

CART Provided by A La CARTe Connection

***This rough edit transcript, which may contain missing, misspelled or paraphrased words, is only provided for your immediate review and is not certified as verbatim and is not to be cited in any way.***

***Stetson University  
National Politics Roundtable  
Thursday, January 21, 2021  
4:00 p.m.***

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: Good afternoon, Hatter Nation! It's so nice able to to be with you this afternoon he with really a wonderful panel of members of our community to talk to us about our perspectives on you are national political context and I'm delighted to introduce them to you now. Before I do so, however, please know that you can obtain cultural credit for your participation in this webinar and we'll have a link at the end of the session so that you can take a quiz at the end of this session. Thank you.

So I hope that this webinar finds all of you doing well and that you've gotten off to a very good start to this semester. I want to thank you again as always for your collaboration during this time of both the pandemic and also political and social unrest so thank you my remarks that's it for me we have a terrific panel ahead of us you really want to hear interest them less from me I moderator and session panelists feel free at any time to ask additional questions in the chat box. We'll try to get to as many of them as we possibly could a few were sent in advance.

Today with us are Louis Virelli a professor of law at the College of Law and an expert on the constitutional law and the separation of powers Tampa Bay Times on the importance of impartiality by Florida senators in the upcoming impeachment trial.

David Hill is with us professor chair political science resident expert on voters political behavior and elections.

Also with us is Andy Denhart, a visiting assistant professor in communications and media studies and a TV critic on social media he writes about reality TV culture and media.

Elizabeth "Libba" Galloway is a business law professor and has had a long career as a lawyer, business executive, and university faculty member. She was the chief legal officer of the LPGA.

George Alderman, Stetson University class of 2021 is the past president of SGA our Student Government Association and he's also president of the model senate and he recently Young Republicans with the leadership of the Republican Party whose letter received national attention and appeared on CNN's.

Aliyah Cruise also class of 2021 is active politically and involved in everything from CC, SGA student ambassadors and the black student association she appeared in the voice of America article in June titled "On Racism: Young Americans Say Change Takes Effort." This was also picked up internationally.

And Joshua Finkelstein, class of 2022 is press of stet as you Student Government Association. Both Josh and Daniel Hendrick is vice president of Stetson's Student Government Association and together they wrote a recent letter to stet students following the events of January 6th.

Joshua joins us now and Daniel will try to join us after he's finished his class some thank you again to all of the panelists borer for being here fortunate to have you with us.

Let's get right to George Josh and Aliyah from your perspective, what do you think that is the best message we can send the students at this time as we confront this very challenging political context. Cautionary tales and messages that can be taken from the last few months.

>> I can go ahead and start. Really what the biggest thing that I want to tell people is we're seeing all of these really terrible manifestations of the slow but really now rapid raising of the national temperature quickly. We're seeing it all really come to pair in the last three weeks and a lot of people are asking well what can we do. How do we stop this? How do we make it so that we can go back to not necessarily a sense of normalcy and take at that events on January 6th never happen again. And I think the best way forward from that is to that change really starts at home. Each one of us is responsible for not otherizing or demonizing sharp disagreements with a lot of stuff making sure that you realize at the end of the day the person that you're talking to even the person on the other side of the screen on the other side of the Twitter argument that's probably another person that's probably another American someone who, you know, you probably have more in common with than you don't. And so, I really hope that we could all learn to start taking it into our own hands to collectively lower the temperature and make it so that January 6th never has to happen again.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: Thank you, George. Aliyah.

>> I would say in agreeing with George I would say also I do like how because I feel, like, I feel like what happened on January 6th to be tragic. It was coming into sense. Like, there was just a lot of different things happening socially culturally, politically to get to that point. I do like that Stetson is taking initiative with immediately producing e-mails being like, hey, we do not stand for this. I hope that you don't like I know none of the students feel that, like, we are an institution that supports this type of behavior. I really appreciate that especially being a student a young woman of color at a predominantly white institution sometimes students like me or students from a similar background may not feel accepted in certain places on campus or may not feel like that certain environments really accept us so it's really nice that, you know, that Stetson is take

the initiative that type of thing isn't okay and it makes us to makes us feel like we're cool we can. Does that make stand.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: Yes, it does. And thank you very much for sharing your perspective and we'll come back to you in a moment of.

Joshua you and I have taken on a presidency at the same time.

