

Moderator: Welcome everyone to this special event with Harvey Silverglate, co-founder of FIRE, free speech advocate, trial attorney and graduate of Harvard Law School. Harvey is currently seeking petition candidacy for the Harvard Board of Overseers. We will start with a short, moderated discussion with Harvey followed by a Q&A.

Harvey, you recently published a piece in *Quillette* about the administrative bloat at universities. Please tell us more about why you think this is an important issue.

Harvey: In some schools there are as many bureaucrats as there are students. The bureaucrats outnumber the faculty numbers considerably. Why do we need all these administrators? We don't. What they do, a lot of them, is enforce speech codes and kangaroo courts.

So, there's a kind of a vicious circle going on here. I did some calculations. If we fire 95% of the administrators, the result would be better education, nobody to enforce draft speech codes and kangaroo courts. Tuition would probably go down by 40 to 45%. And we'd be better off in every sphere of college life. And yet, they stubbornly hang on. There's nobody really to say this in the halls of power.

So, I'm running – or I'm trying to run, I'm trying to get enough signatures to get on the ballot, in order to speak, what do they say, truth to power. I'm not sure I like that phrase. But it is kind of accurate. To say to these people, "Look, why do we have so many bureaucrats?" Let's fire them all, get rid of the speech codes, get rid of the kangaroo courts. Cut tuition by 40 to 45%. And let's make the campuses educational institutions rather than prison camps.

Moderator: Harvey, I know you've been working on this issue for many decades now. In the 1990s you co-authored a book called *Shadow University*. In that book, you documented some of the erosions of free speech and civil rights and liberties on college campuses. I'm curious if you could talk about how things have evolved since then. It's only been 25 years or so. Have things gotten better or worse? How has the dynamic changed?

Harvey: I co-authored a book with Alan Charles Kors, yes, and since then things have gotten worse. One of the lessons I learned was that writing a book doesn't mean very much unless there's a follow-up. What happened was Kors and I wrote the book in 1998. We illustrated, in the book, example after example after example on speech being curtailed at universities. As a result, Kors and I received hundreds and hundreds of pleas from students who were disciplined for what they said. We heard from many faculty members as well. We couldn't handle it. Kors was a full-time professor of Enlightenment history. A great professor, one of the world's leading experts in the Enlightenment. And I had a busy law practice.

So, Kors and I decided we needed an organization to field these

---

requests for help. So, we started out in 1999 with the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education [FIRE], with one executive director and two part-time volunteers. The volunteers were Kors and Silverglate. I made the assumption that we would be in existence for no more than 10 years. Why? The idea of censorship in liberal arts campuses was so absurd, I thought it was a self-contradiction, which it is. That all we had to do was get out there and knock over a few of these speech codes and knock over or get rid of some of these tin-pot Napoleon administrators and the problem would be solved.

So, I predicted FIRE would be around for no more than 10 years, if that. Well, here we are at the 25-year mark. We have a staff now approaching 100. So much for the one employee and two volunteers. The problem is incredibly stubborn. I think it's because so many people have a stake in it. It's affecting the whole culture. That's the dangerous part. America, as a result of the educational system, is gradually becoming a society that believes in censorship. As we educate these kids, young kids, teenagers, and then college-age students – they're adults, presumptively adults. If we educate in censorship, we're going to end up in a society that no longer believes in the First Amendment. The stakes are enormous in this battle.

Moderator: I'm curious how you view this issue as it relates to Harvard, specifically. I know you've had a long connection to the university. You attended the Law School. You also are based down the street in Cambridge. Is your desire to effect change at Harvard purely personal and due to your personal connection to the university? Or do you recognize Harvard plays a larger role in academia?

Harvey: Both. First of all, I did go to the Law School. The Law School is an eight-minute walk from where I live. I practice law mostly at my home office. I rarely go into the office in Boston. I'm a three-minute walk from Dunster House, where for many years I have been a non-resident fellow in law and civil liberties. I conduct two law tables a year, one each semester. Law table is when I have dinner with the students in the Dunster House dining room and I let them pick a topic within my field of expertise that they want to talk about. I give a little talk; we have a Q&A.

