
No. 23-50633

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

SPEECH FIRST, INC.,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

BRIAN MCCALL, in his official capacity
as Chancellor of the Texas State University System, *et al.*,
Defendants-Appellees.

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Western District of Texas, NO. 1:23-cv-411 (Ezra, J.)

**BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE* ALLIANCE DEFENDING FREEDOM AND
THE MANHATTAN INSTITUTE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT**

James A. Campbell
John J. Bursch
Tyson Langhofer
Travis C. Barham
ALLIANCE DEFENDING FREEDOM
440 First Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20062
Telephone: (616) 450-4235

Gordon D. Todd
Brian P. Morrissey
Mackenzi J. Siebert Ehrett
Aaron P. Haviland
Drew K. Cypher
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
1501 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 736-8000
bmorriss@sidley.com

Ilya Shapiro
Tim Rosenberger
MANHATTAN INSTITUTE
52 Vanderbilt Ave.
New York, NY 20017
Telephone: (212) 599-7000

Counsel for Amici Curiae

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 26.1(a), Alliance Defending Freedom certifies that it does not have a parent corporation and that no publicly held company has 10 percent or greater ownership in the organization. The Manhattan Institute certifies that it does not have a parent corporation and that no publicly held company has 10 percent or greater ownership in the organization.

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF INTERESTED PERSONS

Pursuant to Fifth Circuit Rules 26.1.1, 28.2.1, and 29.2, the undersigned counsel of record certifies that the following listed persons and entities as described in the fourth sentence of Rule 28.2.1 have an interest in the outcome of this case. These representations are made in order that the judges of this Court may evaluate possible disqualification or recusal.

Dated: January 23, 2024

/s/ Brian P. Morrissey

Brian P. Morrissey

Amici Curiae:

Alliance Defending Freedom

Manhattan Institute

Counsel for Amici Curiae:

Gordon D. Todd, Brian M. Morrissey, Mackenzi J. Siebert Ehrett, Aaron P. Haviland, and Drew K. Cypher of Sidley Austin LLP

James A. Campbell, John J. Bursch, Tyson Langhoffer, and Travis C.

Barham of Alliance Defending Freedom

Ilya Shapiro and Tim Rosenberger of the Manhattan Institute

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES v

INTEREST OF THE *AMICI CURIAE* 1

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT..... 2

ARGUMENT 4

I. UNIVERSITY POLICIES LIKE THOSE AT TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY ARE CHILLING ACADEMIC SPEECH..... 4

 A. Georgia Gwinnett College illegally restricted the location and content of student speech..... 5

 B. The University of Idaho used its Title IX Office to silence the Christian Legal Society..... 6

 C. Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, issued no-contact orders based on personal and off-campus speech. 9

 D. Florida State University failed to protect the religious speech of its student senate president. 10

II. THE SUPPRESSION OF ACADEMIC SPEECH HAS BEEN A STEPPING STONE FOR TOTALITARIAN REGIMES. 13

 A. The Soviet Union persecuted university professors through investigations, denunciations, and deportations. 14

 B. The Nazi Party took over German universities through ideological faculty appointments and denunciations..... 20

 C. The Chinese Cultural Revolution began in universities, where student mobs harassed, imprisoned, and tortured their professors..... 22

 D. Other totalitarian regimes—including those in Cambodia, Venezuela, and Cuba—suppressed academic speech as they consolidated power. 25

CONCLUSION 33

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Adams v. Trs. of Univ. of N.C.-Wilmington</i> , 640 F.3d 550 (4th Cir. 2011).....	1
<i>Coll. Republicans at S.F. State Univ. v. Reed</i> , 523 F. Supp. 2d 1005 (N.D. Cal. 2007).....	13
<i>Davis v. Monroe Cnty. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 526 U.S. 629 (1999)	3
<i>DeJohn v. Temple Univ.</i> , 537 F.3d 301 (3d Cir. 2008)	1, 3, 5, 12
<i>Gonzalez v. Trevino</i> , 60 F.4th 906 (5th Cir. 2023)	1
<i>Healy v. James</i> , 408 U.S. 169 (1972)	32
<i>I.F. v. Lewisville Ind. Sch. Dist.</i> , 915 F.3d 360 (5th Cir. 2019).....	3
<i>Keyishian v. Bd. of Regents of Univ. of N.Y.</i> , 385 U.S. 589 (1967)	5
<i>McCauley v. Univ. of V.I.</i> , 618 F.3d 232 (3d Cir. 2010)	13
<i>Meriwether v. Hartop</i> , 992 F.3d 492 (6th Cir. 2021).....	1
<i>Nat’l Inst. of Fam. & Life Advocs. v. Becerra</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2361 (2018).....	1
<i>Obergefell v. Hodges</i> , 576 U.S. 644 (2015)	7

<i>OSU Student All. v. Ray</i> , 699 F.3d 1053 (9th Cir. 2012).....	1
<i>Papish v. Bd. of Curators of Univ. of Mo.</i> , 410 U.S. 667 (1973).....	33
<i>Reed v. Town of Gilbert</i> , 576 U.S. 155 (2015).....	1
<i>Speech First, Inc. v. Sands</i> , 69 F.4th 184 (4th Cir. 2023).....	4
<i>Sweezy v. New Hampshire ex rel. Wyman</i> , 354 U.S. 234 (1957).....	32
<i>Texas v. Johnson</i> , 491 U.S. 397 (1989).....	5
<i>Thompson v. Hebdon</i> , 140 S. Ct. 348 (2019).....	1
<i>Uzuegbunam v. Preczewski</i> , 141 S. Ct. 792 (2021).....	1, 5, 6
<i>W. Va. State Bd. of Educ. v. Barnette</i> , 319 U.S. 624 (1943).....	32, 33
Statutes	
Fla. Stat. § 1004.26(1).....	10
Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(2).....	1
Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(4)(E).....	1
Other Authorities	
Hannah Arendt, <i>The Origins of Totalitarianism</i> (Harcourt 1968) (1951).....	14
John Bennett, <i>The Totalitarian Ideological Origins of Hate Speech Regulation</i> , 46 Cap. Univ. L. Rev. 23 (2018).....	15, 19

Bureau of W. Hemisphere Affs., U.S. Dep’t of State,
Intellectual and Academic Freedom in Cuba (Sept. 13,
 2001), bit.ly/3RpiqeX..... 28, 29

Lesley Chamberlain, *Lenin’s Private War: The Voyage of the
 Philosophy Steamer and the Exile of the Intelligentsia*
 (2006) 15