>> Absolutely.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: I would like to hear from you about your own experiences in trying to lead a Student Government Association during a very politically volatile time and how it is you're managing that and whatever else you'd like to share.

>> Absolutely. I think most important thing and the most important message we can communicate out to the Stetson duties the Deland community and to our family friends is a message of unity, message of peace, and a message of understanding. What happened on the 6th was absolutely atrocious it's something that goes against every single American value. Stetson's community values and was overall for a lot of people and everyone that I know was shocking. There's a lot of unknown questions. There's a lot of feelings. I think, you know, having the suggestion sort of like this having discuss what happened how to move forward is the best way to just understand what happened or attempt to understand what happened. But most importantly how to move together at a community so we can better understand each other and understand basically or community values, Stetson's values to make the world a better place.

In regards to SGA, we have a lot of senators with a lot of different opinions, a lot of different feelings. I see it as our job is to come together as a community because we do represent the student body in the best way that we possibly can and the best way that we can do that is by discussing these sort of issues but most importantly making policies that benefit of student population and that's really what our focus has

been so far is how can we understand the events of January 6th but most importantly come together as a community to really make our community at Stetson and Deland and at home and in the world a better place.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: Joshua, thank you very much. And I'm certain that everyone on the panel agrees with our sentiments that no matter where you are on political spectrum that there is no place for violence in our world and we have an opportunity here at Stetson University to model how it is you have difficulty peaceful and productive. So thank you.

>> I'm sorry. I just want to jump in on I agree completely that we have a really our community especially does a really good job of having these conversations like we're doing right now but I also just think there is a general national call for sort of this like meeting in the middle of peacefulness unit which I think one level feels really good nor another marginalized attacked or people want to literally kill them or eliminate them or deny of them basic human rights like asking them to meet their oppressors essentially the people who they, you know, who want asking them to sort of just like let's meet those people in the middle I don't think that's necessarily fair that's arguing necessarily but I do think it's important that just keep in mind that it's not easy necessarily and it's not always possible to have that kind of immediate --

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: I think our panelists would agree with your sentiments that there are differential abilities to meet at the moment so thank you very much Andy. I would like to turn it our constitutional law expert. Tell us a little bit more about your thoughts about the constitutional challenges we've been experiencing and just your thoughts and perspective from a legal perspective.

>> Thank you for that and I've been impressed I'm in agreement with almost everything I've heard. I thought I would build on something that George need to

lower the temperature I think that's something we're here of course that's true that's something place violence is imminent ever, right? Certainly not regularly. But I recently wrote another op-ed in the Tampa Bay times about the 25th Amendment and I think something that is potentially getting lost in this conversation is that the rule of law is in jeopardy to a degree in this country. What could we mean by rule of law. What we mean is we need to follow and enforce even handed rules with how we govern. And in that case, accountability and lowering the temperature aren't mutually exclusive. So I think it is important that in the context of calming ourselves down is critical here. In the context of the in this environment here is critical here. We acknowledge that there are constitutional remedies and legal remedies for the conduct that occurred and they should be pursued. I think that op-ed is not a -- but in the op-ed my point was every president who wants it legally challenge an election will certain end election will end of last term or right before your new term if you want at that challenge violently it will always been transfer of power. If we aren't serious about applying the rule of law to what just happened then we run the risk of not deterring the behavior not taking a legal position that isn't about division in my view to isn't in any way about demonize, other than people who broke the law in this case unfortunately that includes in my view the president and several senators who encouraged that activity. It does not include an entire ideological part of the country or political party or entire group of people who might agree with the incoming president and administration I was encouraged inauguration events cooler heads prevailing I do think as a legal matter I want to distinguish for the audience as far as students that you can hold someone accountable under the law in this case I think it's critical to do that without justifying at least a greater division. Without stoking more discomfort or distaste for one another because the law has a remedy which we should consider applying.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: Thank you, Professor Virelli, I appreciate it

very much. I would like to turn to another colleague, David Hill, who can give us a little bit more context about the state of our two-party system and who are the voters for Joe Biden and who are the voters for Donald Trump and what is the status of the Republican Party given what's transpired over the last few -- over the course of this election.