Let me tell you a bit about Dunster House. It will be an interesting aside. In the mid-1980s, I was invited by Harvard Law School Dean James Vorenberg to teach a one-semester class in criminal law. The reason he asked me is because I decided I was going to take a three-month sabbatical from my law firm. He heard about it and asked me to teach there. I taught there and it was a tremendous success. Vorenberg circulated questionnaires to the students to evaluate the course. And without a single exception, the students loved it. I was the only trial lawyer. Everyone else was teaching about theoretical this and appellate law that, and reviewing Supreme Court decisions, and I was talking about jury trials. The students were enthralled with this course.

---

So Jim Vorenberg called me into his office and offered me a tenure-track position if I would give up my law practice. I said to him, "Jim, I'm flattered. I appreciate your confidence. But I can see from the atmosphere around here that I would really not fit in very well and it would be one clash after another after another. And I would rather be outside looking in than inside looking out." And so I turned it down. Jim said, to his knowledge, I was the first person to turn down a tenure-track position offer from Harvard Law School. I turned it down without even thinking about it. It was not a hard decision.

And things have gotten worse since then. If I were on the faculty now at Harvard, I would be in a straitjacket, actually.

Moderator: Harvard recently selected a new president, Claudine Gay, who is currently a sitting dean at the university, to replace Larry Bacow. I'm curious what your views are on president-elect Gay, if you have any. And whether you're optimistic or pessimistic about what changes could be made under the new president.

Harvey: Let me just say this about Larry Bacow. Larry Bacow is terrific. He is a free speech advocate. He believes in academic freedom. Months ago, I had a one-hour meeting with him to discuss speech codes and other matters. Larry Bacow is a believer in academic freedom, free speech. But he can't do anything.

And the reason he can't do anything is that Harvard is really run by two groups of people. In theory, it is run by the Harvard Corporation, which is the President and Fellows of Harvard College. That is a small group, not elected. If one member dies or retires, he or she is replaced by [a person who receives] the majority vote of the remaining members of the Corporation. And the Corporation really runs the place. The thing about them is they don't really know what's going on because they aren't informed [about what's happening on the ground].

And then there is the Board of Overseers. They're elected by the alumni. Not quite as powerful as the Corporation, but very powerful and very influential. And that body is elected by the alumni. And that's the body that I'm running for because I would like a voice. Is one vote going to make a difference? One vote won't, but one member on the board, what's the phrase, speaking truth to power. One member of the board can be very influential because I can tell them what's going on. I live right in the middle of Harvard. I represent Harvard students. I represent Harvard professors. I represent Harvard administrators. I know the place. I'm an affiliate-in law at Dunster House of Harvard College; I give lectures at Dunster House once a semester on law and civil liberties. I attended Harvard Law School for three years. I even taught at Harvard Law School for one semester in the mid-1980s. I know the place very well.

So, I'm in a unique position. If I can get a foot in the door, I feel I'm in a

---

unique position to really help the situation, much more than you would think.

Moderator: So, what can the rest of us do? I think we have a lot of alumni here on the call today. We have students as well. As part of FAIR HA+ and HAFFS, we have faculty, former faculty, administrators, and many others connected to the university. We can't all sit on the board or run for the board. Alumni can vote for the Board, but are there other things we can do to improve the climate and make sure rights are respected at the university?

Harvey: Well, first of all, I'm assuming that most in this audience graduated from college. So, everybody should be checking their own alma mater, check out the speech codes. These are all online. Check out what the speech codes are. Check out what kind of disciplinary proceedings there are. Check out the number of administrators. The number of administrator statistics are not always easily available. But find out how many administrators there are. As alumni, constantly write letters to the governing board saying why is it that you've got more, far more administrators than students. You've got more administrators than professors. You've got more administrators than students. What do they all do all day?

Well, what they do is they create mischief. So, it's a kind of a vicious circle. The administrators have a stake in having the speech codes continued because that gives them something to do. And if you get rid of the speech codes, you can get rid of the administrators. Then, everything benefits, including the atmosphere of academic freedom. Write letters. Write op-eds. Send letters into the governing boards. Make noise. Don't sit there like quiet victims.

Moderator: Specifically for students, we have some with us today. What specifically can they do? Do they need to be the ones that drive this change? On one related note, I think some of us may have heard over this past year there was talk among the students at Harvard that they might change the Harvard speech code. What would you say to students?