Maria Laura Chang, *All University Places Will be Assigned
 Via the National Admission System, EFECTO COCUYO*
 (Eng. Trans.), <https://bit.ly/3PkKWM3> (last accessed Jan.
 17, 2024) 27

George Chigas & Dmitri Mosyakov, Yale Univ., *Literacy and
 Education under the Khmer Rouge*, bit.ly/3PnmEB0 (last
 accessed Jan. 17, 2024) 25, 26

Thomas Childers, *The Third Reich: A History of Nazi
 Germany* (2017) 20, 21

Robert Conquest, *The Great Terror: A Reassessment* (2008
 ed.) 15, 16, 17, 18

Emily Crane, *Conservative Lawyer Slams Yale for ‘Cowering
 to Mob’ After Free Speech Panel Derailed*, N.Y. POST (Mar.
 18, 2022), bit.ly/44USuuA..... 31

Areg Danagoulian, *My Soviet Past: Why We Need to be
 Vigilant About Academic Freedom*, MIT Faculty
 Newsletter (Nov./Dec. 2021), bit.ly/3RnA9U8 19

Paddy Dowling, *The Khmer Rouge Destroyed Education in
 Cambodia – Now the Country is Fighting Back*, THE
 INDEPENDENT (Dec. 6, 2019), bit.ly/46g1go3 26

Stuart Kyle Duncan, *My Struggle Session at Stanford Law
 School*, Wall St. J. (Mar. 17, 2023), bit.ly/3Ziklnk 30

Richard J. Evans, *Coercion and Consent in Nazi Germany*,
 151 The British Acad. 53 (2007), bit.ly/3PkXzXF..... 22

Richard J. Evans, *The Third Reich in Power 1933–1939* (2005) 21

Klaus P. Fischer, *Nazi Germany: A New History* (1995) 20, 21

Sheila Fitzpatrick, *The Practice of Denunciation in Stalinist Russia*, The Nat’l Council for Soviet and E. European Rsch. (Dec. 19, 1994), bit.ly/45RqNV6 16

Hugo Perez Hernaiz, *Higher Education in Venezuela: Skirting University Autonomy through the Creation of a Parallel System*, VENEZUELAN POLITICS & HUM. RTS. (July 19, 2018), bit.ly/44TIgeb 27

Angelina Jaffé & Benjamin Scharifker, *Academic Freedom Under Threat in Venezuela*, SCHOLARS AT RISK (July 30, 2015), bit.ly/46i4EPz 28

Yang Jisheng, *The World Turned Upside Down: A History of the Chinese Cultural Revolution* (2016) 23

Gilbert King, *The Silence that Preceded China’s Great Leap into Famine*, SMITHSONIAN MAG. (Sept. 26, 2012), bit.ly/44UfTMP 22, 23

Teeda Butt Mam, *Worms from Our Skin*, N.Y. TIMES (1997), nyti.ms/3PFcVYf 26

Czeslaw Milosz, *The Captive Mind* (Jane Zielonko trans., Vintage Books ed. 1990) (1953) 18

George Orwell, *The Freedom of the Press: Orwell’s Proposed Preface to Animal Farm* (1945), reprinted in The Times Literary Supplement (Sept. 15, 1972), bit.ly/45ZjYRu 32

Peking Review, *Sweep Away All Monsters* (June 3, 1966), bit.ly/46a4CsT (last accessed Jan. 17, 2024) 23

Anna Petherick, *Chavez Squeezes Scientific Freedom*, NATURE (Jan. 4, 2011), go.nature.com/45RGGed 28

Princetonians for Free Speech & College Pulse, *Princeton’s Free Speech Campus Culture* at Highlight 7 (May 2023), <https://bit.ly/3S4klEh>..... 31

Jaime Requena, *Venezuela’s Scientist Drain*, N.Y. TIMES (Dec. 2, 2016), nyti.ms/3roP2e5 28

Katelynn Richardson, *Overwhelming Majority of College Students Say Shouting Down a Speaker Is Acceptable: Survey*, COLL. FIX (Sept. 23, 2021), <https://bit.ly/3q0OURA> 31

Ilya Shapiro, *Mob Rule and Cancel Culture at Hastings Law School*, Wall St. J. (Mar. 22, 2022), <https://on.wsj.com/3tTK6zj> 30

Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, I *The Gulag Archipelago, 1918–1956: An Experiment in Literary Investigation* 473 (trans. Thomas P. Whitney) (1974) 18

Elliot Storm & Grace Karram, *A Post-Chavez Higher Education Conciliation?*, UNIV. WORLD NEWS (Mar. 16, 2013), bit.ly/3RowAwN 28

U.S. Holocaust Mem’l Museum, *Request for the Investigation of Hans Peters*, bit.ly/3t0csHq (last accessed Jan. 17, 2024) 21

Kelsey Vidaillet, *Literacy, Censorship and Intellectual Freedom: The Independent Library Movement in Contemporary Cuba* 15, Fla. Int’l Univ., bit.ly/46eubsH (last accessed Jan. 17, 2024)..... 29, 30

David Curtis Wright, *The History of China* (3d ed. 2020) 14, 23, 24

Ji Xianlin, *The Cowshed: Memories of the Chinese Cultural Revolution* (trans. Chenxin Jiang) (2016 ed.) 24, 25

Mao Zedong, *Things Are Beginning to Change* (May 15 1957), bit.ly/46fRnqr 22

INTEREST OF THE *AMICI CURIAE*¹

Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF) is a not-for-profit, public-interest legal organization that protects speech, religious liberty, the family, parental rights, and the right to life. ADF regularly represents parties before the Supreme Court and lower courts in free-speech cases. *E.g.*, *Uzuegbunam v. Preczewski*, 141 S. Ct. 792 (2021); *Thompson v. Hebdon*, 140 S. Ct. 348 (2019) (per curiam); *Nat’l Inst. of Fam. & Life Advoc. v. Becerra*, 138 S. Ct. 2361 (2018); *Reed v. Town of Gilbert*, 576 U.S. 155 (2015). A “nationally respected civil rights organization,” *Gonzalez v. Trevino*, 60 F.4th 906, 913 n.4 (5th Cir. 2023) (Ho, J., dissenting from denial of reh’g *en banc*), ADF represents students and faculty who challenge threats to their free speech rights, often from officials who censor speech using vague “speech codes.” *E.g.*, *DeJohn v. Temple Univ.*, 537 F.3d 301 (3d Cir. 2008); *Adams v. Trs. of Univ. of N.C.-Wilmington*, 640 F.3d 550 (4th Cir. 2011); *OSU Student All. v. Ray*, 699 F.3d 1053 (9th Cir. 2012); *Meriwether v. Hartop*, 992 F.3d 492 (6th Cir.