>> We are becoming an increasingly polarized country. I saw something about the radical middle and the question we can talk about that but there's a group of people called Democrats and polarized sorting ourselves our ideological and along partisan lines they people tend to be left of center then we have a group of people we call Republicans. Those people tend to be right of center now the Republican Party has we'll talk about that in a minute they have a pretty clear division. And it's across economic policy and it's across social policy. And as Andy noted some of the stuff is nonnegotiable, right? Along cultural lines to that compromise is going to come very difficulty. There are challenges to resolve some of these problems some folks on one side have policies that some folks on the other side literally from an existential perspective cannot accept. Politics by the way is about mitigating conflict because politics is about conflict it's inherent to politics and we have two sides in conflict now, right? Elites are far more polarize electorate good electoral system and governing system mitigates that conflict and it's boiling over and I'm not sure our system is doing a good job of that right now.

Now, in terms of the Republican Party there's an divide and that divide has been coming for quite some time. You got a mix of business Republicans traditional establishment business-oriented Republican you've got social conservation types of and now you got this populist wing if we want call it Trump wing the Freedom Caucus or TEA Party it's all kind of the same wing of the party and that is also boiling over. Louis

mentioned the 25th Amendment there was an absolutely stunning moment on January 6th and I remember when it happened and I'm still kind of stunned that it happened. Serious manufacturers one of the trade unions in the United States issued a statement calling for the invoking of the 25th Amendment to remove the president of the United States from power. It was absolutely stunning. This is not even a comment on what happened or President Trump's behavior it was the fact that a Republican-oriented trade association one of the most powerful felt the need to do that. I mean, it was really quite remarkable. In the aftermath of January 6th several major corporations indicated that they would withhold campaign PAC contributions from members of Congress who opposed the certification of the vote. Whether or not they keep that promise moving forward time will tell but they were sending a signal to congressional leadership and Mitch McConnell heard that message very loud and clear. So I think there's this divide in the Republican Party a very serious divide that's going to have to be sort sorted out and given our winner take all system that makes it awful life difficult for small minor parties to win seats into government it's in the best interest of the Republican Party to try to hold it together and perhaps folks like George Alderman can help do that moving forward.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: That's grain turning now to professor Galloway with expertise with business and the law thinking a little further about this call from our corporations, from our businesses, what are your thoughts on that and the impact that might have moving forward where piss are taking a stance on political contributions and the like.

>> I think it's a little too early to say what kind of effect that is going to have. I think if you look at the response that we had from businesses while most of them were saying we're going to suspend our PAC contributions for at least some period of time, others were taking a different probe approach. Others weren't saying suspend they



were saying we were going to stop. Others were going more directly at what they saw as the cause of some of the problems. Simon&Schuster, for example, basically said we're not possible will be Josh HHawley's book you take the PGA of America one of former President Trump's courses and they said, no, we're terminating that agreement. So I think the responses are all across the board and right now there's a wait and see from the corporations because I think you have a lot of corporations who came out with those statements out of a matter of principle. I think you had a lot of them who were like we got to say something to be saying to and we're just going to sit pack and sit back wait suspend things for now see what's going to happen. I think it's too early to say what's going to happen but what I do like about it and I think what has happened, unfortunately, the circumstances were obviously unfortunate but these kind of things are a wake-up call for corporate America of how do we respond when we have these major crises in our society the same things that happened with racial unrest in the spring and I'm hoping that the wake up calls will not just wake us up for 12 hours and then we'll go back to sleep for the night but I'm hoping that they're going make some kind of difference in other corporate community as citizens of our country.

Libba, you mentioned kind of the social media components it's a perfect segment also to Andy are with his spirit in social media and reality TV. Your thoughts overall on the presidency use of Twitter and use of social media as a way to garner support for particular perspective as well as social media platforms to not allow him to continue do that after January 6th.

>> I think it's very clear if anything else that Donald Trump was a president whose popularity grew up on social media. Obviously, it was very much raised by The Apprentice which rehabilitated an image that he had from his life in New York prior to the show. So and I think that direct line to people through social media was made to

