning the BJJ for advocating “self-segregation and censorship.” He was told his white friends did not care about him and was effectively labeled a race traitor: “Josh, why don’t you post something supporting your people instead of trying to bring down those trying to uplift blacks?”

Similarly, Devon Naftzger, a white co-founder of the POCC, describes her experience in an article she and I co-authored for the *National Review* (Attachment 3):

I felt compelled to speak out against their demands and tactics. In an op-ed in Princeton’s student newspaper, titled “We can do better,” I point out the hypocrisy of anti-racism protesters’ making race-based judgments: “As a fundamental principle of equality, the weight of a

person's opinions should not be a function of their skin color but rather the quality of their arguments.” This article alone caused a group of protesters to scream profanities at me while accusing me of being racist and request that I not be allowed to attend an open forum to voice my opinion.⁹

Destiny Crockett, a BJJ leader, further engaged in this race-baiting in an op-ed in the *Daily Princetonian* in response to a piece written by POCC co-founder Beni Snow that defended a Yale professor who sparked controversy by arguing that her university should not regulate “offensive” Halloween customs: “Beni, you, as a white person who benefits from (gasp!) white privilege, do not have to worry about many of the things students of color worry about on a daily basis, so your “worry” in this case is of miniscule value [...]your opinion on what students of color at Yale or any other institution ask of their peers and administration is moot.”¹⁰

Even without the institution of BJJ’s policy demands, students at Princeton are being vilified, slandered, and portrayed as racists simply because they have the audacity to respectfully advance their personal beliefs. The BJJ publicly purports to value freedom of speech. It “is a mark of civil life and should be vigorously defended.” The BJJ hypocritically says, “if freedom of speech is defined as the ability to vilify,” as it and its supporters so often do to their opponents, “this definition does not align itself with the noble idea of civility.”¹¹ Apparently, vilification is only a permissible tactic when used by the BJJ and its allies.

⁹ The editorial written by Ms. Naftzger and I can be found at <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/429064/free-speech-princeton-protesters>.

¹⁰ Ms. Crockett’s op-ed can be found at <http://dailyprincetonian.com/opinion/2015/11/in-response-to-in-the-defense-of-the-christakises/>.

¹¹ BJJ WaPo.

Despite their professed allegiance to the principles of free speech, BJJ leaders seek to purge Princeton of those who disagree with their worldview. In her op-ed in the *Daily Princetonian*, Ms. Crockett wrote,

“if your freedom of thought [emphasis added] means that I, a Black student, do not have the luxury of feeling safe on a campus that I have worked my entire life to get to, it should have no place in universities or any other beloved institution.”

As Ms. Naftzger and I observed in our *National Review* editorial, Ms. Crockett is “employing hyperbole in an attempt to demonize dissent.” There has not been a single instance of racial violence at Princeton, nor has there been any call for the subjugation of minorities. Either of these, of course, would be instantly and unanimously condemned—and everyone knows that. Nevertheless, Ms. Crockett wishes to ban free thought (not to mention free speech), simply because it somehow threatens her safety.

As I have explained at length, some Princeton undergraduates are attempting to create an atmosphere of hostility in which those who disagree with their beliefs will be publicly intimidated, personally slandered, and subjected to vicious ad hominem attacks. University adoption of cultural competency training, creation mandatory courses in the study of “marginalized” peoples, and establishment of affinity housing would only exacerbate these problems.

POCC strives to counteract these recent trends by promoting a culture in which academic discourse and reasoned argument can thrive. While we certainly have our own firm convictions, we do not seek to impose our beliefs on others. We

believe the role of the university is to teach students *how* to think rather than *what* to think. We respect and fight for the rights of all students to advance their personal convictions—whatever they may be. Naturally, this includes advocacy for the aforementioned demands.

Since our founding only a few months ago, we have led the movement to defend the principles at the core of the university's mission. Our open letter to President Eisgruber (Attachment 4) generated considerable national attention. Our co-founders have met with President Eisgruber and members of the Board of Trustees. We have appeared on nationally televised news programs, written editorials for numerous publications, led public debates at Princeton, and inspired the creation of similar Open Campus Coalitions at Duke and Brown Universities. I will be speaking about my experiences with POCC at the Conservative Political Action Conference on March 6.

I would like to conclude with an account of my own experiences at Princeton. I have truly enjoyed and cherished my time at this university. I have had the opportunity to take classes from conservative professors and liberal professors, all of whom have been fair and open-minded and have treated disagreeing students with the utmost respect. The same has been true for most, but not all, of my peers.