¹ Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(4)(E), *amici* affirm that no counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part and that no person other than *amici*, their members, and their counsel made a monetary contribution to its preparation or submission. The parties have consented to the filing of this brief. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(2).

2021). ADF has a strong interest in ensuring that university speech restrictions receive the strictest scrutiny.

The Manhattan Institute (“MI”) is a nonprofit public policy research foundation whose mission is to develop and disseminate new ideas that foster economic choice and individual responsibility. To that end, it has historically sponsored scholarship supporting the rule of law and opposing government overreach, including in the marketplace of ideas. Its scholars regularly speak on college and graduate-school campuses, facing protest, shutdown, and cancelation. MI also runs the Adam Smith Society, which brings together business-school students and alumni for discussion and debate on how the free market contributes to human flourishing and opportunity for all.

This case interests *amici* because of their direct experience with and concern about university policies that censor speech and otherwise create a campus culture hostile to the free exchange of ideas.

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Texas State University’s Discriminatory-Harassment Policy (the “Policy”) is antithetical to free speech because it designates protected speech—*i.e.*, “unwelcome verbal, written, graphic, or physical conduct”—

as punishable. The Court should reverse the district court's denial of a preliminary injunction against the University's Policy, despite its mid-litigation revision, to ensure that Texas State cannot revert to penalizing constitutionally protected speech.

The Supreme Court set the standard for anti-discrimination and harassment policies on at public schools. *See Davis v. Monroe Cnty. Bd. of Educ.*, 526 U.S. 629 (1999); *I.F. v. Lewisville Ind. Sch. Dist.*, 915 F.3d 360, 368–69 (5th Cir. 2019). The standards for these policies at public universities are higher. *DeJohn*, 537 F.3d at 316 (“[University] administrators are granted *less leeway* in regulating student speech than are public elementary or high school administrators.”). Texas State's Policy runs afoul of *Davis* by prohibiting students from engaging in protected speech merely because some may view it as unwelcome.

The district court's decision acknowledged that the University's Policy fell short of *Davis*, but declined to issue a preliminary injunction. This was error. The First Amendment strongly favors more speech, not less, particularly in the university context. Vigilant defense of academic speech promotes vigorous exchange and truth-seeking, core First Amendment values. Instead, the district court perpetuated a policy that

discourages expression, disadvantages minority viewpoints, and detracts from the educational mission.

Texas State’s Policy is not an outlier—such policies are metastasizing across the country. These speech codes have troubling implications for the rights of college students and of Americans generally. Indeed, history is littered with regimes whose first salvo is a broad campaign of repression featuring suppression of speech at universities. This Court should reverse the district court and clarify that the First Amendment prohibits policies that chill student speech.

ARGUMENT

I. UNIVERSITY POLICIES LIKE THOSE AT TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY ARE CHILLING ACADEMIC SPEECH.

Universities across the country have adopted policies intended to regulate speech deemed undesirable by administrators. But the “[c]hilling effects of even well-intended government policies present ‘an evil of constitutional proportions[.]’” *Speech First, Inc. v. Sands*, 69 F.4th 184, 204 (4th Cir. 2023) (Wilkinson, J., dissenting) (quoting Leslie Kendrick, *Speech, Intent, and the Chilling Effect*, 54 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 1633, 1655 (2013)). Texas State’s speech code impermissibly silences unpopular speech, and runs afoul of the *Davis* standard.

ADF has represented hundreds of students and faculty whose First Amendment rights were violated by unlawful campus speech restraints. Courts have repeatedly affirmed “that the government may not prohibit the expression of an idea simply because society finds the idea itself offensive or disagreeable.” *Texas v. Johnson*, 491 U.S. 397, 414 (1989). Indeed, “free speech is of critical importance because it is the lifeblood of academic freedom.” *DeJohn*, 537 F.3d at 314. That is why the First Amendment “does not tolerate laws that cast a pall of orthodoxy” over what is supposed to be “the market place of ideas.” *Keyishian v. Bd. of Regents of Univ. of N.Y.*, 385 U.S. 589, 603 (1967).

Still, University officials often fail to uphold this “bedrock principle.” *Johnson*, 491 U.S. at 414. Some have even expanded censorial efforts *off-campus* expression. ADF’s free speech cases illustrate the breadth of these suppression efforts and the importance of this appeal.

A. Georgia Gwinnett College illegally restricted the location and content of student speech.

Georgia Gwinnett College twice violated the First Amendment: first, by restricting speech to “free speech expression areas,” and second, by silencing religious speech in those areas. *Uzuegbunam*, 141 S. Ct. at 797. As an evangelical Christian, student Chike Uzuegbunam believes

that he is compelled to share his faith. *Id.* at 796. Consistent with this belief, Mr. Uzuegbunam distributed religious literature and invited discussions with interested students in an outdoor campus plaza. *Id.*

School officials first ordered him to desist because speech outside the school’s tiny speech zones—comprising just “0.0015 percent of campus”—was prohibited. *Id.* at 796–97. Mr. Uzuegbunam obtained a permit and continued his evangelism in a designated area. *Id.* College officials again ordered him to cease sharing his faith because his speech generated complaints, threatening disciplinary action if he did not comply. *Id.* Officials held that power because the College’s speech code prohibited any speech that “disturbs the peace and/or comfort of person(s).” *Id.* at 797. The Supreme Court ultimately recognized that Mr. Uzuegmunam’s mistreatment at the hands of College officials represented “a completed violation of his constitutional rights.” *Id.* at 802.

B. The University of Idaho used its Title IX Office to silence the Christian Legal Society.

On April 1, 2022, an anti-LGBT slur appeared on a whiteboard at the University of Idaho College of Law. Am. Compl. ¶ 3, *Perlot v. Green*, No. 3:22-cv-00183-DCN (D. Idaho May 17, 2022), ECF No. 17 (“Perlot

Compl.”). In response, the law school held a “moment of community.” *Id.* ¶¶ 3–4. Several members of the law school’s Christian Legal Society (“CLS”), including its faculty sponsor, attended to denounce the slur. *Id.* ¶¶ 100–02. A student (“Ms. Doe”) approached the CLS members and asked why the CLS constitution states that marriage is between one man and one woman. *Id.* ¶ 105. Mark Miller, a CLS member, and Professor Richard Seamon, the CLS faculty sponsor, explained that this reflects the Biblical definition of marriage—which the Supreme Court has described as “decent and honorable.” *Id.* ¶¶ 108–09; *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 576 U.S. 644, 672 (2015). The parties respectfully disagreed, and the conversation went no further. Perlot Compl. ¶¶ 110–11.