possible for him to speak directly to people and it's almost weird in the last, you know, week to have this sort of silence and, of course, what happened we saw for 8 or 10 years media would amplify whatever he would tweet. I was very glad to see that Twitter and Facebook and basically and every other social platform to, like, Peloton and Air BNB cut off Trump's access. I do think I understand that people are sort of surprised by this in many ways on the one hand the people who screaming free speech especially those who are in government I appalled they have such after you minimal understanding of the First Amendment being only applying to government and not to private corporations and if you want center a conversation about whether social media should be a public good and monopoly that's another thing. At the same time I also understand that, like, cutting Trump off last week and also starting to cut other people off seemed a little bit out of left field considering all the other stuff he'd done. It sort of to me sounded like you have a house guest over and that house guest, like, trashes their room and sets fire to the curtains and smears feces on the wall and one day doesn't use a coaster you got to go now because that coaster was just so important and it's like that tweet or the things that he tweeted last week were relative to other stuff like he literally threatened nuclear war on Twitter so if that's not a threat of violence that would violate Twitter's terms of service I don't know what is I understand those people who want these companies to be a little more consistent but at the same time to have kind of impossible jobs of moderating journalism about the lives of people who do moderate and how difficult it is for them just like low paid workers subject to the worst things in the world that they see currently and it give people that responsibility is pretty significant just as it's pretty significant to give like, you know, CEO's of Twitter and Facebook being able to unplug access for politicians or other people.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: I would like to turn students if I may for a

minute take this conversation a bit further around the experience with social media during this context. Our students have you noticed a change in social media usage after January 6th, or is this pretty standard fare in this environment in which we live? What has been your experience. Yes.

>> So I would say at least from my perspective and my platforms to seemed pretty like to wasn't so out of the usual whenever something major was to hit the country. There was people being engaged. I don't think there was a lot of, like, social media arguments that I've been seeing going on because I think at this point, like, people knew each other political ideologies at that point you weren't friends I see me meme Generation Z likes to cope on comedy so there was like at memes in terms of addressing the event it didn't seem too much out of the normal. I did see out of the usual I didn't see, like, there was obviously the passing of fake news and different things like that but from what I've seen it wasn't to too much like from the type of behavior that I've been seeing before.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: Go ahead, George.

>> My social media is mostly full of I imagine a lot of people people who I think sort of similar to me so if from my case that's younger Republicans and Republicans and younger conservatives one of the things that I noticed that day following afterwards still largely keeping up is that a lot of people who hadn't been saying anything before suddenly were very, very active like for a lot of people that I know a lot of friends this was, you know, I mean for all of us upsetting is not enough of a word for it but it really activated something a lot of people who last couple of years I saw people who were fans of the Trump administration suddenly completely back off say no this cannot happen anymore to seemed like a turning point for a lot of people I know a lot of friends I have and that night and the day after and couple days after I was having private conversations

with some of my friends who think similarly to me because we were all on the same page of being incredibly again upset is too weak of a word but it's the only one that comes to me right now. This is not okay. This cannot happen again. We know what caused this and we don't want this to happen ever again. We don't want to get anywhere close to this and so that's actually why I ended up writing this open letter I partnered with some friends at an organization called GenZGOP an open letter to Republican leadership really anyone who will listen saying we know what caused January 6th, we know the rhetoric that caused to, and we know that members of the Republican Party having embracing that for a while for the political gain of it that cannot happen ever again and luckily that message seemed to resonate with a lot of people as of I think last night we had over 110 signatures from young Republicans and young conservatives from across the country echoing the same thing that's what I saw for a lot of people who are about as conservative difficult as me a lot more conservative than me it was a turning point for a lot of them.

Go ahead Josh, please.

>> Thank you. I green with both Aliyah and George on what they said saw on social media for me on that day as a user on Instagram so timeline and feed where I was seeing a lot of different messages from a lot of different individuals on both sides from highway Republican who identify as Democrat and I think in general outrage on both sides of what occurred and, you know, I think what it really shows social media is really great as it kind of reflects it's Amy crow come of really what the George national thought was during that time and during that day and so when it came to the social media poverties of who was occurring, what was going on, I think, you know, when this came to there's a lot of outrage there's a lot of confusion, of course, there was, you know, memes as a coping mechanism what happened moving forward from that January 6th event of what occurred, you know, it's understanding those feelings, those us that that were

reflected obvious social media. And in general nationally in figuring out okay what do we do then afterwards how can we not just reflect on what occurred but also make sure A to doesn't happen again and B what can we do differently it really make sure that this doesn't happen again as well as to make sure that essentially there is an understanding and I'm not talking about on the far fringes of Republican right of the far right or far left but a common understanding on how we can move this country forward together to make policies that, again, benefit everyone in this country.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: Daniel Hendrick has joined us welcome Daniel thank you for rushing over following your class. I want to reengage the faculty in our discussion four I fire moment try to have an opportunity to share divergent perspectives as best we can oftentimes around very difficult contentious issues and what it being your experience in the classroom in this political environment and how do you try to promote the sharing of divergent perspectives within your own classrooms particularly when there is a divergence of opinion perhaps among your students.

