**Kardashians: An Honor Council Social Trial**

**Abstract Draft Feedback**

We believe that releasing this abstract is inappropriate, and we DO NOT CONSENT to its release. The trial and its resolutions were deemed to be invalid – due to flawed process and content – by Martha Denney and Kim Benston. By releasing an abstract of an invalid process, the content of this abstract will be given unwarranted validity and potentially do more harm than good.

In light of the fact that the hosts of the party in question graduated last year, it was difficult for us to provide detailed feedback because we weren’t a part of the confronted party and had limited knowledge of the situation. However, we sought some input from those who might have a little more information on the matter. Although we’ll provide some specific feedback on the draft of the abstract, ultimately we want to provide some general commentary (at the end of this document) on how this trial was symptomatic of the current campus culture and reiterate our desire to continue to be a part of helping to improve the campus culture.

There are four parts to our feedback: 1. Correcting the facts and timeline leading up to the trial; 2. Objecting to the editorializing (instead of a recounting of facts) that occurs in this draft; 3. Challenging some misused/inaccurate terminology in the draft; and 4. Summarizing our thoughts on this situation.

**Correcting the facts and timeline leading up to the trial**

Dean Seacrest, in meeting separately with both parties, urged direct communication in order to ensure that each party better understood the other. The confronted party offered to speak with the confronting party about the issue, but that request was declined by the confronting party, and the only communication occurred via digital means. At that point, Dean Seacrest (not “Kourtney,” as stated in the abstract) recommended to both parties that facilitated dialogue should resolve the issue and that this situation wasn’t worthy of an Honor Council trial. The confronted party agreed to facilitated dialogue, but the confronting party refused to acknowledge that option and took the issue directly to Honor Council. As a result, opportunities to resolve this issue in a more personal and educational way were bypassed.

And at the beginning of the trial, “the jury decided to be clear that the confronted party was the entire family.” However, from the beginning of the issue (starting with meeting Dean Seacrest and communication with the confronting party prior to the trial), the three students (Kim, Khloe and Kourtney) had taken responsibility for being the party hosts. The “entire family” was never a part of the process prior to the trial or, in reality and by facts, during the trial as well.

**Objecting to editorializing (instead of a recounting of facts)**

The draft of the abstract states “the family had a certain presence and reputation on campus, and there was a history of people being hurt by things the family had done.” This kind of opinion or personal perspective is not based in fact and shouldn’t be included in the draft. It’s certainly possible that some people don’t like the “family,” for whatever reason, but the assertion that there was a “history of people being hurt by things the family had done” is inaccurate, offensive and out of bounds.
“The breach was with the entire campus community” was a phrase used multiple times in the abstract and is another example of inserting personal opinion into what is supposed to be a recounting of the facts. In reality, the issue couldn’t have been a breach “with the entire campus community” because many, many other members of the campus community attended the party this past year and in previous years. The community had established a social norm over many years, and a large segment of the community had no issue with the party.

Challenging some misused/inaccurate terminology

In the “Tentative Resolutions” portion of the abstract draft, it was recommended that the “family” host discussions related to a variety of topics, including “toxic masculinity.” This is completely offensive and inaccurate, and has never been a part of how the “family” identifies or cultivates its own culture. Additionally, we understand “toxic masculinity” is an issue the community is interested in, but it is independent from the trial and therefore should not be included in the abstract as this is an unfair claim falling outside the scope of the case. There was no mention of “toxic masculinity” at any point in the abstract until the resolutions section where it was inserted without warrant.

General summary

Aside from wanting to correct the record on the issues listed above, we want to express the following...

Despite the fact that only three people were the party hosts, this trial morphed into an attempt to take a poke at a specific group on campus. This wouldn’t be allowed for any other group on campus, and we hope that, in the future, this doesn’t happen to any other group on campus.

It seems like this trial was symptomatic of the current campus climate, and we urge everyone (the entire community) to truly get to know each other. Misconceptions, preconceived biases and lack of understanding seemed to play a role in this situation and others recently, and we all (the entire campus community) bear the responsibility for being better than this. After all, we’re all a part of one campus community, and we all want that community to be as rewarding and as meaningful as possible for each other.

That’s not to say that we won’t have our differences, in perspectives, interests and opinions, along the way. But if we truly get to know each other better (and learn how to communicate face-to-face a little better and more often), we’ll find out that there’s already a lot more trust, concern and respect for others than some may currently realize.