A few days later, at a panel hosted by the American Bar Association, Ms. Doe complained about CLS’s religious beliefs and claimed (without attribution) that some of her fellow students had told her to “go to hell.” *Id.* ¶¶ 121–25. Another CLS student, Ryan Alexander, expressed his concern about the ability of CLS members to live consistent with their religious beliefs while on campus. *Id.* ¶¶ 127–28. Three days later, and with no investigation, the law school issued no-contact orders to three CLS members, prohibiting them from having any on- or off-

campus contact with Ms. Doe and instructing them to “sit on opposite sides of the room” in classes they shared. *Id.* ¶¶ 133–37, 145–46. “Contact” included written, verbal, and non-verbal communication, as well as “social media,” “videos,” and “music.” *Id.* ¶ 136.

As the CLS advisor and her constitutional law professor, Professor Seamon emailed Ms. Doe, to offer his support. *Id.* ¶¶ 158–59. Ms. Doe thanked him and indicated she would follow-up during his office hours. Instead, Ms. Doe emailed Professor Seamon, copying the law school’s dean and associate dean, and stated that her experience at the community event “caused [her] to fear for [her] life, . . . [she was] scared to be on campus, [she was] scared to be in [his] class” and that she “fear[ed Professor Seamon]” and “the CLS.” *Id.* ¶¶ 161–63, 169. Following this exchange, and again without investigation, the law school prohibited Professor Seamon from contacting Ms. Doe “outside of what is required for classroom assignments, discussion, and attendance.” *Id.* ¶¶ 174, 179–80. This again applied to written, verbal, and non-verbal contact including social media. *Id.* ¶ 177. As a result, CLS students and Professor Seamon were forced to self-censor speech reflecting their

religious beliefs in fear that their expression might result in additional sanctions. *Id.* ¶¶ 186–89.

C. Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, issued no-contact orders based on personal and off-campus speech.

Maggie DeJong was a graduate student at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville. Compl. ¶ 4, *DeJong v. Pembroke*, No. 3:22-cv-0112-NJR (S.D. Ill. May 31, 2022), ECF No. 1. Ms. DeJong holds beliefs consistent with her Christian faith, which she expressed in class and on her personal social media accounts. *Id.* ¶¶ 5, 61, 62, 73, 81, 83. In February 2022, Southern Illinois officials issued orders prohibiting her from “any contact” including “indirect communication” with three other students. *Id.* ¶¶ 110–14. The University acknowledged that the orders were not due to “a violation of University policy,” but rather were “intended to prevent interactions that *could be perceived* . . . as unwelcome, retaliatory, intimidating, or harassing.” *Id.* ¶ 118 (emphasis added).

Later, Ms. DeJong learned that the orders were based, in part, on posts from her personal social media accounts. *Id.* ¶¶ 169, 176. Those posts included her personal views on topics such as religion, politics, and

COVID-19 regulations. *Id.* ¶ 285. Based on the posts’ content, the University accused Ms. DeJong of “misconduct” and “oppressive acts,” *id.* ¶ 264, and threatened her with “disciplinary consequences,” *id.* ¶ 276.

Southern Illinois’ misconduct—punishing speech on personal social media because other students claimed to feel “threatened”—similarly demonstrates how pervasive threats to free speech have become on university campuses.

D. Florida State University failed to protect the religious speech of its student senate president.

A devout Catholic, Jack Denton was involved in religious groups and student government at Florida State University. *See* Am. Compl., *Denton v. Thrasher*, No. 4:20-cv-00425-AW-MAF (N.D. Fla. Feb. 11, 2021), ECF No. 69 (“Denton Compl.”). The student body elected Mr. Denton to the student senate, part of student government, *id.* ¶ 60, an entity created by Florida law as part of the state university and subject to University oversight. Fla. Stat. § 1004.26(1); Denton Compl. ¶ 37. The senate elected Mr. Denton as its president. Denton Compl. ¶ 62.

The following summer, Denton participated in a private group chat for members of the Catholic Student Union. *Id.* ¶¶ 63–69. When another student shared a fundraising video, Mr. Denton noted that some of the

organizations involved advocated causes that contravened Catholic teachings. *Id.* ¶¶ 69–70. While recognizing that this was an “emotional topic,” he felt obligated to share his defense of core Catholic religious beliefs in a private, Catholic forum. *Id.* ¶ 71.

Mr. Denton’s religious expression was not universally appreciated. One student took a screenshot of the private messages and shared them on social media. *Id.* ¶ 80. Another student senator brought a motion of no confidence, which failed but generated a massive public campaign. *Id.* ¶¶ 83, 89–90. A petition calling for Mr. Denton’s removal garnered over 6,000 signatures in less than two days. *Id.* ¶ 91. In response, Mr. Denton convened a special session of the senate to entertain a second no-confidence motion. *Id.* ¶ 92. Senators denounced his remarks as “abhorrent,” “demeaning,” and “disgraceful.” *Id.* ¶¶ 103–04, 107. Others said they needed to remove him to “do right by the LGBTQ+ community” and not “enabl[e] bigotry.” *Id.* ¶¶ 108–09. The second no-confidence vote passed, removing Mr. Denton from office based solely on his religious speech. *Id.* ¶ 119.

Florida State’s rules prohibited actions that violate a student’s constitutional rights. *Id.* ¶ 39. Although University administrators

retained authority to require the student government to comply with University policy or state or federal law, they took no action to prevent retaliation against Mr. Denton for his religious speech. *Id.* ¶¶ 37–39, 126–28. His appeals to University officials fell on deaf ears, *id.* ¶¶ 125–126, and he was forced to file a lawsuit to vindicate his rights. *See generally id.*

* * *

ADF’s additional legal work illustrates a disturbing trend in higher education. ADF successfully challenged a university’s requirement that students post what amounted to a “trigger warning” for their proposed pro-life display, causing the students to self-censor and not set up their display. *See generally* Compl., *Students for Life at Miami Univ. of Ohio v. Trs. of Miami Univ. of Ohio*, No. 1:17-cv-804-TSB (S.D. Ohio Nov. 29, 2017), ECF No. 1. In another instance, a student at State University of New York-Geneseo was banned from teaching and field work because school officials were offended by videos posted on his personal social media discussing his religious and political views. In yet another, ADF successfully challenged overbroad policies prohibiting speech that may create a “hostile or offensive environment.” *DeJohn*, 537 F.3d at 320; *see*

also generally Coll. Republicans at S.F. State Univ. v. Reed, 523 F. Supp. 2d 1005, 1010 (N.D. Cal. 2007) (student group endured months of investigation under a speech code because of complaints about their speech).

