

**Report  
of  
The Joint Senate-Administration Workgroup  
on  
The Role of the University and its Units in  
Political and Social Action**

**May 2022**

## **Table of Contents**

<i>I. Introduction: Background, Process, Scope, Definitions.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>II. Response to the Draft Recommendations from the University Committee on Academic Freedom .....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>III. Notes Toward an Update of the Kalven Report.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>IV. Suggested Guidance for Departments.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>V. Next Steps.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Appendices .....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Appendix 1.....</i>	<i>20</i>

DRAFT

# I. Introduction: Background, Process, Scope, Definitions

## A. Background

The Joint Senate-Administration Workgroup was convened in the spring of 2022 to formulate guidelines and recommendations on a complex set of issues related to political speech and academic freedom within the university. The workgroup drew together a mix of faculty and administrators representing a broad spectrum of views and beliefs about the issues and about possible remedies for the challenges we gathered to address.

The workgroup was formed partly in response to concerns that have arisen over the past few years when both administrative and academic departments at Berkeley have posted statements on their websites that expressed the political perspectives of staff, faculty and/or students. Some of those statements were presented as—or could easily have been construed as—positions adopted by the department itself, and not just of individuals affiliated with the department. Given their placement on digital platforms belonging to the university, these statements raised concerns that they could be mistaken for official positions inconsistent with the university’s legal, ethical, and educational responsibilities to maintain political and viewpoint neutrality. Because some of these statements offered support to one side of the conflict in the Middle East, they were also perceived by some to violate the campus’s Principles of Community, which commit us “to ensuring freedom of expression and dialogue that elicits the full spectrum of views held by our varied communities” and to “respect[ing] the differences as well as the commonalities that bring us together.”

## B. Process and Scope

The [group's charge](#) from the Chancellor, the Interim Executive Provost & Vice Chancellor, and Chair of the Academic Senate specifically asked us to formulate:

- 1) a draft set of principles and issues to consider when the university and its units are commenting on matters about which people have deeply held views; and
- 2) resources that would help the leadership of academic departments and operational units consider when and how to issue statements on behalf of their units about current events or controversial subjects.

The group's work proceeded in two phases over the course of four remote meetings in March and April 2022. During the first phase the group focused on drafting a response to the recommendations on departmental political statements from the systemwide Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF). In the second phase we expanded the conversation to consider the broader issues connected to political speech on campuses as it intersects with issues of free speech and academic freedom. During that second stage of discussion we were inspired and galvanized by a reconsideration of the [Kalven Report](#). Drafted at the University of Chicago in 1967, the Kalven Report remains a touchstone for all who confront issues of political speech in the university. The workgroup agreed that it would be valuable to draft a statement that would address some of the same issues as did the Kalven Report, but revised and updated to take account of current understandings of free speech and academic freedom, the current communications environment, and the values and expectations of the public university.

The group's discussions were intense, focused, and wide-ranging. Group members approached the questions of political speech with very different assumptions and opinions, some but not all of which were resolved during our deliberations. It is important to stress that the recommendations laid out in this report reflect a consensus arrived at by the group, not unanimity. Through the process it became clear to us that unanimous agreement on these complex and fraught issues was not possible, and

perhaps not even desirable, and group members aired their differences of opinion with openness and respect. Where there were differences of opinion on substantive issues, we flag those in what follows.

The group's deliberations began from a basis of shared respect and esteem for Berkeley's legacy as the home of the Free Speech Movement, the protections and parameters of the First Amendment, and our unwavering commitment to academic freedom. At the same time, we recognize the tension between freedom of expression and the restraint sometimes necessary to sustain a community where all can feel a true sense of belonging. We grappled with the knowledge that certain forms of protected, permissible speech have a potent ability to damage, threaten, and deeply disturb valued members of our campus community who do not share the beliefs and perspectives espoused.

Nothing in these recommendations is meant to constrain or even influence the right and ability of faculty, staff, and students to engage in discussion about political issues or make use of the numerous non-institutional platforms and channels available to individuals to share their beliefs and perspectives. Our focus is on the use of institutional platforms and the adoption of departmental positions on matters that are not directly related to the department's business. Messaging about controversial issues has the potential for adverse impacts on members of the community and on the reputation of the institution as a whole. As a public university we serve a diverse array of stakeholders, and we are the object of scrutiny by observers and commentators of every sort. Our every word and deed is closely watched by those who respect the university's role in facilitating informed political debate and support our commitment to supporting diversity of perspective. Our perspective and recommendations are therefore informed by awareness of both the reputational risk to the institution posed by statements on controversial issues and the benefits that can accrue to institutions that show leadership by articulating strong and ethical statements on pressing issues. We are painfully aware that these perceptions will always cut both ways with our many partners: what looks like strong leadership to one constituency may well alienate another.