Harvey: Students who, for example, work for the school newspaper can try to cover free speech activities. If they have any control over editorials in the school newspaper, they can write free speech editorials. If they're not on the boards of the newspaper, they can write letters to the editor. They can do guest columns. What we need is for students to not be afraid to voice these civil libertarian academic freedom views. Students who are disciplined for speech matters should raise holy hell. They should not be silent victims. As for administrators, if alumni who give a lot of money knew where their money was going, they wouldn't give so much and they wouldn't give it unconditionally. But a lot depends on the students. The students have tremendous power. Not because they technically have the power, but they know what's going on. They're the victims of what's going on.

---

Moderator: I want to leave sufficient time for questions. Let's shift now to the Q&A and start with D.

D: I happen to be a retired professor who once taught at Harvard and was also an alum. I want to say, Harvey already knows this, that he is doing the Lord's work. And that the idea of firing 90% of the administrators on principle is a very good one. I would just like to put his effort in a broader context. Our universities need a lot of reforming. I regret to say this so much, but Harvard, with whom I was associated with so long, is one of the last places that would ever take a lead in reforming at this point. Because what they are doing is working for them.

They have all the money they want. They have the reputation they want. They have all the students they want. On the other hand, as we all know, there are liberal arts colleges on the point of extinction who could save themselves by firing 90% of the administrators, also by revamping their curriculum. It's the same situation almost everywhere, to a greater or lesser extent.

So, I am hoping that your campaign, however far it goes, echoes out there in the heartland, and perhaps could have some repercussions elsewhere.

Additionally, your co-author, Alan Kors, wrote a piece some years ago in which he said that any college that would return to a traditional humanities curriculum, such as we studied, would be the envy of the nation within five years. When the students realize what this curriculum was and what it offered them, the college would be swamped.

Now the other huge problem is that because after 40 years of postmodern education, there aren't any schools that have the faculty to teach this way anymore and they would have trouble finding the faculty. But all I'm saying is change, it really could have a profound ripple effect.

Harvey: Kors is one of the great scholars of the Enlightenment. Probably the leading Enlightenment scholar in the country and one of the great Enlightenment scholars in the world. Fabulous teacher. Students who had him were very lucky. He, unfortunately, retired. He was also a fighter on the faculty at Penn for free speech and academic freedom. What we need is faculty members like Alan Kors to speak up. Tenured faculty. They're not going to be fired for speaking truth to power.

D: I'm not so sure about that!

Harvey: I've never really understood the reluctance of tenured faculty to speak up more. So, in any event, I am not [a tenured faculty member]. I didn't accept Dean Vorenberg's invitation, so I am not on campus. I'm actually glad that I didn't accept the invitation because I think I can be more influential outside here.

---

Moderator: Harvey, one of our current students wrote in the chat that the *Crimson* recently posted an editorial saying that student concern for free speech was simply conservative self-censorship. I'd like to hear what your thoughts are on two parts of this. First, the cultural concern that it's self-censorship and not actual rules or policies. It's more of a cultural phenomenon. And second, the political dynamic here on whether this is a conservative or liberal phenomenon.

Harvey: First of all, you don't have speech – speech codes and the culture of free speech are intertwined. Each one reinforces the other. So, I never get into the cause and effect. But they coexist and they mutually reinforce one another. That's number one.

Number two, I find it absolutely – I read the *Crimson*. I find it absolutely astonishing that a newspaper that depends for its very existence on a culture of academic freedom, free speech, press freedom. Remember that? That happens to be in the First Amendment to the U.S Constitution. That an organization that depends on free speech doesn't vigorously defend the concept for everybody. So, I'm very disappointed in the *Crimson*.

It would also be very good if more free speech advocates applied for positions on their college papers. Because if we can get the college papers criticizing the administration, that's very effective.

Moderator: I see J has a question.

J: Harvey, I don't know if it was deliberate, but you didn't tell us what your expectations are as far as Claudine Gay is concerned. I have to say I'm very worried. Everything I've seen makes me think she's no friend of free speech. But I'd be curious to know what you think.

Harvey: She is no friend of free speech. She is unqualified to be the president of any university. She is a bureaucrat. She is not a teacher. She has been a dean of the faculty or associate dean of the faculty. She's basically a bureaucrat. Harvard could have gotten virtually anybody in the country to accept an offer to be president. And they picked one of the few people who was least qualified. This is a very, very bad development.