Universities' rush to regulate off-campus speech that others *might* find offensive is particularly alarming. A university's discretion to regulate student speech is far more limited than in the K-12 context because university students are adults who engage in mature debate on campuses where they live, without school authorities acting *in loco parentis* to protect them from disfavored ideas. *E.g.*, *McCauley v. Univ. of V.I.*, 618 F.3d 232, 242–47 (3d Cir. 2010). Unfortunately, a myriad of examples—and Texas State's Policy—demonstrate that universities have not taken this admonition to heart. This Court should reverse the district court and reaffirm that when a university's effort to censor unpopular speech results in silencing protected viewpoints, it runs afoul of the First Amendment.

II. THE SUPPRESSION OF ACADEMIC SPEECH HAS BEEN A STEPPING STONE FOR TOTALITARIAN REGIMES

The prevalence of speech codes at American universities is disquieting. Alarming, they parallel some of the world's most

oppressive regimes. Totalitarian movements invariably target universities because they recognize the threat that free thinking poses to their hold on power. As the political philosopher Hannah Arendt observed:

The consistent persecution of every higher form of intellectual activity by the new mass leaders springs from more than their natural resentment against everything they cannot understand. Total domination does not allow for free initiative in any field of life, for any activity that is not entirely predictable.

Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* 339 (Harcourt 1968) (1951).

Concurrently, the radicalization of students against existing norms, including encouraging the reporting of “antisocial” expression, has been a powerful tool for authoritarians. See, e.g., David Curtis Wright, *The History of China* 168–69 (3d ed. 2020) (Mao Zedong “told a generation of Chinese youth that it was acceptable for them to rebel against authority figures” who were “revisionist or counterrevolutionary”).

A. The Soviet Union persecuted university professors through investigations, denunciations, and deportations.

From its inception, the Soviet Union silenced its intellectual elite from opposing the regime:

The Russian intelligentsia had for over a century been the traditional repository of the ideas of resistance to despotism and, above all, to thought control. It was only natural that the Purge struck at it with particular force.

Robert Conquest, *The Great Terror: A Reassessment* 291 (2008 ed.). Victor Serge, a revolutionary who later became a critic of Stalin, “discerned within the Russian Revolution the seeds of such serious evils as intolerance and the drive toward the persecution of dissent. These evils originated in an absolute sense of possession of the truth, grafted upon doctrinal rigidity.” John Bennett, *The Totalitarian Ideological Origins of Hate Speech Regulation*, 46 *Cap. Univ. L. Rev.* 23, 26 (2018) (quoting Victor Serge, *Memoirs of a Revolutionary* 374–75 (Peter Sedgwick trans., Oxford University Press 1980) (1951)).

Lenin targeted the intellectual elite soon after his ascent to power. In May 1922, he ordered the State Political Directorate to investigate the backgrounds and political leanings of academics, writers, and students. Lesley Chamberlain, *Lenin’s Private War: The Voyage of the Philosophy Steamer and the Exile of the Intelligentsia* 2–3 (2006). This investigation culminated in the deportation of 60 intellectuals, including cultural critics, religious thinkers, authors, journalists, and teachers. *Id.* at 3.

Lenin and Stalin operated regimes characterized by their ongoing repression of university professors and students.² Between 1921 and 1938, all 13 of Kiev Academy of Sciences' Secretaries were arrested. Conquest, *supra* at 293. During that same period, Kiev University had seven different Principals, six of whom were arrested. *Id.*

These denunciations and arrests reached a fever pitch during Stalin's purge in the mid-1930's "Great Terror." "Professors were a convenient class of suspect because they were in a position to recruit plausible terrorists in the persons of students—also a much-arrested class." *Id.* at 291–92. Indeed, it was remarked at a 1937 trial that the anti-regime terrorists sent to Siberia sought their membership "chiefly among the young people in the universities." *Id.* at 292.

History professors were frequently targeted with denunciations. *Id.* Konstatin Shteppa, a professor of ancient history, was targeted after describing Joan of Arc as "high-strung." *Id.* Because Joan was the heroine of the French Popular Front, Shteppa's comment was construed as hostile to that group and the global workers' movement generally. *Id.* Suspicion

² See generally Sheila Fitzpatrick, *The Practice of Denunciation in Stalinist Russia*, The Nat'l Council for Soviet and E. European Rsch. (Dec. 19, 1994), bit.ly/45RqNV6.

of Shteppa grew when he expressed his opinion that people from the countryside are backward—an opinion that happened to be shared by Stalin’s political enemy, Leon Trotsky. *Id.* Shteppa was eventually charged with and convicted of espionage on behalf of Japan. *Id.* The only “evidence” was that he had served as the head of the “Byzanatological” Committee of the Ukrainian Academy of Scientists—Byzantium, (later Constantinople, now Istanbul), like Japan, is in the “East”—and, in that role, occasionally met with foreigners. *Id.*

Unlike many others, Shteppa survived the labor camp. *Id.* at 293.

After his 1939 release, he reflected on the mass arrests of his colleagues:

I was naturally sorry for my friends, but I was not only sorry for them. I was also afraid of them. After all, they could say things about conversations we had had, in which we had not always expressed the orthodox view. There had been nothing criminal in these conversations; they had contained no attacks on the Soviet power. But the trivial criticisms and grumbles and expressions of resentment and disappointment which occurred in every conversation forced every Soviet citizen to feel guilty.

Id. at 292 (quoting F. Beck & W. Godin, *Russian Purge and the Extraction of Confession* 154 (1951)).

Stalin’s purges extended to scientists. For example, the research team at the Kharkov Physics Institute—“one of the most important of its

kind in Europe”—was decimated by the Great Terror. *Id.* at 293. Multiple department heads, as well as the founder and the director of the institute, were arrested. *Id.* at 293–94. At the Kiev Academy of Sciences, when one professor was denounced at a meeting with his colleagues, another scientist spoke up in his defense, arguing: “Where class instinct speaks, proof is unnecessary.” *Id.* at 293. That scientist was later also arrested. *Id.*

The fear of denunciation took a heavy toll on Soviet society. Solzhenitsyn observed that, in the wake of Stalin’s purges, the gulags could only metastasize because “there was no [remaining] public opinion in the Soviet Union.” Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, I *The Gulag Archipelago, 1918–1956: An Experiment in Literary Investigation* 473 (trans. Thomas P. Whitney) (1974). Czeslaw Milosz, the poet and Nobel laureate who escaped from Communist Poland, described the challenges of working under constant fear of denunciation: “Work in an office or factory is hard not only because of the amount of labor required, but even more because of the need to be on guard against omnipresent and vigilant eyes and ears.” Czeslaw Milosz, *The Captive Mind* 76 (Jane Zielonko trans., Vintage Books ed. 1990) (1953).

