



### **Statement from Mitchell Hamline School of Law Faculty**

The federal enforcement surge in the Twin Cities and elsewhere in Minnesota has created and generated widespread fear and disruption in our community. People from across the political spectrum are asking important questions about their fundamental constitutional rights.

Concern and uncertainty of this kind have real legal consequences. When people begin to question whether they can safely exercise those constitutional rights, the exercise of constitutional rights is diminished. When people refrain from speaking, protesting, traveling, seeking services, or participating in civic life because they fear immigration enforcement, constitutional protections are weakened in practice.

As law professors at Mitchell Hamline School of Law, we hold a shared commitment to the rule of law and to the constitutional guarantees that structure democratic life. These include the rights to speak, protest, observe government action, dissent, and move freely without unlawful interference. They also include the principle that government power—federal, state, or local—must always be exercised within legal bounds and subject to meaningful accountability. These commitments are not political positions. They are foundational premises of constitutional governance and legal practice.

Mitchell Hamline’s [vision](#) is “a legal system that is just and accessible to all.” Our [mission](#) calls on us “to build practice-ready professionals with passion for law and justice.” Our institutional values call for work that is responsive to real and immediate legal needs, especially when people face confusion about their rights or risk harm from mischaracterization or misuse of legal authority. Engaging with moments of legal uncertainty and potential overreach is therefore a core institutional responsibility, not an optional endeavor.

That responsibility is shaped by where we are. The Twin Cities have long been a focal point for questions of protest, public safety, racial justice, and government accountability. Current federal actions do not occur in a vacuum; they unfold within a regional and historical context in which

certain communities have repeatedly borne the costs of expansive or insufficiently constrained state power. As faculty with long-standing relationships with courts, lawyers, community organizations, public officials, and affected residents, we are positioned—and obligated—to bring legal analysis, historical awareness, and doctrinal clarity to these developments.

In furtherance of that obligation, members of the Mitchell Hamline community have created a [Federal Surge Resources hub](#) to make primary legal materials and explanatory analysis readily accessible to community members, lawyers, journalists, advocates, and public officials. The purpose of this hub is practical as well as educational: to support informed decision making, facilitate legal accountability, and reduce the confusion that often accompanies rapidly evolving enforcement activity-making, and facilitate legal accountability.

In these and other ways, we will continue to offer analysis, education, and support to those seeking to understand the law, protect their rights, or uphold constitutional values under difficult conditions. This work reflects both our professional obligations as legal educators and our responsibility to the communities in which we teach, practice, and live.

Signed,

Brad Colbert  
Rebekah Cudé  
Joseph L. Daly  
Greg Duhl  
Angelique EagleWoman  
Mark Edwards  
Maggie Eilertson  
Jay Erstling  
Eleanor Frisch  
Leanne Fuith  
Carolyn Grose  
Jim Hilbert

Morgan Holcomb  
Jean F. Holloway  
Beth Honetschlager  
Eric Janus  
Peter Knapp  
Mehmet Konar-Steenberg  
Kate Kruse  
Peter Larsen  
Bobbi McAdoo Gahlon  
Nicole McConlogue  
Jared Mollenkof  
Garrett E. Mulrooney III

Natalie Netzel  
Anthony Niedwiecki  
Sharon Press  
Laura Reilly  
Brandon Robb  
Wendy Shea  
John Sonsteng  
Mary B. Trevor  
Howard J. Vogel  
Kim Vu-Dinh  
Jessica West