I have written for the *Princeton Tory*, a magazine of conservative political thought, for four years. To say the least, our conservative magazine is rather unpopular on a predominately liberal campus. When I wrote an article critical of feminism, no one called me a misogynist. When I belittled the notion of racial microaggressions, I was not referred to as a racist. Instead, people (for the most part)

respectfully rebutted my ideas or just dismissed them as ridiculous. No one attempted to intimidate, demean, or slander me.

My classmates overwhelmingly display the virtues that are vital to the functioning of the university: open-mindedness, candor, respect, tolerance, and erudition. They demonstrate a willingness to evaluate an argument based on its merit rather than the identity of its advocate. Until last year, I had witnessed only a handful of isolated incidents of intolerance for others' viewpoints. Since then, I have seen numerous disturbing instances of closed-mindedness and unwillingness to tolerate dissent. Most disturbing among these was when a student who wrote a pro-free speech article for the *Tory* woke up to find a shredded copy of the magazine taped to her door.

It is because of my love for my soon-to-be alma mater that I fear for its future. The university must, in addition to refusing BJJ's destructive demands, take affirmative measures to protect diversity of thought and foster a community in which all students can advance their views without fear of intimidation. Other universities must follow suit.

Although I am skeptical that governmental intervention is the proper way to solve the current crises on private college campuses, our political leaders must reaffirm the importance of free speech as a core American value. President Obama rightly condemned students who feel a need "to be coddled and protected from different points of view. You shouldn't silence [speakers] by saying, 'You can't come because I'm too sensitive to hear what you have to say.'"¹² POCC calls on our elected officials, liberal and conservative, Democrat and Republican, to follow our

¹² See <http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/253641-obama-hits-coddled-liberal-college-students>.

president's example and unite in condemnation of students and university administrators who seek to restrain or prevent those who seek to exercise their fundamental human right to free speech, especially that which is perceived as tasteless or offensive, for it is the most offensive speech that requires the most protection.

Attachment 1

Dear POCC, I'm a student at Wesleyan University where I speak only after glancing over both shoulders, in hushed tones, and with as many qualifiers as I can think of. It gives me hope to see your letter to your university president, that there are students who are "coming out" in opposition to campus intimidation. I feel like I'm living in a version of 1984, truly. I came to Wesleyan a liberal, and have grown increasingly wary and afraid of the direction that is considered the vanguard of liberalism. I work [REDACTED] on campus and I had to undergo "social justice sensitivity training". We were told these would be honest, vulnerable conversations for us to dig deep and understand our biases. The truth was that each of us recited lines. This was not open dialogue, we all know the script. In a circle, one after another, students said what they knew was expected of them, as if honest revelations. Social justice is presented as a science, like, we've figured how things should work and now we will impart those findings on you. Anyway, thank you thank you thank you, I feel less afraid!

 Write a reply...

Attachment 2

Attachment 3—National Review Article

Last month, a group of student protesters led by an organization called the Black Justice League occupied Princeton University president Christopher Eisgruber’s office for 32 hours and refused to leave until he had signed a watered-down version of their demands. These demands included instituting a “safe space” on campus, renaming the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs and the Wilson residential college because of President Wilson’s racist beliefs, mandating “cultural competency” training for faculty, instituting a distribution requirement that would force students to take a course on “marginalized peoples,” and providing de facto racially segregated “affinity housing” (disguised as housing for students interested in black culture).

There has been lots of controversy on campus about whether the protesters can be credited with promoting dialogue or stifling it. While the group stated publicly that it supports free speech, some members’ words and actions contradict this claim. Protesters purport to seek diversity, but what they really want is conformity.

For example, some protesters publicly shame and stigmatize those who question their demands and methods, thus promoting a campus culture of intimidation. Many non-black students who opposed the protest refrained from voicing their criticism out of fear of being labeled as racists and subjected to ad hominem attacks. Some students resorted to an anonymous forum called Yik-Yak to post statements like, “It’s alarming how few people publicly oppose BJL [protesters] even though I’ve gotten the impression that most people don’t support them,” to which another person replied, “If you publicly speak out against BJL people fear being labeled as a racist.”