Although all publications in the Soviet Union were subject to official state censorship, with the successful co-opting of the academy “most of the censorship was done by editors and authors themselves.” Bennett, *supra* at 52 (quoting Archie Brown, *The Rise and Fall of Communism* 575 (2009)). Soviet academics were “trained to know what [was] politically ‘correct’” and self-censored their work accordingly. *Id.* (quoting Leszek Kolakowski, *Totalitarianism and the Virtue of the Lie*, in *1984 Revisited: Totalitarianism in Our Century* 122, 129 (Irving Howe ed., 1983)). Genetics, for example, was declared to be a “false ‘bourgeois’ science,” and, even as late as the 1980s, Soviet textbooks contained little discussion of DNA. Areg Danagoulian, *My Soviet Past: Why We Need to be Vigilant About Academic Freedom*, MIT Faculty Newsletter (Nov./Dec. 2021), bit.ly/3RnA9U8. Serge observed:

I have seen the intellectuals of the Left, responsible for editing reputable reviews and journals, refuse to publish the truth, even though it was absolutely certain, even though they did not contest it; but they found it painful, they preferred to ignore it, it was in contradiction with their moral and material interests[.]

Bennett, *supra* at 52 (quoting Serge, *supra* at 376).

B. The Nazi Party took over German universities through ideological faculty appointments and denunciations.

When Hitler ascended to power, he immediately sought to instill ideological purity in German higher education. His government appointed Nazi rectors, who then appointed “politically correct” deans, who then appointed ideologically friendly department heads. Klaus P. Fischer, *Nazi Germany: A New History* 347–48 (1995). Faculty members were required to attend a course offered by the National Socialist Lecturers Association that included physical and military training and political indoctrination. Thomas Childers, *The Third Reich: A History of Nazi Germany* 298 (2017).

The takeover of German higher education was swift. *Id.* at 297–98. Though few faculty were members of the Nazi party before 1933, many professors were ideologically predisposed to support Hitler. *Id.* Many also seized the opportunity to settle old scores or to advance their career ambitions by denouncing their colleagues for pre-Nazi activities. *Id.*

Because University faculty were subject to the Aryan Paragraph of the Civil Service Law of 1933, many professors were forced out soon after the Nazis came to power. *Id.* at 298. By 1934, approximately 1,600 out of

5,000 German university faculty members—about one-third of whom were Jewish or had Jewish spouses—had been dismissed. *Id.* The result was a sharp decline in the quality of German education and scholarship. Fischer, *supra* at 348.

Following the Nazi takeover, German professors “conformed so well and toed the party line so obediently that the regime did not have to spy extensively on teachers.” *Id.* German students also became increasingly radicalized and regularly denounced both their professors and their peers for perceived failures to follow the Nazi Party’s ideology. *E.g.*, U.S. Holocaust Mem’l Museum, *Request for the Investigation of Hans Peters*, bit.ly/3t0csHq (last accessed Jan. 17, 2024). By 1936, denunciations had become so frequent that the German minister of education “was moved to warn students to relax their vigilance and not subject their professors to political reliability tests.” Childers, *supra* at 301–02.³

Fear of denunciation fostered a culture of distrust. Ordinary Germans “knew well that rash, politically unacceptable remarks and corresponding behavior could lead to serious punishment and possibly

³ See also Richard J. Evans, *The Third Reich in Power 1933–1939*, 292 (2005) (discussing student protests and denunciations).

endanger their lives.” Richard J. Evans, *Coercion and Consent in Nazi Germany*, 151 *The British Acad.* 53, 70 (2007), bit.ly/3PkXzXF (quoting Erica A. Johnson & Karl-Heinz Reuband, *What We Knew: Terror, Mass Murder, and Everyday Life in Nazi Germany: An Oral History* 359–60 (2005)). “In the course of time, all people became cautious. They simply didn’t speak with people anymore.” *Id.*

C. The Chinese Cultural Revolution began in universities, where student mobs harassed, imprisoned, and tortured their professors.

In China, Mao Zedong initially encouraged free expression. In the mid-1950s, he told Chinese intellectuals that he welcomed their honest opinions: “[L]et a hundred flowers bloom, ... let a hundred schools of thought contend.” Gilbert King, *The Silence that Preceded China’s Great Leap into Famine*, *SMITHSONIAN MAG.* (Sept. 26, 2012), bit.ly/44UfTMP. Academics took him at his word; students at Beijing University erected a “[d]emocratic [w]all” critical of the Communist Party. *Id.* Predictably, this did not last. Mao reversed course, explaining that “poisonous weeds have been growing side by side with fragrant flowers.” Mao Zedong, *Things Are Beginning to Change* (May 15 1957), bit.ly/46fRnqr. He subsequently launched an Anti-Rightist Campaign in 1957 that resulted

in hundreds of thousands of people either being executed or sent to reeducation camps. King, *supra*.

A decade later, Mao launched the Cultural Revolution, in which he turned China's disaffected youth against their elders. In May 1966, a professor at Beijing University protested the university president by placing large posters written with bold Chinese characters—known as “big-character posters”—around campus. Wright, *supra* at 169. Mao endorsed the professor's actions and the posters, which set off a firestorm on university campuses. *Id.* Thousands of students turned on their professors, walked out of their classrooms, and began staging mass protests. *Id.* A newspaper editorial called on protestors to “clear away the evil habits of the old society” by launching an assault on the “horde of monsters that have entrenched themselves in ideological and cultural positions.” Peking Review, *Sweep Away All Monsters* (June 3, 1966), bit.ly/46a4CsT (last accessed Jan. 17, 2024). Mao called these student protestors his “Red Guard[].” Wright, *supra* at 169. He endorsed their slogan “to rebel is justified.” *Id.* And he urged them to destroy the “four olds”—old thinking, old culture, old customs, and old habits. Yang

Jisheng, *The World Turned Upside Down: A History of the Chinese Cultural Revolution* 121 (2016).