### C. Definitions

Before proceeding to our recommendations, it seems important to define some foundational terms. As the debate about political speech in the university has heated up, the concepts of “free speech” and “academic freedom” have sometimes been employed loosely or interchangeably. Furthermore, these conversations do not always draw a clear distinction between individual speech and institutional speech (e.g. by a department) and are sometimes also based on impressionistic or inconsistent notions of what counts as a “political” statement. In what follows we seek to establish clear definitions and usage for each of these terms.

We understand **free speech** in the terms outlined in the First Amendment, and acknowledge that as a public university Berkeley is bound by the right to free speech for all. As UCAF states in its October 20, 2021 communication to the systemwide Senate, “individual faculty members and collectives of faculty members have a virtually unqualified right to speak publicly about anything. This is a core tenet of free speech and, to some extent, academic freedom.” However, we see freedom of speech as subject to two limiting factors. First, freedom of speech is not an absolute value or an absolute good, and individuals and groups should always consider the harm that their speech may cause and keep Principles of Community (civility and respect) front and center. Second, the principles of free speech pertain to the speech of individuals and, to some extent, of the university as a whole, but departments or other corporate entities within the university cannot be understood as possessing a right to free speech.

The principle of **academic freedom** has too often been conflated with a broad interpretation of free speech and taken as granting faculty permission to say whatever they think on any topic at all.<sup>1</sup> Properly understood, academic freedom refers to the protections offered to scholars within the university to research, teach, and make

---

<sup>1</sup> See Michael Berubé and Jennifer Ruth, “[When Professors’ Speech Is Disqualifying](#),” *The New Republic*, March 12, 2022, excerpted from their book *It’s Not Free Speech: Race, Democracy, and the Future of Academic Freedom* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2022).

statements about topics relevant to their discipline, without interference from the university administration and without the threat of censorship or discipline. Academic freedom also protects the rights of individual faculty members to make statements as private citizens. It does not apply to the speech of corporate entities such as departments, and thus does not protect the rights of departments to use their web sites to make statements on controversial issues that lie beyond the immediate governance concerns and research expertise of the department.

It became clear during our meetings that many conversations about **political statements** by departments are conducted without a clear sense of when such a statement should be considered “political” in nature. Some cases are clear, as when a department of gender studies makes a statement about the conflict between Israel and Palestine, but many others are less clear-cut. Consider the example of a departmental statement announcing a set of changes to the requirements for that department’s major, which were developed in part to make the program less Eurocentric and more inclusive. Such a change would certainly reflect the preferences of a majority of faculty in the department, who would be likely to regard the changes as a matter of pedagogy and curricular design. But any dissenters among the faculty could be justified in arguing that the changes were motivated in part by political concerns and that a statement announcing them was therefore also political in nature. Another case in point is the 2020 announcement by the Department of English at the University of Chicago that it would prioritize for admission to its PhD program the following year “applicants who work in and with Black studies.” This policy centrally concerns the pedagogical mission and research priorities of the faculty, but has been received by some as imposing a political test for admission. Considering these and other examples, we concluded that it is not possible to distinguish between “political” statements and other statements.

Finally, it is necessary to establish some distinctions among the various channels of communication available to individuals and departments to disseminate views on controversial issues. The recommendations in this report concern communications disseminated through official university channels, which include university-managed websites (including those of academic and non-academic departments), social media

channels associated with university offices or entities, digital signs, and statements on university letterhead.

DRAFT



## II. Response to the Draft Recommendations from the University Committee on Academic Freedom

Much of the group's conceptual framing of the issues was achieved during our initial meetings, as we considered the recommendations governing departmental political statements from the systemwide Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF).

In its thoughtful document, UCAF made two main recommendations:

- 1) any statement from a department "indicating support, endorsement, or opposition with regard to any commercial, religious, or political activity or issue should be accompanied by a disclaimer" explicitly stating that the statement should not be taken as the position of the campus or the university; and
- 2) departmental statements on such issues should always indicate whose views are represented by the statement, and should ensure that dissenting views can be expressed on the same platform.