Those of us who have some knowledge of Harvard will remember that Lawrence Summers was the president. And he is a staunch free speech advocate. He is on the board of advisors of FIRE. He was president for a very short period because he gave a talk that some claimed demeaned women scientists because he said that there were relatively few women in science because they really aren't equipped to be. What he meant was that women in the society were not educated adequately. That women tended to be encouraged to take non-scientific majors. That there were not enough women in science.

---

But the way he put it, somewhat ineloquently, made it sound like he was saying – or at least if you wanted to listen to it this way – that women were not qualified. That was not what he was saying. There was such an uproar that he had to resign. And he was replaced by Faust. When Bacow comes in later, he knows that one of his predecessors said something that got him removed. So, Bacow walks on his tiptoes throughout his tenure. Mind you, he's a free speech advocate. He believes in academic freedom. But he also knew there was a limited amount that he could do because he wouldn't have the support of the Harvard Corporation if he were to do something as radical as promote academic freedom and free speech. This is on a college campus.

Claudine Gay, however, is the ultimate apparatchik. It's disastrous. When I read the *Crimson*, which announced it first, I thought to myself, I really have to win this election.

Moderator: O, you've had your hand raised.

O: Thank you very much. I'm grateful to you, Mr. Silverglate, for running. I'm a graduate of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, not the college. I want to say a couple things. One is that I teach at another university— [a top-ranked public university]. The problems you describe are everywhere. As a Harvard alum, I have two reasons for voting for you and supporting you. One for the sake of Harvard, and one for the sake of my university now and universities around the country because Harvard is a trendsetter. It has what Joseph Nye calls soft power. Please don't underestimate that. That what you do, what Harvard does, has ramifications for the rest of us.

The other thing I wanted to say is I agree with D on the difficulty of firing bureaucrats, particularly if there's so little financial pressure to do so. But I hope you'll be thinking of a positive case should you be elected to the Board of Overseers, for Harvard to be a pioneer, to be a leader in free speech. Something by which Harvard can distinguish itself in a positive way. Some of us are grappling with that at my university. How do we do this? What's the positive case that the average person who doesn't have a dog in the fight would respond to?

I do think one possible fruitful avenue would be the tide is starting to turn on what you called wokeness or woke culture. That's starting to happen. Why not be a leading university, the leading university that is showing the way, setting the pace. So, I think some kind of positive case is very important if the tide's going to turn. Thank you.

Harvey: That's a very useful tip, yes.

Moderator: Follow-up question to a point O just brought up about the growth of administrators not just at Harvard but at other universities. There's a question from the chat about this proliferation of administrators in search of a mission. Where did that problem come from and what is the

---

root cause of all this?

Harvey:

My way of looking at it is this: When I went to Princeton, class of '64, there were two administrators. There was the dean of students and the dean of the faculty. Now, of course, there are more administrators than professors by far. The army of administrators is starting to be as big as the student body. I think that one of the ways I'd like to approach this is that college should be more affordable. I think this is something everybody will understand. That's one of the reasons – now Harvard, of course, has a lot of money. This is not so much a Harvard incentive, but there are a lot of schools that don't have that kind of money and spend a fortune on administrators. Some of them even have to borrow money.

So, I think that the financial argument is not insubstantial. That we can have massive cuts in tuition, more people could afford to go to college without scholarships. And the middle class could benefit tremendously from getting rid of these administrators who not only are not useful but who are harmful. So, I think that is a very good argument. It isn't ideological. It's economic.

I also do have an ideological argument. I believe it's very bad for academic freedom to have – and for the intellectual life on the campus. At Harvard now, if you say something that offends someone, you can get called up on harassment charges by an administrative office. Well, how can you have real intellectual discourse like this – you must walk on eggshells. Harvard students, college students all over the country, shouldn't be so fragile that they hear something that insults them, that they don't like, that they then ask a dean to punish the person who made them feel uncomfortable.

College is four years of discomfort. If you aren't discomforted by what you learn in college, your education has been a failure. The whole idea is to introduce you to new, uncomfortable, challenging concepts.

Moderator:

I see our next question is from H.

H:

Yes, I graduated from the college in 1951, at which time James Bryant Conant was president of Harvard. Slight difference from the current one. The tuition at that time was \$400 a year. When someone asks me why I went to Harvard, I said it was the only school we could afford. As I recall, the administration consisted of the dean of the college. I suppose you had a secretary. And the bursar, who collected our \$400.