Many students have witnessed that detrimental labeling firsthand. After attending the protest, I (Devon) was so shocked by what I saw that I felt compelled to speak out against their demands and tactics. In an op-ed in Princeton’s student newspaper, titled “We can do better,” I point out the hypocrisy of anti-racism protesters’ making racebased judgments: “As a fundamental principle of equality, the weight of a person’s opinions should not be a function of their skin color but rather the quality of their arguments.” This article alone caused a group of protesters to scream profanities at me while accusing me of being racist and request that I not be allowed to attend an open forum to voice my opinion. A Black Justice League leader reinforced this fear when she responded to another student’s article by writing that because of his “white privilege” his opinion was “moot” and “of miniscule value.” By focusing on the race of an opponent or portraying him or her as racist, protesters seek to shut down debate rather than engage them with legitimate points of disagreement.

Minority students are also subjected to this racially divisive and stigmatizing rhetoric. For instance, after posting a Facebook status questioning protesters’ demands, a dissenting black sophomore was told by a protest leader to suppress his opinion and instead “stand in solidarity” and support “your people.” He was told that white people did not care about him and that his black peers would pray for him — as if his free thought were a mortal sin. It is appalling that anyone in our nation, let alone a college student

who cherishes academic debate, is treated like a traitor or “white sympathizer” for simply expressing thoughts contrary to those of other students of his race. Similarly, Hispanic and black students who oppose the protesters have been called “tokens” of their white peers. The message is clear: Conformity to the protesters’ worldview is required; there is no room for diversity of thought.

In response to this toxic campus culture, we helped found the Princeton Open Campus Coalition (POCC) to protect diversity of thought and promote the right of all students to advance their academic and personal convictions in a manner free from intimidation. We seek to counteract the politically correct culture on college campuses that victimizes both liberal and conservative students by pressuring them to hold certain beliefs depending on their gender, sexuality, ethnicity, race, or other demographic traits.

A key element of the protesters’ strategy is to “reeducate” minority students who do not think of themselves as victims. A black POCC member was told at a public debate that her well-reasoned opposition to the protesters’ tactics and demands was simply “a result of internalized oppression.” This is an underhanded attempt to avoid meaningful engagement with her ideas by attempting to create a victim complex within a student who does not believe that she has been discriminated against or persecuted at Princeton on account of her race.

Students on Princeton’s campus, and any campus for that matter, should have the intellectual freedom to espouse whatever idea they choose, especially if it is controversial or uncharacteristic, for it is controversial ideas that tend to generate the most robust and productive debate. As POCC wrote in our letter to President Eisgruber, “there should be no space at a university in which any member of the community, student or faculty, is ‘safe’ from having his or her most cherished and even identity-forming values challenged.”

Yet protesters request insulation from controversial and potentially offensive conversations by demanding affinity housing and a “safe space” where they can seek shelter from the “danger” posed by ideas. This insularity contradicts the core mission of the university. A Black Justice League leader’s opinion piece argued:

“If your freedom of thought means that I, a Black student, do not have the luxury of feeling safe on a campus that I have worked my entire life to get to, it should have no place in universities or any other beloved institution.”

She appears to be arguing that allegedly offensive thoughts somehow threaten the physical safety of minorities. Never mind that she ignores the difference between feeling threatened and being threatened. Never mind that she cannot cite a single instance of actual racial violence at Princeton, or even a credible threat thereof. While we certainly respect the author’s right to voice her opinion, her call to purge Princeton of “freedom of thought” is antithetical to the mission of the university and anathematic to its search for

truth and wisdom.

It's clear that a call for the subjugation of, or genuine violence towards, minorities at Princeton or any other mainstream American university would be met with forceful and near-unanimous condemnation. Those who believe otherwise and claim that offensive or un-p.c. views at Princeton actually jeopardize students' safety are employing hyperbole in an attempt to demonize dissent.

In shying away from sharing opinions on "touchy subjects" such as this that may offend other students, we do a disservice to students who came to Princeton to improve their intellects and be exposed to diverse perspectives — which includes having their ideas scrutinized. We also worked our entire lives to get into Princeton, and we, unlike some of our peers, came here to think and to have our ideas challenged, not to be coddled and protected from those who blaspheme against the postmodern orthodoxies of the sort protesters are seeking to enforce at Princeton and across the nation.

The Black Justice League has indeed done a service to Princeton by raising the issue of President Wilson's racism and inspiring a passionate philosophical debate about veneration. As a precursor to student debates on issues like this, however, the right to exercise freedom of thought and expression must first be protected for all students. No group should dictate what student traits (especially demographic ones) are prerequisites for debate participation; instead, all opinions should be invited, considered, and challenged in a civil manner. When all students, regardless of race or ideology, feel welcome to participate in the campus conversation, arguments will inevitably be advanced that make most people uncomfortable. Good. Offense and discomfort are signs that one's preconceived notions are being challenged. That is what is supposed to happen in a university worthy of the name.