The workgroup opted not to endorse the first recommendation, because of the difficulties outlined above of distinguishing between statements whose content would merit such a disclaimer and those that would not. In broad terms we endorsed the second recommendation, while also arguing that departments *as entities* cannot validly represent themselves as holding or espousing views on issues other than the department's policies, narrowly defined. In a departure from UCAF's perspective, the workgroup argued that "departments wishing to issue statements on issues not directly relevant to their policies should always present those statements as signed by all who support them, even if the support is unanimous among the faculty. When a group desires to make a dissenting statement we believe it should be publicized in a similar way (and on the same platform as) the majority view." We further suggested that departmental statements on issues that lie beyond the governance and pedagogical concerns of the department should be issued sparingly and that the campus should

provide departments with guidance—perhaps in the form of some suggested bylaws—that would ease decision-making in these situations.

Not all members of the workgroup were in agreement on these points. Some members held a strong conviction that departments should never make statements on issues not connected to their policies or pedagogical mission, even if signed by individual department members who endorse the statement. Our response to UCAF therefore included a dissenting statement which read in part: “statements on departmental websites are appropriate only when connected to the business of the department and when the statement contains a clear rationale for its relevance to the work of the department.” The dissent proposes that if a department wants to make a statement on a topic that does not intersect with its work, the appropriate way to do this is in the form of “a letter signed by all the faculty who agree with the statement” and recommends that these statements can be disseminated not on official university-held channels such as department websites, but instead as op-ed articles, on individual web pages (including those maintained by the campus), via email, or on social media. The view of this group is that these statements must be signed to indicate that the faculty involved speak for themselves, and not for the institution. The dissent was signed by two members of the workgroup, but conversations both before and after we submitted the response made it clear that other group members also inclined towards this view, some strongly and some less so. (See Appendix 1 for the [full text](#) of the workgroup’s response to UCAF.)

### III. Notes Toward an Update of the Kalven Report

In the recent atmosphere of constant eruptions and fierce wrangling over the definitions and limits of free speech and academic freedom, it seemed clear to the workgroup that there was value in drafting a new statement of general principles governing political speech in university settings. Setting out to draft a preliminary update to the 1967 Kalven Report, the group began by considering which aspects of Kalven remain valuable today and in what areas updates are needed.

Conceived under the lingering influence of Cold War politics and pressure for the University of Chicago to take a position against the Vietnam War, the Kalven Report charted a careful path between neutrality for the institution and the guarantee of academic freedom for its faculty. Much has changed in our political and media landscapes since 1967. We have learned much about the potential harms of unfettered speech and habits of communication have changed radically with new technologies and the new online communities they enable.

The ubiquity of electronic communication and social media mean that communication has sped up and statements have greater reach—and in this media environment it is all the more important to speak with care and to safeguard principles of community. Any document outlining principles for political speech on campus in 2022 must take account of our radically expanded and accelerated media environment.

Finally, whereas Kalven spoke only to issues connected to political speech by faculty, we regard it as important that any such statement originating at Berkeley should reflect the views and interests of the entire university community. Faculty and academic departments share many goals and values with academic support units, non-academic departments, and other campus entities, and we aim to articulate principles that will be applicable to all.

In our view any new statement about political speech in academic settings could not do better than to begin from the Kalven Report's assertion that the role of the university is to challenge social values and to propose new ones:

A university faithful to its mission will provide enduring challenges to social values, policies, practices, and institutions. By design and by effect, it is the institution which creates discontent with the existing social arrangements and proposes new ones.

As a public institution and the site of the founding of the Free Speech Movement, Berkeley embraces the principle of free and open expression as fundamental to its identity. We energetically endorse the idea that an important aspect of the mission of the university is to challenge the status quo and to advance new social models.

But where Kalven goes on to assert that “a good university, like Socrates, will be upsetting,” we would embrace a more deliberative approach. Acutely conscious of the delicate balance between speech that sparks new ideas and speech that is damaging, we advocate for a mode of debate that promotes values of shared inquiry over the aim of “upsetting” existing ideas. Academic conversation and learning should be conducted as open conversation that encourages individuals (in all settings) to pursue their interests as far as they can, to rethink fixed positions, and to transform how they view an issue. Berkeley's Principles of Community call for respect for “the differences as well as the commonalities that bring us together” and “civility and respect in our personal interactions.” In that spirit, we encourage members of the university community to express their views with respect for interlocutors and in an open and dialogic mode, rather than as declarative statements that suggest that there is only one possible view of a situation.