Thank you, David.

>> It's becoming increasingly challenging. I'm a bit of a free speech fundamentalist I think particularly on a university campus is why we're I said high minded conversations about big ideas and sometimes those ideas are uncomfortable. There are lines that can't be crossed. All opinion matters I think politically. All people have the right to express their opinions. There are lines that cannot be crossed constitutionally although that line is pretty difficult to cross I guess we're going to find out over the next couple of months in legal proceedings having to do with January 6th perhaps starting with the impeachment trial. But in the classroom you have to create a space where all students feel safe and letting one student voice their opinion perhaps of what happened on January 6th may cause another student some harm it's a very, very challenging

environment that I try to respect all my students' opinions. I respect all opinions until that line is crossed and I can't tell you what it is I just know when it's crossed. And so, it's all you can do is make clear there are things that cannot be said and I go with insults you're just not allowed to insult anybody. You're not allowed to use racial slurs, ethnic slurs religious, et cetera. But beyond that, I think we have to protect an individual's right to engage in free speech in a classroom.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: Other thoughts from faculty I think this is a fascinating and timely topic and even as your president I get inquiries about this kind of thing all the time, right? How do you pull this off where you have a free exchanges of ideas at the same time being mutually respectful of divergent perspectives.

>> It's interesting to teach different classes and how v different subject matter come up I've actually found it to be increasingly easy in the past few years to have conversations in the classroom because I think people really want to have those discussions and sort of by setting an environment kind of like David describing where you can feel free to share what you're thinking you can also free to their if someone has hurt you with the wrong thing that makes it a lot easier significant try to do and I know I'm sure I'm not always successful but just to establish an environment where I know I'm going to say the wrong thing sometimes I might use a term that is outdate order old and that might cause someone some pain, for example, for sure there is a line that respecting the common humanity of other people and a log and understanding that their experiences we're not going to challenge or question those but we can talk about what we think about those and how they make us feel and where that came from and I think my experience at least and perhaps I just been really fortunate with amazing students which we are very fortunate with here at Stetson just that there's a real hunger for kinds of conversations thorough and rich and also you can fact check me here taken my classes recently if I am

completely lying right now and that's actually not the case in my experience.

>> He's not lying he's telling the truth.

>> He absolutely is telling the truth it's important to have those conversations because if you just don't have that sort of free environment you're not going to have those interest very fine line and we have to be cognizant of that line. Andy or he does an absolutely amazing job.

>> And I've had class was Dr. Hill as well and that's what I'm saying, like, because it's when you're taking political science and everyone is affiliated with a political party someone was it slip I know it's commonly in the back of my mind I hope it's common in the back of my mind shared this out loud but I get really scared if somebody slips and says something that maybe that's like they don't think it is but it might come across as racist or homophobic or sexist when they're not realizing it and so that's constantly been a fear. So far that, like, you know, Dr. Hill and then Dr. Denhart have been good at good at trying to navigate those discussions.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: I can tell from removing your mask Daniel that you will like to say something.

>> I do have a little bit to add I'm in a place where I can now remove my mask and I'm free to do so. So I just think that it is important to see, like, how difficult and how we must sort of remove ourselves and our own opinion and even at some point our own experience from the conversation because of how important it is to recognize how like y'all said something that I may not find offensive something that may not take me to that place of frustration or just pure exhaustion or that sort of place may take another student there instantly it's a place of not looking from an individual perspective but leaning able to sit in the seat of your students and be able to see that and understand and sympathize with their -- with unique and community perspective.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: Professor Virelli, I saw you want to chime in as well.