— Devon Nicole Naftzger and Josh Zuckerman are seniors at Princeton University.

Attachment 4: Open Letter to President Eisgruber

Dear President Eisgruber,

We write on behalf of the Princeton Open Campus Coalition to request a meeting with you so that we may present our perspectives on the events of recent weeks. We are concerned mainly with the importance of preserving an intellectual culture in which all members of the Princeton community feel free to engage in civil discussion and to express their convictions without fear of being subjected to intimidation or abuse. Thanks to recent polls, surveys, and petitions, we have reason to believe that our concerns are shared by a majority of our fellow Princeton undergraduates.

Academic discourse consists of reasoned arguments. We simply wish to present our own reasoned arguments and engage you and other senior administrators in dialogue. We will not occupy your office, and, though we respectfully request a minimum of an hour of your time, we will only stay for as long as you wish. We will conduct ourselves in the civil manner that it is our hope to maintain and reinforce as the norm at Princeton.

This dialogue is necessary because many students have shared with us that they are afraid to state publicly their opinions on recent events for fear of being vilified, slandered, and subjected to hatred, either by fellow students or faculty. Many who questioned the protest were labeled racist, and black students who expressed disagreement with the protesters were called “white sympathizers” and were told they were “not black.” We, the Princeton Open Campus Coalition, refuse to let our peers be intimidated or bullied into silence on these--or any--important matters.

First, we wish to discuss with you the methods employed by protesters. Across the ideological spectrum on campus, many people found the invasion of your office and refusal to leave to be troubling. Admittedly, civil disobedience (and even law-breaking) can sometimes be justified. However, they cannot be justified when channels of advocacy, through fair procedures of decision-making, are fully open, as they are at our University. To adopt these tactics while such procedures for debate and reform are in place is to come dangerously close to the line dividing demonstration from intimidation. It is also a way of seeking an unfair advantage over people with different viewpoints who refuse to resort to such tactics for fear of damaging this institution that they love.

Second, we welcome a fair debate about the specific demands that have been made.

We oppose efforts to purge (and literally paint over) recognitions of Woodrow Wilson’s achievements, including Wilson College, the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, and his mural in Wilcox Dining Hall. As you have noted, Wilson, like all other historical figures, has a mixed legacy. It is not for his contemptible racism, but for his contributions as president of both Princeton and the United States that we honor Wilson. Moreover, if we cease honoring flawed individuals, there will be no names adorning our buildings, no statues decorating our courtyards, and no biographies capable of inspiring future generations.

We worry that the proposed distribution requirement will contribute to the politicization of the University and facilitate groupthink. However, we, too, are concerned about diversity in the classroom and offer our own solution to this problem. While we do not wish to impose additional distribution requirements on students for fear of stifling academic exploration, we believe that all students should be encouraged to take courses taught by professors who will challenge their preconceived mindsets. To this end, the University should make every effort to attract outstanding faculty representing a wider range of viewpoints--even controversial viewpoints--across all departments. Princeton needs more Peter Singers, more Cornel Wests, and more Robert Georges.

Similarly, we believe that requiring cultural competency training for faculty threatens to impose orthodoxies on issues about which people of good faith often disagree. As Professor Sergiu Klainerman has observed, it reeks of the reeducation programs to which people in his native Romania were subjected under communist rule.

We firmly believe that there should be no space at a university in which any member of the community, student or faculty, is "safe" from having his or her most cherished and even identity-forming values challenged. It is the very mission of the university to seek truth by subjecting all beliefs to critical, rational scrutiny. While students with a shared interest in studying certain cultures are certainly welcome to live together, we reject University-sponsored separatism in housing. We are all members of the Princeton community. We denounce the notion that our basic interactions with each other should be defined by demographic traits.

We hope that you will agree to meet with us. We will be happy to make ourselves available to meet in your office at your earliest convenience. We are also requesting a meeting with the Board of Trustees. For reasons you have articulated in your recent message to the community, there is no time to waste in having these discussions.

Unlike their counterparts at other universities, Princeton undergraduates opposed to the curtailment of academic freedom refuse to remain silent out of fear of being slandered. We will not stop fighting for what we believe in.

Thank you very much for your consideration. We look forward to your reply.

-The Legislative Committee of Princeton Open Campus Coalition

Allie Burton '17

Evan Draim '16

Josh Freeman '18

Sofia Gallo '17

Solveig Gold '17

Andy Loo '16

Sebastian Marotta '16

Devon Naftzger '16

Beni Snow '19

Josh Zuckerman '16