Yet the university—and especially the public university—must be open to the expression of conflicting views and must even allow space for the expression of views that many will find unacceptable or abhorrent. Although the campus generally cannot punish such

speech, it must act to create an inclusive environment for all students, staff, and faculty, including responding to hateful speech in a way that reaffirms our principles of community. Disruption or silencing of speakers or speech one disagrees with is not acceptable within a truly open educational institution. There is no right to use speech to silence others, no right to shut down events even when the speech they foster is perceived as doing harm to members of the community. The appropriate response to speech one disagrees with is tolerance and peaceful protest. ;

In keeping with all of these goals, we reiterate our concern that statements issued in the voice of a corporate entity (whether an academic department or the university as a whole) risk attributing the views of a majority, or of the leadership, to all, and thus risk implicitly silencing and infringing on the academic freedom of dissenters. The authors of the Kalven Report were alert to this danger, writing that the university is a community which “cannot reach a collective position without inhibiting that full freedom of dissent on which it thrives... if it takes collective action, therefore, it does so at the price of censoring any minority who do not agree with the view adopted.” In other words, institutional neutrality and the expression of a diversity of views by members of the university community are interdependent.

It is on this basis that we argue that statements on controversial issues should be issued infrequently and, when made, should be signed by those who endorse them (even if the statement is endorsed unanimously) and that space should be made available on the same platform for the expression of dissenting views within the department or unit. Even when no one expresses dissent outright, those in power should understand that the less powerful members of a community (for example, those without tenure or with contingent employment) may not feel empowered to express their views openly or fully. In many situations a better approach will be for individual faculty, or groups of like-minded faculty, to issue a statement in their own names and via separate, non-university-operated channels. Appropriate sites for such statements include op-ed articles, the [Berkeley Blog](#), and personal social media accounts.

However, we recognize that there are many issues on which faculty and departments hold passionate views and that faculty often regard it as an ethical and professional responsibility to take a stand on such issues. It is also important to acknowledge that the forbearance to express an opinion on a contentious issue does not amount to neutrality on that issue. Rather, silence often equates with implicit support of the status quo.

When or if academic or non-academic departments do choose to place statements on their websites, they must follow a consistent policy that does not discriminate based on the views expressed. Departments should adopt bylaws that govern when and how they can make such statements, who has the power to decide when to make a statement, and how dissenting views will be aired. The university should take the lead in providing departments with resources for making these decisions, in the form of written guidelines and a set of suggested bylaw options. (See Section IV below for some suggested guidance for departments.) When groups of faculty issue a statement, it is essential that those voices not be punished or silenced by the administration; to do this would contravene the principles of academic freedom and would amount to censorship. To offer a case in point: While the University of Chicago English Department's decision to give preference to applicants working on Black studies in 2020 was taken by some as an unacceptable politicization of graduate education, it could just as easily be argued that the department's (and all departments' ) previous policies of *not* prioritizing Black studies was not neutral, but actually amounted to an endorsement of systemic racism simply by not challenging the existing state of affairs.

## IV. Suggested Guidance for Departments

We suggest that the following recommendations be made available to all campus departments and department leadership be invited to review the options and decide on a set of policies that will bind their approach to this issue. Departments may change their practices with changes of leadership or changes in external circumstances, but all such changes should be reviewed and agreed upon by the department members or by a representative group from the department, should be recorded in writing, and should be available for consultation by members of the department.

No policies currently exist that prohibit departments (academic or non-academic) from using their websites to make statements on current events and public controversies. As the most recent communication from UCAF has established, paragraph 40 of the [Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students](#) “does not preclude the practice of departmental statements on a wide variety of topics.” Therefore, the recommendations below concern not what departments are *permitted* to do, but what is wise, humane, and likely to promote civility among members of the community. The guiding principle is deliberation: we counsel any department considering issuing a statement to think carefully about the interests of their various constituents and the unintended results that might flow from such an utterance.

Because this guidance is intended to present a menu of options from which departments can develop their own policies, some of the numbered items present approaches that contradict each other. The list is not intended to articulate a policy to be adopted wholesale.

Two members of the working group, Erwin Chemerinsky and Dan Mogulof, disagreed with the group consensus that departmental statements should be permitted, and have offered these [statements of dissent](#) (also included in Appendix 1).