>> Obviously, since I believe I'm only one not teaching in Deland so I will keep it brief I will say constitutional law address a lot of topics destined to be personal some of the most personal things we talk about as a society up front that we're going to do that and we're going to do that in a respectful way and open way I try make the following point and you're not discipline you're studying in any case law we're all teaching in a discipline that opinion's got to be based in knowledge. It doesn't have complete mastery we're here to learn but we have to be transparent about what we know what we think we know what we think is true and then build our views on that. And if we start from a place that's reckless with the truth or incomplete with our knowledge of the discipline. So I teach *Rowe v. Wade* I tell my students doctrine yours until you now what the doctrine that opinion isn't terribly useful as lawyer you're smiled to interesting class discussion we're talking about a doctrine that you have not learned about yet. And I think this group is sophisticated and I mean both faculty and students of course this sophisticated I've met undergrads impressive but the larger community needs to I think be reminded of that sometimes. That's quite real every opinion about everything is equal value there is such an expertise such a thing as knowledge we have to be respectful but respectful and relativist are not the same thing. And in so in the law when you make an argument you are bound to cite things relying verifiable and you can get yourself in an a lot of trouble of the none of students would ever do that I promise but it's possible in the discipline. So I think as educators coming from a place of knowledge base, right? Like I said that doesn't people that people who not learned yet can't share it means that comes in the form of a question or in the form this is what I understand it be true and this is what I think about that that's a very productive place to start because at the end everybody can learn from



something maybe some of givens understood expand our horizons that way perspectives and building on those. We have a lot of conversations in the law school about it.

>> I'm going to add from a little bit of a different perspective, my experience with Stetson students have been that they are very polite and Chris I might even say kind they are a very kind group of people sometimes I feel like they're polite to a fault. So for those students who are out there, I'd like to who are listening, I'd like to encourage you sometimes it get out of your comfort zone, get out of your comfort zone in the way that Dr. Hill and Professor Virelli have talked about and in a way that is respectful in a way that is based in fact or based in law or whatever. I would like to hear from more of you. So don't be afraid to speak up.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: I don't mind sharing with the broader audience that I just wrote in the chat that we have available to each other as panelists and organizers this is awesome. I think this is exactly the kind of dialogue that we want to engage in as a community in higher education. Just awesome so I feel grateful to be part of the conversation. Thank you. Let's get back to the politics peace for a little bit. There are concerns in the nation even yesterday when we were experiencing the inaugural events and so on what are your thoughts about the likelihood of additional violence that might occur given the sociopolitical divide in the United States.

Obviously, security was stepped up tremendously during the inaugural events et cetera. But how do you feel about it what are were you prediction action probably very difficult to predict what are your thoughts about the likelihood of additional violence around the sociopolitical context.

Professor Virelli.

>> I do not have a reputation for honesty when I say I'll be brief, but I'll try to be brief. We should expect the really possibility of more violence because of where

it's coming from. And it is it's because the domestic terrorism the nature of terrorism is that it continues until its grievances are met which never occurs' rational talk about why there's been conversation about this never happening again all of which of course I agree with but I would maybe broaden the definition of what I think this meant in that sense the pronoun me. It me the this was willingness of public officials to embrace known falsehood, right? So when lie becomes reality or is repeated as reality by people in authority then you get a greater likelihood that the causes of violence will persist particularly of terrorist violence right which is dependent on a view of reality that is neither dignified, kind, moral or true. So I think that's something we need -- I view cause of all of this as at a minimum the abject denial, false denial of the legitimacy of an election that has nothing to do with the winner people can believe me the fact that it happened repeatedly across government. Is the thing that caused this. The president was complicit in that in the speech on January 6th certainly spark for that but we need to think about truth as an important security mechanism. Because democracy depends on it and we didn't. And I think until we embrace a more transparent truthful dialogue we're going to run the risk of more violence and I'm not an alarmist I promise but I do think that's true.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: Please let's go to Aliyah and then over to Dr. Hill.

>> Yeah. I would just say from a student perspective there has been I know with like at least my circle of friends that I don't believe in violence, I don't want there to be more violence but there's always been a concern if you just look at this interviews of the people that stormed the capitol wearing shirts with anti-Semitic, you know, writings on it or reenacting the George Floyd incident and different things like that to different minorities to comes off like an image that things can get worse and that's why I really admire that George took that step to, you know, with other young Republicans to kind of,

like, change of image of the Republican Party because currently the face of the Republican Party seems to be Trump and Trumpist ideology and with that comes the type of people that storm the capitol and it takes type of way about the hateful messages we're thinking that all Republicans are like that not every Republican is like that but that's the kind of image that we get the image of Blue Lives Matter, Nazi ideology. We don't get that type of image Republican Party George is trying to fix. That type of thing. So I don't like there to be I don't want there to be more violence but currently at this time there is that fear so I feel like just having more you know more dialogue conversations like this and taking action is a step.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: Thank you so much.

Dr. Hill.