So, here's my question. How do we access the petition to get you on the Board of Overseers?

Harvey:

Go to [Harvey4Harvard.com](http://Harvey4Harvard.com). There are complete instructions, but unfortunately the instructions are not that easy to follow. It's not right that Harvard has made the process so difficult. If I can get a foothold, I think I can be incredibly effective. And that's why I'm working so hard.

---



It's not that I have a lot of extra time. I'm a full-time, practicing lawyer. I write. But this is a very important undertaking of mine. I'm hoping that if I win a seat, in the next election, there will be more petition candidates who share my concerns.

Moderator: Our next question is from M.

M: Harvey, as always, my hat is off to you for all the good work that you do. I raised my hand because I wanted to say something you just said, which is that you will do a world of good if you can get on this Board of Overseers. But I think what really needs to happen is there needs to be a crowd of people on the Board of Overseers who can act as a voice of sanity in what is clearly now an asylum run by the lunatics.

I'm an alum not only of the college and the law school, but also of the *Crimson*. As you point out, the *Crimson*, of all things, has become an institution opposed to free speech. So, with all agreement with your indictment of the administrators, I'm afraid the rot goes a lot deeper. One man, even you, it seems to me, can't do the job here. The Board of Overseers has to become a board of common sense.

In that connection, I also wanted to say something you just said a moment ago. The rules are incredibly complicated to qualify to sign a petition. If any state attempted to do this sort of thing, the Harvard faculty would be up in arms, alleging an attempt to suppress the free exercise of the franchise. So, in addition to this Corporation, which is responsible to no one, you have a Board of Overseers, which is also, essentially, a closed body. So, I would hope you would make it an order of business, if you are elected, to liberalize the procedures for petition candidacies.

Harvey: Absolutely. My goal is if I can win a seat, my goal is to make it easier for a tidal wave of people to run and win. We have to start somewhere.

M: Let it be the people's house. Thank you.

Moderator: Our next question is from X.

X: I first want to congratulate Harvey Silverglate for the great work that he has done and is doing. I fully support his efforts. Just to make a brief statement, I was a Harvard dean. I lived in the belly of the beast, so to speak, seeing how the university operates both within a school and across the various schools, as you get to do when you are a dean. I will say that since stepping down, one of my major interests in writing and thinking has been about the very issues that we're discussing. One other organization I've seen doing great work is Heterodox Academy. And interestingly, the single largest number of members of Heterodox Academy are members of faculty of Harvard University, by a lot. There are chairs of major departments, university professors.

---

Recently, Heterodox Academy announced that they are creating campus communities. More than 50 universities put in inquiries about becoming leaders for communities at different universities. Today, Heterodox announced the first 22 of these, which include, among others, MIT, Cornell, McGill, Berkeley, University of California, one of the branches, University of North Carolina. And then a lot of smaller schools. They had to turn away the rest for now because they couldn't handle as many as applied.

There are many at Harvard interested in either leading or joining one of these communities. The value of this, in my view, is that we need to have a self-aware group of people who understand issues like academic freedom and the ability to have serious conversations across differences. We need those people to know who else shares their concerns. I can promise you this will happen. It's happening right now.

One of the things that we have all become aware of very quickly, and I know the MIT group found this out, is that there are alums who don't want to give so much to their university right now, but would give to support a community such as Heterodox that will allow speakers to come in, programs to be developed, etc. So, I'll just say this is one way the goal that we all have for better conversations, more academic freedom, less cancellation, all of that, will happen.

- Harvey: I think what you're saying is that the counter-revolution has begun.
- X: Correct.
- Harvey: Yes. And we all should be part of it.
- X: Yes. And I'll say the stimulus to the MIT community doing something was the cancellation of Dorian Abbot, which was an absurd illiberal thing to do. This caused a huge outcry across the country. FIRE played a great role. So did other organizations. But this stimulated the president of MIT, who is now a different person, to ask for a faculty committee to review freedom of speech at MIT. They came up with a brilliant statement.
- They issued the statement and then the committee said, "Oh, now the corporation and the faculty have to approve it." A few weeks ago, the faculty voted overwhelmingly to support this statement. It is now the law of MIT. And it will create a different background for future events like the one that happened last year.
- Harvey: That's part of this counter-revolution. It's there, we just have to nurture it and join it.
- Moderator: Our next question is from B.
- B: Thank you, Harvey, for your lifetime achievement and your willingness at
-

this tender age to keep fighting this battle, particularly against the bulwark of Harvard. One of the reasons for the lack of free speech is because there's a lack of viewpoint diversity. We can dwell on the meaning of diversity and so forth. But it's because there's such one-sidedness in the viewpoints of the faculty and student body – or it seems that way. I'm sure there's less than it seems because of the self censorship issue you raised.