1. Departmental statements on controversial issues should be made sparingly and with great thought and care about their possible effects—including harm and hurt to members of the university community and reputational damage to the university.
2. In general academic and administrative departments should use their websites and other channels of communication only to make statements on matters that are related to the research, teaching or outreach/service mission of the department and (therefore) on which the members of the department are understood to have relevant expertise. Departments should be able to articulate how the content of a statement is related to the teaching or research work of the department.
3. Academic and administrative departments or divisions should have policies in place that state who decides how and when the department's website (and other communication channels) can be used for statements on current events and public controversies. Usually this would be the chair or another supervisor, possibly in consultation with some sort of executive group.
4. In deference to Berkeley's principles of shared governance, department guidelines should designate an appropriate academic leader (generally the chair or dean) as the final editor and arbiter who is institutionally accountable for all departmental communications. The Chancellor, EVCP and other administrative vice chancellors should not censor or remove statements published with the sanction of an academic department. Because administrative units operate according to a formal hierarchy within the campus that is not impacted by shared governance, the vice chancellor responsible for an administrative unit should generally be the final editor and arbiter who is institutionally accountable for all non-academic unit communications.



5. Departments that issue such statements should consider appending a disclaimer explicitly stating that the statement should not be taken as the position of the campus or the university
6. When considering issuing such a statement department leadership should consult with the Academic Senate committees on [Academic Freedom](#) and on [Diversity, Equity, and Campus Climate](#). We recognize that such statements are often time-sensitive and effective communication sometimes will not allow for an extensive consultation process. However, a quick exchange with the chair or membership of the relevant committee could help a department think through likely effects on department climate.
7. Statements criticizing religious practice or beliefs, engaging in political campaigning, or promoting commercial interests are never appropriate.
8. An academic department's mechanisms could permit attributed statements by members of the department that do not reflect the views of the entire department. If a department maintains that practice, then such statements should be signed by the members of the department who endorse them.

If adopting this approach, the department should declare that no statements on issues that lie beyond the governance policies and pedagogical mission of the department will be issued without such attribution. Department leaders should be aware that signing onto a majority statement or voicing dissent are not always a simple matter for members of a department, especially those with less power or seniority. Insisting that department members openly endorse or dissent from such statements may expose those in vulnerable positions to criticism or retaliation and may force others, who fear such retaliation, into concealing or misrepresenting their actual opinions.

9. When such a (signed) statement is released, the department must provide the opportunity for non-signing members of the department to express their dissenting or otherwise contrasting views on the same platform. Such communications should be clearly presented by the department as a forum for the views of department members who do not agree about a specific subject, to avoid the appearance of a free-for-all.
  
10. All such statements (majority or minority) should be formulated in a way that abides by the university's [Principles of Community](#), with particular attention to the clause that calls for respect for “the differences as well as the commonalities that bring us together” and “civility and respect in our personal interactions.”

DRAFT

## V. Next Steps

This report is conceived as the first step in a longer process of deliberation. One near-term goal is to finalize and disseminate the guidance for departments outlined in Section IV. On a longer timeline we envision developing Section III into an update of the Kalven Report and making it available on our campus and beyond as a touchstone for conversation and thinking on these issues. For both of these goals the immediate next step is consultation with a broad range of individuals and groups on campus. We envision sharing this report widely, with an open comment period of 60 days from the beginning of the Fall semester through late October. We will meet with campus groups during September and October, including the relevant committees of the Academic Senate, the Council of Deans, the Student Advisory Committee in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, and relevant Registered Student Organizations. We also plan to schedule a Campus Conversation on the topic early in the Fall semester. After this consultation phase, we anticipate delivering a final report before the end of November 2022.

## Appendices

1. Dissenting statements of Erwin Chemerinsky (Dean, UC Berkeley School of Law and Jesse H. Choper Distinguished Professor of Law) and Dan Mogulof (Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Communications and Public Affairs)
2. October 2021 [Recommendations from the systemwide University Committee on Academic Freedom](#)
3. [Joint Senate-Administration Workgroup Response to UCAF Recommendations](#)
4. [Free speech commission report](#)
5. [1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure](#) (rev 1970), American Association of University Professors (AAUP)
6. AAUP [FAQs on Academic Freedom](#)
7. [Critical Incident Communications Protocol](#)
8. University of California, Berkeley [Principles of Community](#)