>> I want to agree with Professor Virelli. Politics is about incentives and when politicians see an incentive or perceive an incentive that there's electoral gain or political gain to be had either by lying, right? Or just engaging in an exaggeration to the point of stirring up people's passions then people follow politicians that's where we get our cues. Even the most intelligent of us the most educated of us follow political elite cues if that political elite cue is saying the election is stolen and you have to fight to protect our nation there are people that are going to follow that and they're going to react to that. And so, I'm with Ali I have a family I have people a love I have a country that I love I don't want there to be violence I'm hoping that the main source of the. So falsehoods has been deplatformed that has reduced hopeful this country has a history of political violence. And I'm afraid and fearful that it may moving forward. Add one thing to this there's this belief that the institutions hell I heard it many, many times over the last the institutions held, okay. Fine the institutions held because people inside of institutions chose to make sure they held, right? Some didn't others did. So what I saw and as I sat on January 6th

watching my TV and with anger and amazement and great fear that that was greatest piece of evidence that we even needed that democracy is very fragile. Very, very fragile and if our politicians are not committed to those institutions and by the way are willing to may are fire I'll be generous to say play with fire and not incite violence and we may me soar moves it's not a hopeful way to look at it but I hope it's an honest way.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: A question just came in on chat which I think is nice follow-up to this robust conversation and it's about I guess I would call it a category of political accountability. So we had a number of members of our government promote this narrative and the question specifically was in the chat about holding members of Congress accountable for. So actions and who are your thoughts about the likelihood of that. I know there are different mechanisms such as censure and the like what are your thoughts and predictions around I guess a category we call political accountability. And maybe we'll see. We don't know. I think this is your territory, David.

>> I don't know. It me, some of it telling someone to lightly threaten your constituents I'll defer to our attorneys if that cross a legal line or not. Inside the body, the options are pretty limited. You know couple of the names mentioned in the question in the chat they're really new. Three freshman were in the list. There are sanctions that the party can take. Of course censure is a vote and that can be done. The party can also remove committee or prevent committee assignments they can limit party support et cetera if the party leadership decides that a person has crossed the line. We're going to find that out with a couple of people that are freshman it first year house members who may have crossed a line rhetorically and beyond that. And our system you can't be removed from office short of malfeasance you can be censured right if you commit sedition you can removed short of that it's going do be censure or committee assignments power et cetera and, by the way, in Georgia, Republican Party removed some committee

memberships for people in the state legislature that rhetorically supported events and so there are things that can be done but it's limited.

>> I'm sorry. Dr. Hill's better view of it the members can be removed by their own house. So the member of the house can be removed by two-thirds vote in the senate as well.

>> That's right.

>> It won't be right. But just in the interest of this because I'm a law professor and there are students here extreme thing the question is what's likely I agree a hundred percent that's not likely that's why you're seeing Section 3 of the 14th Amendment and the impeachment post term note inauguration of the President Trump as relevant things they are accountability measurements running for office again particularly the president that about as much as we can do now that he is no longer active life the president of the United States.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: There's a question in the chat that I should respond to transparent about this is there's been some rumors around that there were members of the Stetson community that may have been present in Washington, D.C. on January 6th and we did have evidence to suggest that that's true I just wanted to assure the community and those on the screen that there's been outreach from our student life staff and from our administration to both those students that were concerned that we had students there as well as the students that were there and so I want you to know those conversations have occurred. We have no evidence whatsoever that anything illegal took place from Stetson community members but please know that we are on top of that context and I hope that's an adequate answer for what has been on the minds of some members of our community. So I hope that's adequate. Where do we go from here? That's a big question. That's a big question it's a question I want to ask and take us home

on in the next few minutes where do we go from here I think we've had a great conversation here about social media, about the effects it's having on the classroom how do deliver a set of context for discussion across divergent perspective very robust conversation where Do we do from here Stetson community as a nation.

George.

