

1. What are your views on campus free speech? Should Harvard adhere as closely as practicable to the First Amendment (with narrow exceptions interpreted by courts as immediate threats, incitement, harassment, and unlawful conduct), or impose stricter guidelines?

Universities are places to cultivate two things: the capacity to understand and engage with the world as it is, and the character to do so with creativity, courage, integrity, and wisdom. Free speech plays an important role in both. Students should expect to become uncomfortable at times. They should have to confront ideas they find troubling. They should expect to be challenged. As far as possible, there should be no limitations on the *content* of speech.

The same cannot be said of the *conduct* of speech. Harvard is a community of learners who owe each other respect and civility. No member of the Harvard community should ever be harassed or physically threatened. No one should be shut down or excluded. To these ends, members of the Harvard community should moderate their speech and behavior if necessary to ensure the full participation of everyone. They should honor their colleagues, especially those with whom they disagree, by following norms of conduct that ensure the free flow of ideas and the well-being of the entire community.

Harvard is conducting an active and healthy conversation with itself about the importance and limits of free speech on campus. I fully agree with the recent statement adopted by Harvard's Council on Academic Freedom: "[e]very member of the academic community should be free from fear of reprisal for positions they defend, questions they ask, or ideas they entertain...[and] should enjoy full standing to speak and be heard, regardless of background or social position...We also have a moral duty to listen, and to approach disagreement in a spirit of genuine curiosity, motivated by the desire to learn from each other, and open to the possibility that any of us, at any time, might be wrong."

2. What are your views on whether Harvard should take positions on political and publicly debated events and issues or remain institutionally neutral/nonpartisan?

I believe Harvard should take a position of institutional neutrality on politically contentious issues, much as has the University of Chicago for many years. By maintaining issue neutrality, members of the Harvard community will be free to take their own positions without fear of being at odds with the University's official opinion. I am glad to see that Interim President Garber has set up a working group to consider a university policy of issue neutrality.

Having said this, there are many situations where the simple commitment to issue neutrality will not spare Harvard from making institutional decisions on politically charged issues. Decisions on investments, fair labor practices, academic freedom, free speech, community engagement, and crisis responses, to name a few, can all be seen as political issues. On all of them, Harvard will have to make considered responses, guided by an application of its own values and commitments to the facts.

3. What are your views on Harvard requiring or considering equity, diversity, inclusion and belonging statements or commitments as part of its faculty hiring, promotion and tenure processes?

Harvard should be the safest place on earth for people to be themselves. To this end, Harvard should have a robust institutional commitment to protect diversity, foster inclusion, and increase a sense of belonging for everyone in the Harvard community. This commitment should be articulated in university-wide documents to which every faculty member should subscribe. *Beyond that, additional statements should not be required.*

Fundamentally, the job of faculty is to help students pursue the truth. Faculty should be afforded abundant academic freedom in doing so. The AAUP's enduring *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* is a good guide to what should be expected of faculty and what freedom should be given them. For 84 years, that statement has affirmed the belief that "[t]he common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition. Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning." Any university-wide commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion should be considered in the context of this commitment to academic freedom.

There is a positive tension between a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion, and a commitment to academic freedom. The former compels every member of the Harvard community to do what they can to create the conditions for diversity of all kinds to flourish on campus. The latter requires them to not let that commitment become a source of censorship over those who might not follow the predominant political positions. Exploring this tension is among the most important things Harvard must do now. Again, I commend Harvard's Council on Academic Freedom for its work to this end.

I don't want there to be any doubt about my own commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. I would like to reiterate what I said to Harvard's Coalition on Diversity on a related question. To that group I wrote: "diversity, equity, and inclusion are among the most important things in any institution and community, including Harvard. Diversity of lived experiences, diversity of thought, diversity of beliefs, and diversity of all kinds make for an abundant learning community. Advancing equity, especially in light of past systemic inequities, is a moral obligation that Harvard should shoulder with integrity, creativity, and institutional resources. And these things can only happen if there is an abiding commitment to, and hunger for, full inclusion of everyone."

4. What are your views on the importance of viewpoint diversity on campus? If important, how do you think Harvard should cultivate such diversity within its communities (students, faculty, administrators) and classrooms?

Viewpoint diversity, like all kinds of diversity, will make Harvard stronger and its graduates more capable of making a positive difference in the world. Viewpoint diversity enhances critical thinking, promotes innovation and creativity, prepares students for the real world, strengthens democratic principles, reduces echo chambers, and encourages empathy and understanding. I experienced a great deal of viewpoint diversity at the Kennedy School, both in class and outside of it.

Harvard should cultivate viewpoint diversity through policies that encourage free speech, diversify faculty hiring along lines of ideological perspectives, support student organizations that represent a broad spectrum of viewpoints, host diverse speakers and events, do all it can to promote civil discourse, uphold the value of academic freedom, and encourage interdisciplinary collaboration.

5. If elected, would you be willing to meet occasionally with the leaders and/or members of our groups during your tenure?

Yes. I would welcome it.