DRAFT

## Appendix 1

### **Dissenting statements of Erwin Chemerinsky (Dean, UC Berkeley School of Law and Jesse H. Choper Distinguished Professor of Law) and Dan Mogulof (Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Communications and Public Affairs)**

#### **Dissent by Dean Erwin Chemerinsky**

It has been an honor serving on the Working Group and I agree with much in its excellent report. But I respectfully dissent from its conclusion that departments or schools may make statements on “controversial issues.” I do not believe that departments or schools as entities have the authority to do this or should do this. Faculty members, individually and collectively, can and should express their views, including on controversial issues. They, of course, may make statements and sign letters and use other methods of communication. These can be on behalf of some or even all of the members of a school or a department. But the department or school as an entity should be limited to expressing and explaining its academic policies and procedures.

I believe that only the Regents of the University of California can take official positions on behalf of the University of California. Departments and schools are delegated authority to set their academic policies and procedures, but this does not include making statements about controversial issues on behalf of the University or its schools or departments. For example, in the Law School, faculty members may file briefs in courts on behalf of themselves or their clients, but they cannot file a brief on behalf of the University of California Berkeley School of Law or any part of it. Only the Regents can do that. Similarly, the Law School can adopt a policy (as we have) requiring all students to take a course about race and the law in order to graduate and we may explain why we have adopted that requirement. But we should not issue statements as a Law School criticizing a particular Supreme Court case no matter how much most of our faculty disagree with it.

Even if there is authority to make such statements, I think it is unwise because on controversial issues there frequently will be those within a school or department who disagree with the majority. I fear that the process of deciding when and whether the department should issue a statement frequently would be very divisive. Also, it is hard enough, especially for untenured faculty, to disagree with their more senior colleagues. But it is much more difficult to disagree with an official department statement on controversial issues.

The Working Group report states, “we recognize that there are many issues on which faculty and departments hold passionate views and that faculty often regard it as an ethical and professional responsibility to take a stand on such issues.” I agree and believe that faculty should take a stand on such issues, but they should do so as individuals or groups of faculty expressing themselves. The department or school as an entity should not be taking positions.

Nor is this made acceptable by saying, as the report does, that such statements should be “rare.” I believe that it is always unnecessary and undesirable for departments or schools to take positions on controversial issues.

Under First Amendment law, a distinction often is drawn between the speech of individuals and the speech of entities. I strongly support faculty members speaking out, including in jointly signed letters identifying them as members of a department or school. But I do not believe that the department or a school itself should be issuing statements on controversial issues. I therefore respectfully dissent from this aspect of the Working Group’s report.

*Assistant Chancellor Dan Mogulof supports this statement and offers his own immediately following.*

## **Dissent by Assistant Chancellor Dan Mogulof**

The diversity—in terms of identity, origins, and perspectives—of the public we serve, the students we educate, and the alumni we rely on is such that politicization of the institution—perceived or actual—comes with great costs to our mission, our reputation, and our academic integrity. We will tie ourselves in knots, and potentially tear ourselves apart, trying to explain to our stakeholders, and ourselves, why a departmental or school statement on a departmental or school website signed by those presumed to be leaders is not somehow an expression of an institutional position. That in turn creates potential for significant reputational damage among those stakeholders who might disagree with the position taken and, perhaps more significantly, among those stakeholders who highly value, and wish to protect, the university's political neutrality and its ability to provide a sense of inclusion and belonging to every member of the community regardless of their origins, identities, or perspectives.

We are more than a few thousand free agents who all happen to call Berkeley our professional home. We—particularly faculty—are already afforded an unbelievable degree of latitude and public access when it comes to expression on an individual level, and that must be maintained. But, so too is there is a greater institutional good that is best supported by a shared recognition of the costs we will incur if departments are free to post political statements on departmental websites.

I also dissent due to the likely consequences of a department or school's posting of a statement which—by virtue of its tone, form, and content—differs dramatically from the central campus's position, principles, and messaging in so far as divisive political issues are concerned. Given that the central campus is the sole, legitimate source of institution-wide positions, principles, and messaging, then administration could, in the future, be compelled to publicly distance itself from a departmental or school statement in order to dispel any notion that a given statement (presented on an institutional platform) represents the institution's perspectives. Pressure on the central campus to distance itself from—or even condemn—a departmental statement would only increase should that statement conflict with our Principles of Community. I have profound concerns

about the internal and external costs and consequences of a house publicly divided against itself.

DRAFT