



Kenneth L. Judd
Paul H. Bauer Senior Fellow

November 1, 2019

Dear President Zimmer, Provost Diermeier, and Editors and Publishers of JPE,

The University of Chicago (UC) claims to advocate freedom of speech. The Report of the Committee on Freedom of Expression, available at <https://provost.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/documents/reports/FOECommitteeReport.pdf>, begins with

"From its very founding, the University of Chicago has dedicated itself to the preservation and celebration of the freedom of expression as an essential element of the University's culture. In 1902, in his address marking the University's decennial, President William Rainey Harper declared that "the principle of complete freedom of speech on all subjects has from the beginning been regarded as fundamental in the University of Chicago" and that "this principle can neither now nor at any future time be called in question."

This report has become known as the "Chicago Principles." The UC has received well-deserved praise for its commitment to free speech.

The Economics Department has also had a reputation for its commitment to free speech, as noted by Ken Griffin when he said that the Economics Department is *"fundamentally committed to free expression, fierce debate and intellectual pursuit."*

I am writing to inform you about an example where free speech principles were, in my opinion, clearly violated, and to ask how UC can reconcile these actions with its support for free speech.

Here are the basic details. In November, 2012, I (along with Yongyang Cai and Thomas Lontzek, who were postdoctoral students at that time) submitted a paper to Journal of Political Economy (JPE) on the social cost of carbon. Monika Piazzesi was assigned to handle the submission. It was rejected in November, 2014. I wrote to Jim Heckman, an editor at JPE, about that rejection and pointed out the many ways in which the rejection letter did not conform with what I had understood to be the standards at the JPE. He told us to change the title of the paper and resubmit it, and said that he and Harald Uhlig would handle the paper. The attached document [Judd_to_Heckman_re_JPE_rejection.pdf](#) contains my message to Heckman.

In September, 2015, we received a R&R from Heckman along with six referee reports, some being very negative.

Piazzesi's rejection letter advocated an approach to research which I, and many others, regard as unacceptable. I planned on using my experience with Piazzesi as part of my critique of the current state of

economics. When I mentioned this to Heckman, he responded with threats. The clearest one was in a Nov. 3, 2015, email where Heckman said

"I continue to think your paper has great merit. But don't create a stink and make a delicate situation much much worse Its so counterproductive What rate of discount do you have to go off on these rants against people who respect you and want to encourage your work Even if you are suicidal have you no concern about your coauthors?"

"A revised paper along the lines of my letter will very likely be published If however you continue to rub old sores we will have to reconsider this decision. However angry you may be do not destroy a very delicate situation with a rant against Monika Leave it alone or leave the JPE Call me a son of a bitch, an idiot or whatever you like but let this act of respect for you and your work not be harmed and just do what you do best-wonderful economics"

Later, Uhlig sent an email endorsing Heckman's threats. All of my emails with Heckman and Uhlig are attached.

The idea that Heckman was afraid of Piazzesi is ludicrous, not only because Heckman is not afraid of anyone but also particularly since I am sure he also disagreed with her methodological demands. I do not know what Heckman's true motivation was, but it was clearly another example of his hostility towards me and/or my work, not fear of some economist.

These threats imposed very high costs on me and my coauthors (who, by the way, were not informed of these threats). I told them that in light of the very negative referee reports we had to work hard on the responses. For example, there were claims that our paper had nothing new. We responded by analyzing the previous papers cited by negative referees, showing that their simplifications affected their results and that the details of the model contradicted the narrative. This involved making computations of their models that the authors did not do themselves. We wrote up several lengthy "notes" to counter the referees' criticisms.

I also told my coauthors that getting an R&R and positive comments by Heckman meant nothing. I was a Visiting Professor at UC in the fall quarter from 2004 to 2013. I (and others) have had experiences with Heckman, and many other UC professors, and learned that it is dangerous to believe any of their flattery. I told my coauthors that we had already written an excellent paper, but the goal was to be so thorough in our response to the criticisms that Heckman would appear ridiculous if he rejected our paper.

In December, 2017, we had finished the revision. Before sending the revision to JPE, I instructed my coauthors to remove my name from the paper. After receiving Heckman's and Uhlig's threats, I knew I had to remove my name. They made it absolutely clear that the paper would not be judged solely on its scholarly merits, and the appearance of my name might lead to a rejection. They held the paper and my coauthors's careers hostages. I wanted this paper to appear in a major journal and my coauthors to have a top five publication. Removing my name was essentially required by Heckman and Uhlig in their desire to impose costs on me.

In May, 2018, the paper was accepted and will appear in late 2019.

I know that free speech is not free, but I was shocked that editors of JPE would use their editorial power in an attempt to silence me and inflict these costs on me for no reason other than to shield a former editor from standard scholarly criticism. The University of Chicago declared that Steve Bannon would be free to express his ideas at UC, but Heckman and Uhlig acted against my plans to discuss the academic and intellectual issues related to my paper.

The message in this letter is directed to the various UC people who have responsibilities related to the JPE.

To the publishers of JPE, I ask "Is this behavior by Heckman and Uhlig consistent with the ethical standards UC Press expects the editors of its journals to follow?"

To each editor of JPE, I ask "Do you approve of Heckman's and Uhlig's threats? Would you threaten an author under the same circumstances?"

To Provost Diermaier and President Zimmer I ask, "Do you claim that Heckman's and Uhlig's threats are compatible with the Chicago Principles (<https://freeexpression.uchicago.edu>)? If so, what arguments support such a claim?"

I hope that each person sent this letter via email will reply. In fact, I welcome a discussion of these issues. To that end, I include my phone numbers below. The standard operating procedure at UC is to ignore my emails. So, I should tell each of you that silence will be interpreted as a declaration that you find the threats issued by Heckman and Uhlig to be fully acceptable and reasonable, as well as compatible with the Chicago Principles.

Sincerely,



Dr. Kenneth L. Judd
Paul H. Bauer Senior Fellow
Hoover Institution
650-723-5866
650-799-5172