It seems to call for affirmative action in this new fashion. I'll just give you a quick story of my own battle with Harvard. I tried to introduce some debate in my reunion programming. There was a seminar on climate. The reunion committee decided on four panelists, all of whom were going to be cheerleaders for the best ways to fight the climate crisis. I said to the committee, why don't you at least have one person who is going to discuss scientific issues regarding whether in fact there is a climate crisis and how to approach it, even if it is a crisis--the wisdom of destroying and failing to invest in the current infrastructure while relying on unreliable renewables and as yet unfeasible battery backup, and so forth. I tilted at that windmill for a while and lost. They decided it wasn't a good idea. They would rather listen to four people agreeing with themselves than having even one person who would disagree.

I said, "I've looked in vain for anyone on the faculty who has a diverse view on this. The university itself is on the record of being in the vanguard of people who are going to decarbonize as fast as they possibly can. You have lots of deans for that and dozens of faculty members. There doesn't seem to be any controversy over what is in fact a raging controversy, scientifically-speaking, as to the climate issues and also the energy implications."

I suspect there would be a riot, led by not just students, but professors as well, as there has been at Georgetown and other bastions, if a highly credentialed climate skeptic were invited to speak on campus, like Judith Curry, a University of Chicago trained physicist and former head of the Earth and Ocean Science Department at Georgia Tech, or Will Happer, physicist and emeritus professor at Princeton, or Richard Lindzen, physicist and emeritus professor at MIT (also a former Harvard professor).

My view is, as I said to them, "All we need is debate. Harvard is about academic freedom. Let's have some debate." Of course, they couldn't do it. In response to a follow-up letter I sent, the president of Harvard sent me a polite, terse reply on the subject which acknowledged that people have different views on these things. That's all they were able to

---

say about it.

So, I would urge you to think about what kind of affirmative action could we have to raise the consciousness of the community on various controversial topics where one view holds sway at the university, but where there is a great deal of legitimate debate. And make the university host those debates. Have it at the Kennedy School. Or, if it's a matter of science, have it somewhere else. Let's acknowledge that we have a diversity problem when it comes to these issues. Let's hold spirited and respectful debates. And teach people how to do it.

Moderator: Harvey, I see one last question. It's from a current Harvard undergraduate student.

A: Thank you very much. I helped launch a petition last semester for the presidential search committee asking the next president to stand up for free speech. We received around 400 signatures. More than 50 faculty signed and more than 250 students. Unfortunately, we didn't have enough time to get as many signatures we'd wanted because the presidential search ended early. There's definitely a lot of hope out there.

We're trying to do what B said. With these signatures, we're hoping to launch a debate series with the students that will have equal representation on both sides of an argument. Hopefully, with that, we'll be able to start a consistent stream of debates challenging the PC and status quo that will get people used to this type of dialogue and seeing the advantages of it.

Harvey: Fabulous. I should mention that anybody who's in the audience who is around the Cambridge/Boston area, whether it's BU or Harvard or MIT, shoot me an email, [Harvey@HarveySilverglate.com](mailto:Harvey@HarveySilverglate.com) and we'll get together, we'll talk about these things. I don't only give talks like this. I meet with students, alumni, faculty.

Moderator: I think that's a great note to end on. And it speaks to the fact that we're trying to forge a community here of like-minded folks that are fighting for the same issues at Harvard. Thank you so much, Harvey, for taking time to talk with us tonight. And thank you everyone for joining.

I encourage everyone to check out our [FAIR Harvard Alumni+ website](#) with FAIR, the Foundation Against Intolerance and Racism, as well as our co-sponsors for the night, [HAFFS. Harvard Alumni for Free Speech](#).

Thank you everyone. Have a great night.

---