>> So this is also kind of aiming to address another question that came up in the chat earlier how is the Stetson community, you know, as a political reflection of the country are we as polarized as bad on ground here as to appears on it be national level to really doesn't look like that and I think one of the binge reasons for that is because we have a sense of community here it's stronger and some people than with others but fundamentally there's there is a sent of community that allows comes into conflict with just the sheer political shoes of someone and I think that is going to be a long and difficult part of, you know, going forward from here. I don't think all of the solutions to the national problems are going to come from, are not going to come from Washington, D.C. in the form of policy they're not going to come from any state cap doll or any legislature or any government power start from home like I said earlier and rebuilding communities that are much more separated now who are all over the place and a lot of people are left with the only thing being present in their lives being politics and I think that's one of the major things kind of under current level that is cause the a lot of this and so rebuilding America's communities on literally a block by block level churches, schools, you know, recreation clubs that sort of stuff that's really what America is about and there's been I've read some work in the last couple of years saying that a lot of that has really declined and that has allowed politics to come in and fill the void for a lot of people which has been one of the really big themes that has kind of brought us to this point so that's what I think is going to be one of the big parts and saying what I said at the beginning to starts at home to starts

with each one of us to make the conscious choice to be better. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: Perhaps others on this virtual meeting have the same reaction I do we hope four students on our screen maybe consider a life in public service because they are articulate they are smart, they're compassionate their thoughtful Aliyah I want to chime in on big question where do we go from here.

>> So kind of like what George said to starts with the individual. I think that Stetson as a whole is doing a good job at trying to address one of the with the country. But at the same time every single student every single faculty member is going to have their own personal opinion and their personal political affiliation. I really like how I am seeing a lot from other students that are like maybe freshman they're starting their own podcast and talking about these different issues about wanting to get in involved with helping other students get involved with activism seniors sharing hair knowledge as well with be a social media platforms dedicated to spreading information factual information about certain topics. So I really like how the students are getting super, super involved and I think that's also going to influence Stetson and our programming and having, you know, other events like this. I think that it's good to have that free exchange of ideas but I also like if something was it cross the line or in this case like that we have no tolerance for it which I also think is nice as well. So, yeah.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: Thank you. Joshua, I think you wanted to add some perspective on this.

>> Absolutely. I agree with what both George and Aliyah had said. I think the big thing it understand this is talk mostly to the students on chat is that we're growing up in a time of tumult with us changes we've seen a lot of growing mains as you well within the American system and I think we are in a very interesting time where we're observing all these things all these different actions all these different opinions and we're

growing up in a country we as individuals can make that change. We can make and cultivate a change that we want to see within our local communities nationally and on the global level. So I think where we go from here is, you know, by being activists by understanding getting involved in the country and by understanding one another each other and in coming together to make policies as well as different sorts agreement and policies that benefit ourselves, our neighbors, and our communities. And, you know, that's just kind of a challenge that I want to pose to the students of this call is to understand and try to find a way that they can better help their communities that is being politically active. Volunteering try understand how you can make a better change in this world in the Deland community and the Stetson community.

>> I second that.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: Professor Denhart.

>> One thing woven theme is the idea of accountability and whether that's like on a national level and holding elected leaders responsible for their words and actions I think maybe even the more important part that come up a bunch here is the accountability of just like in the community and even more friends and family members and being able to hold each other accountable for our words and actions and how they affect us even like on a day-to-day basis I don't think I've done as good an understanding as I can do mean my own placement and votes effect support of certain candidates or ideas or policies effect the people I know and that's like just having this conversations can be uncomfortable and awkward but by doing that I think we can take steps forward rather than just kind of staying in place where we are now worried and scared rather than optimistic and hopeful.

>> Thank you so very much. Professor Galloway.

>> I just want to say very briefly and don't forget we have an in this



history in this country of forgetting what we have gone through we get complacent after the '60s let's not get delays enter of the racial unrest in the spring the political unrest we've had now. Let's continue to remember what we've gone through.

PRESIDENT ROELLKE: On behalf of the panel and on behalf of Stetson I really want to thank everyone that participated today. I personally found this quite energizing because it gives me hope and gives me energy to take your words seriously. I feel privileged and honored to be part of this community and I'm absolutely a hundred percent confident that we will, in fact, be resilient we will, in fact, abide by our values and will, in fact, emerge out of this stronger at the end. So let's thank everyone on the panel. I can't see anybody else on the screen except the panelists but I want to thank them very, very much a consideration expertise is very much appreciated. It was also energize webinars obviously talking about public safety and COVID and so on it was kind of nice to take a break from that for a moment and really get into an intellectual exchange of ideas and I'm really grateful for that. You can, in fact, obtain cultural credit to receive cultural credit please click on the link in the chat to compete the quiz and I also need to thank everyone behind the scenes for these webinars our communications team does a great job allowing us to have these coverings and I'm grateful for that as well. Please stay safe. Please stay well. Go Hatters!

(Applause.)

(Webinar concludes at 5:00 p.m.)