

EXHIBIT 09

For FAS FAC ANTHRO 05-18-20

In writing this response, I have found myself varying between an impulse to rebut the various small lies and inconsistencies in Professor Comaroff's statement, and the urge to ignore these efforts to distract from the bigger picture of his ongoing sexual harassment. I have settled on a middle ground, not because I wish to be drawn further into a debate about whether the layout of his house renders the fact that he forcibly kissed me inside of it "plausible" or not, but because I would not wish his misdirections to stand uncontested on the record.

Professor Comaroff claims that in the case of the corrective rape conversation—the sole offense he admits to here, and even then only partially—he was motivated by a concern for my safety so urgent that he needed to spell out this risk to me on my first day of graduate school and at the very moment he learned I was in a same-sex relationship. The bulk of his reasoning in his response, however, demonstrates his profound inattentiveness to others and his neglect of the day-to-day ethical behavior that secures students' safety.

I would have more respect for Professor Comaroff if he could acknowledge that he does certain things without thinking, or that he approached, for example, the topic of corrective rape in an inappropriate and disturbing manner. However, he is wholly unwilling to admit errors of judgment or express regret. He "regrets" my "impression" of him, in that he regrets its existence in the world and the possibility it may have consequences for him, but there is nothing that he would have done differently; in fact according to him it would have been a "dereliction of duty" for him to act otherwise.

Professor Comaroff's insistence on his own infallibility is evidence that he could cause harm and resist attempts to be held accountable. In fact, as I explore throughout this document and in my reading of his conclusion, he provides us with ample reasons to doubt his characterization of himself as a protective, warm, caring, innocuously affectionate advisor. His response is consistent with my complaint.

To help those reading cross-reference the various documents involved, I have provided an index on pages 2-4.

4. In this section I address Professor Comaroff's characterization of our October 2018 meeting (4a), and further institutionally lodged evidence of his misconduct (4b).

4a: Professor Comaroff describes my emotional state in a meeting of October 2018 as part of an attempt to characterize me as overly emotional in general, and thereby unreliable. I discuss this overall characterization in closing.

However, here I want to address Professor Comaroff's inclusion of a detail that he and [REDACTED] wanted to contact health services on my behalf. This detail seems fabricated after the fact, given that I spoke openly in that meeting about how I had already gone to Harvard University Health Services and the Bureau of Study Council for help addressing my grief. What I did not say in that meeting with both Professors Comaroff was that, at Harvard University Health Services in the summer of 2018, I also began to speak to a counselor about Professor Comaroff himself, and his repeated sexual harassment of me.

The death of two of my male relatives in the summer of 2018 had begun to create a moral dilemma for me. I spoke with a counselor at Harvard University Health Services at length about what I had admired about those two relatives, particularly their gentleness and thoughtfulness. I realized that I had too often used excuses like "men of a certain generation have poor boundaries" to try to make sense of the gender dynamics in my department, including my experiences with Professor Comaroff. Yet my own relatives were proof that not all men behave in this way. I had the growing realization that I needed to report my experiences with Professor Comaroff, despite my anxiety about the risks of doing so.

Yes, I was emotional in that meeting with the Professors Comaroff in October 2018. I was more emotional in their presence than in the presence of other faculty. This had to do with my grief, but it also had to do with how that grief was bringing up complex feelings for me about Professor Comaroff's misbehavior. As I reflected on this later, I cried in the presence of both Comaroffs because of the weight of Professor Comaroff's harassment of me.

While meeting with a counselor at Harvard University Health Services, I began to speak about my experiences with Professor Comaroff. I spoke about how uncomfortable he had made me and how I felt that he was involving his wife in his misconduct, using her as cover.

As I was speaking, I remembered that if I said more this counselor might have to report my experiences. I had very little understanding of the Title IX system at that time— what I knew I probably knew from my Title IX trainings, and I would have taken one around this time. I knew that there was such a thing as a "mandatory reporter" and that if this counselor was one, I might be forced into reporting Professor Comaroff before I was ready.

Because of my fear that discussing my experiences frankly with a Harvard employee would remove my agency over how that information was shared, I sought out a new licensed mental health professional with whom to discuss these issues. I consulted her in 2018 and again in 2019, in the wake of my conversation with Professor Pimenta, as I specifically weighed whether I should pursue disciplinary action against Professor Comaroff. She is currently on vacation, but I believe she has specific memories of our conversations about misconduct in my department, my concerns about the damage Professor Comaroff could do to my career, and my repeated and unfruitful attempts to get assistance. She is ready to attest to this when she returns from vacation.

Thank you to Professor Comaroff for jogging my memory on this additional incident of contemporaneous corroboration and disclosure of his misconduct and its effects on me.

5. In this section I address descriptions of character, those Professor Comaroff provides of himself (5a), and those he provides of me (5b).

Technically, I am told, character witnesses cannot be a part of the ODR process. However, given that my complaint and Professor Comaroff's response are part of the process, I find them very helpful documents to read carefully, as we are taught to do as scholars. We can learn from the forms of reasoning and description of which Professor Comaroff avails himself.

5a: Professor Comaroff describes himself and his actions as "rational" (p. 5), "elegant" (p. 5), and "reasonable" (p. 16). He is "consistently calm" (p. 8) and is "very slow to anger" (p. 8). When he acts he acts only and always out of care, and he never makes mistakes. He insists on the absolute infallibility and unshakeability of his own character. He insists that he treated me exactly like other students, and that nothing about my treatment was "singular" (p. 12, 13, 14). He repeatedly refers to himself and his wife Jean as a unit, acting with one body and mind, consistently and without fail.

He does not provide much basis for this description of himself, beyond repeatedly saying that he would "never" do things which, in fact, he did and which the evidence will show that he did.

He does not tell us *how* he makes decisions about when to talk about violent sexual topics with his students, and when to touch students, even though he admits that he does both of these things.

Reading his own account of his conduct, we see that the way in which Professor Comaroff is unlike most other people is in his intense focus on his own perceptions, needs, and victimhood. Keep in mind that I spent countless hours trying to understand Professor Comaroff's behavior toward me. This is what anthropologists are supposed to do; we decenter our own perspectives to make sense of the actions of others. Yet when