The Red Guard employed various tactics against anyone viewed as counterrevolutionary. Professors suspected of having Western sympathies were subjected to “struggle sessions,” where they were physically and verbally abused. Wright, *supra* at 173. Ji Xianlin, a Beijing University professor, described one such session against an elderly professor:

The corridors were plastered with caricatures that depicted him as a spear-wielding devil with blood dripping from his teeth. Inside the conference room, the mob directed its own bloodthirsty frenzy at a helpless old man who wasn’t allowed to speak. Spit flew, as did false accusations. Someone put a wastepaper basket on his head. A Red Guard splashed a full bottle of blue ink down his shirt, making it look like a military camouflage shirt. Eventually he was ordered to go home.

Ji Xianlin, *The Cowshed: Memories of the Chinese Cultural Revolution* 15–16 (trans. Chenxin Jiang) (2016 ed.).

Another tactic was to storm into professors’ homes to search for anything suggesting Western sympathies. Wright, *supra* at 173. Ji Xianlin describes the experience of being woken up in the middle of the night in his own home by six of his students:

I was hustled into the kitchen before I could get dressed. My wife and elderly aunt were being held there already. We shivered in the piercing draft. I couldn't tell what they were thinking because the men were waving cudgels in our faces and we weren't allowed to speak.

Xianlin, *supra* at 38–39. After searching his home, the students forced him to hand over his address book, which they could later use to track down his family and friends. *Id.* at 40.

The Red Guard also set up makeshift prisons on university campuses, where it incarcerated professors determined to be “class enemies.” *Id.* at xix. Each day, inmates were assembled in rows, forced to memorize and recite quotations from Mao, and slapped in the face if they made a mistake. *Id.* at 3.

D. Other totalitarian regimes—including those in Cambodia, Venezuela, and Cuba—suppressed academic speech as they consolidated power.

To transform Cambodia into a classless agrarian utopia, the Khmer Rouge targeted intellectuals and academics. A “pure” revolutionary consciousness could be inculcated only with the elimination of such “new people” and their counterrevolutionary ideas. George Chigas & Dmitri Mosyakov, Yale Univ., *Literacy and Education under the Khmer Rouge*, bit.ly/3PnmEB0 (last accessed Jan. 17, 2024). To avoid detection, “new

people” aimed to appear less educated. They removed their glasses and stopped reading novels, the latter considered a capital offense. Those who failed to evade detection were tortured and killed. *Id.*

By eliminating, or otherwise silencing, criticism from “new people,” the Khmer Rouge was able to transform education and consolidate power. They taught that the correct way to read was as a “peasant.” That is, “one should read in an uncritical and passive way, taking things at face value and not questioning the meaning or source of the text.” *Id.* Any who dared think critically were considered dangerous, and the silent were reminded to remain silent: “To keep you is no benefit, to destroy you is no loss.” Teeda Butt Mam, *Worms from Our Skin*, N.Y. TIMES (1997), [nyti.ms/3PFcVYf](https://www.nytimes.com/1997/03/03/asia/03teeda.html). In time, “old” books were burned and school yards were turned into killing fields for those who espoused dangerous ideas. By the end of the Khmer Rouge’s brutal reign, 90% of schools had been destroyed and only 87 of the initial 1,000 academics remained. Paddy Dowling, *The Khmer Rouge Destroyed Education in Cambodia – Now the Country is Fighting Back*, THE INDEPENDENT (Dec. 6, 2019), [bit.ly/46g1go3](https://www.independent.co.uk/news/asia/khmer-rouge-destroyed-education-in-cambodia-now-the-country-is-fighting-back-a9011111.html).

Trying to institute a socialist “Bolivarian Revolution,” Venezuela’s Hugo Chavez too suppressed academic speech. Recognizing that

universities and students were an institutional barrier to one-party absolutism, Chavez's hold on academic speech grew increasingly repressive during his tenure. Even before university- and student-led opposition to his regime, Chavez worked to transform schools into partisan arms of the state. In 2003, he founded the Bolivarian University of Venezuela ("UBV"). The state-controlled university dramatically undercut academic autonomy; even today, faculty are appointed by the government, and the content of courses is subject to government scrutiny. Hugo Perez Hernaiz, *Higher Education in Venezuela: Skirting University Autonomy through the Creation of a Parallel System*, VENEZUELAN POLITICS & HUM. RTS. (July 19, 2018), bit.ly/44TIgeb. In other state-controlled schools, the government plays a role in the admissions process. Maria Laura Chang, *All University Places Will be Assigned Via the National Admission System*, EFECTO COCUYO (Eng. Trans.), <https://bit.ly/3PkKWM3> (last accessed Jan. 17, 2024). And by design, UBV and other state-controlled schools divert considerable resources from autonomous schools, the most important source of government criticism. Hernaiz, *supra*.

When students at autonomous universities led opposition to Chavez, his regime deliberately crippled them financially, leading to the exodus of more than 2,000 scientists from Venezuela. Elliot Storm & Grace Karram, *A Post-Chavez Higher Education Conciliation?*, UNIV. WORLD NEWS (Mar. 16, 2013), bit.ly/3RowAwN; *see also* Jaime Requena, *Venezuela's Scientist Drain*, N.Y. TIMES (Dec. 2, 2016), nyti.ms/3roP2e5. The regime interfered with the governance of autonomous universities by, among other ways, interrupting the election of their authorities and student bodies. Angelina Jaffé & Benjamin Scharifker, *Academic Freedom Under Threat in Venezuela*, SCHOLARS AT RISK (July 30, 2015), bit.ly/46i4EPz. More than 3,000 students were prosecuted for protesting, and professors were dismissed from their posts for criticizing the government. *Id.*; *see also* Anna Petherick, *Chavez Squeezes Scientific Freedom*, NATURE (Jan. 4, 2011), go.nature.com/45RGGed.

In Cuba, Fidel Castro likewise coopted academia to bolster his Communist dictatorship, permitting intellectuals to produce only work that advanced state interests. In 1961, he defined the parameters for scholarly debate: “inside the revolution – everything; outside the revolution – nothing.” Bureau of W. Hemisphere Affs., U.S. Dep’t of State,

Intellectual and Academic Freedom in Cuba (Sept. 13, 2001), bit.ly/3RpiqeX. Students were warned that “education in Cuba was exclusively for supporters of the revolution.” Kelsey Vidaillet, *Literacy, Censorship and Intellectual Freedom: The Independent Library Movement in Contemporary Cuba* 15, Fla. Int’l Univ., bit.ly/46eubsH (last accessed Jan. 17, 2024).

The Cuban government sought to minimize access to “dangerous” ideas. University admissions included a test to assess the applicant’s “revolutionary” attitude. Bureau of W. Hemisphere Affs., *supra*. Students in turn could gain access to “sensitive” works only with approval from the Communist party. *Id.* Private libraries housing banned materials were shut down. *Id.* And intellectual dissidents were imprisoned or killed.

