show trial to beat all show trials,” and asked, “How much longer will this faculty allow gender politics to diminish this University and the search for knowledge in which we are supposed to be engaged? The damage is becoming incalculable...."

But the criticisms were surprisingly widespread and passionately held among members of FAS—a faculty to which Summers belongs, over whose meetings he presides, and in which he has invested much energy as he advocated curriculum review and his other priorities.

Arthur Kleinman, Rabb professor of anthropology, the department chair, decried “reckless and undigested words based in half-baked sociological prejudices” concerning women that have “created in me, for the very first time, the dismayed and undermining feeling of misplaced loyalty” to the University, after 29 years. Professor of anthropology and of African and African American studies J. Lorand Matory denounced “the political selectiveness of your support for free inquiry on campus.”

Master of Lowell House Diana L. Eck, Wetherham professor of law and psychiatry in society, an FAS member since 1976, described a “dispirited, discouraged, and even angry” community buffeted by “an atmosphere of mistrust and fear of retribution...an atmosphere in which a vibrant intellectual community cannot thrive.” Speaking “with reluctance and respect,” she asked how Summers would respond to “what is clearly a widening crisis of confidence in your fitness to lead our University?”

The last faculty speaker, professor of the history of science Everett Mendelsohn, noted that Harvard “can always improve, and always ought to be challenged to improve,” but that it was not “broken” when Summers became president, and did not require “radical surgery.” Of Robert Rubin’s comments to the Times, he said, “I do know that a member of the Corporation who is not aware of the tenor of discussion that had gone on really is not doing his job.” Corporation members had made “no careful attempt to see what the problems are and what responses might be.” Mendelsohn felt a need for “structural changes” in response to the “disaster” that had resulted from “the move toward centralization on so many fronts” that was making Harvard “more hierarchical and less responsive at a time when just the reverse is needed.” Universities, he said, are not pyramidal businesses, but “pluralistic” by nature. To pursue those issues, Mendelsohn moved that the meeting be continued.

Before the vote on that motion, President Summers responded that “This has been a searing afternoon for me.” He had heard “a set of perceptions that are entirely at variance with what I have tried to do” in challenging, arguing, and raising questions: “For me that is an important data,” he said, “what the quality of efforts to enhance diversity. “[I]t reached a 40-year agreement with the city in December, including a 2.5 percent annual increase in its PILOT payments and a pledge that any of its property converted to nonprofit use beyond 2.5 percent of the total would be subject to full commercial tax rates.
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Harvard’s payments in lieu of taxes (PILOT) to the City of Cambridge have been renegotiated to include an escalator that will increase the University’s payout to the city by 3 percent annually for the next 20 years. The agreement, which is renewable for up to 50 years, further stipulates that if Harvard converts any of its taxable property in Cambridge to educational use, it will continue to pay the same amount on that property that it would have paid in taxes, again with a 3 percent annual increase. In addition, Harvard will pay the city an extra $1 million in 2006, raising that year’s PILOT above $3 million. Harvard paid $4.5 million in taxes to the city last year on its taxable properties, plus a PILOT of $1.7 million.

As a nonprofit, the University is not required to pay taxes on certain kinds of property, but has voluntarily made payments in lieu of taxes since the 1920s. The most recent PILOT agreement, negotiated in 1990, had been set to run through 2010. But after Harvard negotiated more generous PILOT terms with Watertown following its purchase of the large commercial Arsenal property there (see “The Watertown Agreement,” March-April 2003, page 61), Cambridge took notice. Under that agreement, Watertown allowed Harvard to use its property for a range of academic purposes—without having to seek special zoning permission each time—in exchange for provisions protecting the town’s tax base. The agreement with Cambridge, says Mary Power, Harvard’s senior director of community relations, is based on similar “principles of mutual benefit.” MIT reached a 40-year agreement with the city in December, including a 2.5 percent annual increase in its PILOT payments and a pledge that any of its property converted to nonprofit use beyond 2.5 percent of the total would be subject to full commercial tax rates.
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Nonetheless, some of Summers’s language attracted attention—notably the context he set for the underrepresentation of women in science by asserting that “the data will, I am confident, reveal that Catholics are substantially underrepresented in investment banking...that white men are very substantially underrepresented in the National Basketball Association; and that Jews are very substantially underrepresented in farming and in agriculture.”

Less remarked upon were his descriptions of efforts to enhance diversity. “[I]t would be very useful to know, with hard data,” he said, “what the quality of marginal hires are when major diversity efforts are mounted.” After several years of such efforts, he wondered about “the quality of the people who have been hired... how many are there who have turned out to be...”

Before the faculty reconvened, both the president and the Corporation weighed in, on February 17. Summers released the transcript of his January remarks. In substance, his major points were what had been reported from accounts by symposium participants: a series of arguments about conflicts between family obligations and employer demands for “high power and high intensity,” differences in “intrinsic aptitude,” and “lesser factors involving socialization and continuing discrimination.”
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Less remarked upon were his descriptions of efforts to enhance diversity. “[I]t would be very useful to know, with hard data,” he said, “what the quality of marginal hires are when major diversity efforts are mounted.” After several years of such efforts, he wondered about “the quality of the people who have been hired... how many are there who have turned out to be...”

The meeting then adjourned until February 22.
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