Even more sinister than the outright suppression of academic speech was pernicious self-censorship, which effectively stifled any further academic debate—as in countless other totalitarian regimes. Novelist Reinaldo Arenas, who was sentenced to a year in prison for “ideological diversionism,” reflected:

It would be almost naïve to analyze the repression only in terms of the people the system has decided to sentence to

prison or shoot. More subtle, more sinister, more immoral, more impossible to verify and more terrible, is the repression of silence, of compulsion, of threats, of daily extortions, the unceasing official menace, the fear unleashed through the perfect mechanisms that make of man not only a repressed person, but also a self-repressed one, not only a censored person, but a self-censored one, not only one watched over, but one who watches over himself....

Vidaillet, *supra* at 6.

* * *

These examples cast recent events on American campuses in a particularly troubling light. At a Stanford Law event organized by one of the lawyers on this brief, a federal circuit judge was accosted by jeering, stamping, and howling students. The alleged offense? Opinions that students derided as “crimes against women, gays, blacks and ‘trans people.’” Stuart Kyle Duncan, *My Struggle Session at Stanford Law School*, Wall St. J. (Mar. 17, 2023), [bit.ly/3Ziklnk](https://www.wsj.com/articles/stanford-law-school-student-protest-2023-03-17). A year earlier, students at another Bay Area law school prevented another lawyer on this brief from speaking because they considered his views politically incorrect. Ilya Shapiro, *Mob Rule and Cancel Culture at Hastings Law School*, Wall St. J. (Mar. 22, 2022), <https://on.wsj.com/3tTK6zj>. At Yale Law School, administrators allowed students to scream at, harass, and threaten ADF’s then-General Counsel, Kristen Waggoner, for daring to speak

about the *Uzuegbunam* case discussed above. Emily Crane, *Conservative Lawyer Slams Yale for ‘Cowering to Mob’ After Free Speech Panel Derailed*, N.Y. POST (Mar. 18, 2022), bit.ly/44USuuA. That “controversial case” involved the truly divisive subject of nominal damages.

While American universities have traditionally been respected as bastions of free speech and intellectual rigor, today university administrators rank among the worst suppressors of speech. And many students sadly embrace the opportunity to censor rather than debate.⁴

As the tragically prophetic George Orwell wrote in an unpublished preface to *Animal Farm*, in Western civilization it is chiefly “the literary and scientific intelligentsia, the very people who ought to be the guardians of liberty, who are beginning to despise it, in theory as well as

⁴ See Katelynn Richardson, *Overwhelming Majority of College Students Say Shouting Down a Speaker Is Acceptable: Survey*, COLL. FIX (Sept. 23, 2021), <https://bit.ly/3q0OURA> (discussing 2021 studies showing that 66% of university students think shouting down a speaker is a proper response to ideas one does not like and 23% believe violence is an appropriate response); Princetonians for Free Speech & College Pulse, *Princeton’s Free Speech Campus Culture at Highlight 7* (May 2023), <https://bit.ly/3S4klEh> (noting that 76% of Princeton students approve of shout-downs, 44% approve of blockading events, and 16% approve of violence).

in practice.” George Orwell, *The Freedom of the Press: Orwell’s Proposed Preface to Animal Farm* (1945), reprinted in *The Times Literary Supplement* (Sept. 15, 1972), bit.ly/45ZjYRu. But university administrators should take heed. Orwell also predicted that, “if you encourage totalitarian methods, the time may come when they will be used against you instead of for you.” *Id.*; accord *W. Va. State Bd. of Educ. v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 641 (1943) (“Those who begin coercive elimination of dissent soon find themselves exterminating dissenters. Compulsory unification of opinion achieves only the unanimity of the graveyard.”).

The Supreme Court has long protected free speech, especially on university campuses. If students are not “free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding”—all of which presupposes the freedom to express views others might dislike—“our civilization will stagnate and die.” *Sweezy v. New Hampshire ex rel. Wyman*, 354 U.S. 234, 250 (1957) (plurality opinion). Indeed, “state colleges and universities are not enclaves immune from the sweep of the First Amendment,” because college students have the same rights on campus that they do in the “community at large.” *Healy v. James*, 408

U.S. 169, 180 (1972). Texas State has no more right to limit speech it or others dislike than did the University of Missouri officials who tried to regulate depictions of the Statue of Liberty in the campus newspaper. *Papish v. Bd. of Curators of Univ. of Mo.*, 410 U.S. 667, 670 (1973) (per curiam) (“[M]ere dissemination of ideas—no matter how offensive to good taste—on a state university campus may not be shut off in the name alone of ‘conventions of decency.’”).

These fundamental legal protections are not dead letter, despite what Texas State may desire or what the district court may have allowed. This Court should make that clear by overturning the district court’s refusal to grant a preliminary injunction. *Barnette*, 319 U.S. at 640 (“We cannot, because of modest estimates of our competence in such specialties as public education, withhold the judgment that history authenticates as the function of this Court when liberty is infringed.”).

CONCLUSION

American higher education of late has been quick to adopt policies that prohibit speech merely because it is deemed undesirable. Such policies are inconsistent with the First Amendment. This Court should reverse the district court’s denial of a preliminary injunction.

Respectfully submitted this 23rd day of January, 2024.

James A. Campbell
John J. Bursch
Tyson Langhofer
Travis C. Barham
ALLIANCE DEFENDING FREEDOM
440 First Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20062
Telephone: (616) 450-4235

Ilya Shapiro
Tim Rosenberger
MANHATTAN INSTITUTE
52 Vanderbilt Ave.
New York, NY 20017
Telephone: (212) 599-7000

/s/ Gordon D. Todd

Gordon D. Todd
Brian P. Morrissey
Mackenzi J. Siebert Ehrett
Aaron P. Haviland
Drew K. Cypher
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
1501 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 736-8000
bmorriss@sidley.com

Counsel for Amici Curiae

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 23rd day of January, 2024, an electronic copy of the foregoing was filed with the Clerk of Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit using the appellate CM/ECF system, and that service will be accomplished by the appellate CM/ECF system.

/s/ Brian P. Morrissey
Brian P. Morrissey

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

This document complies with the type-volume limitation of Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure 29(a)(5) and 32(a)(7)(B) because, excluding the parts of the document exempted by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(f) and Fifth Circuit Rule 32.2, this document contains 6,493 words.

This document complies with the typeface requirements of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(a)(5) and the type-style requirements of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(a)(6) because this document has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word in 14 point Times New Roman font.

Dated: Jan. 23, 2024

/s/ Brian P. Morrissey
Brian P. Morrissey