Vincent Munoz:

I think what we need to do is explain how our principles of free speech, free inquiry will help serve the cause of justice.

Betty Friendan:

The First Amendment, the constitutional freedom of speech and freedom of conscience that is the bulwark of our democracy.

Bettina Apthekar:

There was a passion in what was being said, affirming what people considered a sacred constitutional right, freedom of speech and freedom of association.

Michelle Deutchman:

From the UC National Center for Free Speech and Civic Engagement, this is SpeechMatters, a podcast about expression, engagement, and democratic learning in higher education. I'm Michelle Deutchman, the center's executive director and your host. First, I want to take a moment to thank those who attended the center's annual SpeechMatters Conference earlier this month. Over 500 people gathered on Zoom for a half-day conversation about truth, trust, and transformation. For those of you who missed it, I encourage you to take a peek at the recording of the event, which can be found on our website, freespeechcenter.universityofcalifornia.edu.

On today's episode, we are thrilled to welcome a leading voice in higher education, Jeremy Young. Jeremy has been a powerful advocate against educational gag orders, including anti-DEI and anti-CRT legislation, raising the alarm about the risks of increased government regulation of what is taught and discussed on campus. This month, Jeremy joins us to reflect on the evolving landscape of state and federal policy. And to explore how the sector can unite to uphold the mission of delivering a robust, inclusive and diverse education for all Americans.

But before we get to our conversation, let's take a listen to Class Notes, a look at what's making headlines. The Trump administration is stepping up its scrutiny of foreign money and influence in higher education, launching a new federal investigation into UC Berkeley, just weeks after initiating a similar probe into Harvard University. The moves follow President Trump's recent executive order, transparency regarding foreign influence at American universities, signed on Wednesday, April 23rd, which directs the Department of Education to strengthen enforcement of Section 117 of the Higher Education Act. The law requires colleges and universities to report foreign gifts and contracts worth more than $250,000.

Critics argue that the investigations are politically motivated, particularly since they come after Harvard announced plans to sue the administration, while supporters contend that stronger oversight is essential to protect national security and promote transparency in academia. In the new preliminary injunction, two federal courts have temporarily blocked the Trump administration's efforts to curtail diversity, equity, inclusion initiatives on college campuses. The education department's February Dear Colleague Letter threatened to withhold federal funds from institutions that continued their DEI programs, citing alleged violations of civil rights laws. However, judges in New Hampshire and Maryland found the guidance to be vague and potentially unconstitutional, raising concerns about infringement on academic freedom and First Amendment rights.

These rulings underscored the judiciary's role in checking executive actions that may overreach into academic freedom and free speech. On a related note, the National Institute of Health, which provides research money to universities, announced last week that it will deny funding to institutions that refuse to certify that they do not conduct DEI programming. This announcement continues to demonstrate the administration's willingness to use the NIH as a vehicle to eliminate certain topics and discussions from

higher education. Last Tuesday, April 22nd, the American Association of Colleges and Universities or AAC&U, released a call for constructive engagement between higher education institutions and the current Trump administration.

The letter denounces the unprecedented government overreach and political interference now endangering American higher education. As of Monday afternoon, April 28th, it had been signed by 534 higher education leaders from around the country, including all 10 University of California chancellors and System President Michael V. Drake. We'll talk more about the significance of this letter during our conversation. Now back to today's guest. Jeremy Young started this month as the senior advisor for strategic initiatives at the American Association of Colleges and Universities, also known as AAC&U. Jeremy comes to AAC&U from PEN America, where he served as director of state in higher education policy, overseeing state-level policy engagement across the US free expression programs. He also directed PEN America's Freedom to Learn program, which fights government censorship of colleges and universities.

His commentary on issues of academic freedom, higher education and American democracy appears frequently in media outlets, including The Washington Post, Time, Newsweek, The Hill, The Daily Beast, and Inside Higher Ed. A historian by training, Jeremy holds a BA in history and music from St. Mary's College of Maryland, and an MA and PhD in US history from Indiana University. He previously served as communications and marketing manager at the American Historical Association, and as an assistant professor of history and director of the Institute of Politics and Public Affairs at Utah Tech University. Jeremy, welcome and congratulations on your new role. AAC&U is lucky to have you.

Jeremy Young:

Well, thank you. It's great to be there and it's great to be here with you, Michelle.

Michelle Deutchman:

So, Jeremy, as we just said in the intro, you are a man of history. And a lot of what's now happening at the federal level has been bubbling up at the state level for a number of years. And I'm wondering if you can draw on your expertise from your time at PEN to broadly review for our audience the types of statewide legislation that you helped track and respond to when you were at PEN.

Jeremy Young:

Absolutely. So, I mean, I don't think for any keen observer of higher education. What we're seeing at the federal level should be surprising to anyone who has been paying attention over the last five years at the state level, because we have started to see these kinds of restrictions on higher education institutions at the state level, going back to 2021. There were initially a batch of state laws aimed at restricting the speech and ideas of college faculty. The speech particularly around so-called divisive concepts related to critical race theory and other topics related to race, gender identity, and US history. Those laws began to be struck down by federal courts in late 2022.

And in 2023, we saw a switch to a more all encompassing attack on higher education writ large. Restrictions on DEI offices, on accreditation, on programs and curricula related to race, gender and identity, on general education, on college mission statements, and on the autonomy of shared governance in higher education. And those threats really ramped up over the last couple of years. And now, of course, we're seeing something similar to that appearing at the federal level, where every one of those ideas is getting rolled into an executive order, and is becoming now something that colleges and universities have to deal with.

Michelle Deutchman:

So, before we turn to the federal level, which is where we're going to spend most of our time, I do want to ask you if you're continuing to see the same amount of activity at current state legislative sessions, and both the same level of activity. And are they being met with the same level of success or has that changed especially in light of the presidential election?

Jeremy Young:

So, I haven't been tracking it as closely this year. But from what I've seen, there are probably more restrictions being passed at the state level this year than in any previous year. And I would say the difference between the state and the federal level is in the levers of power. At the federal level, control is largely through pots of money that support various functions at the university, such as research or various other functions. But not so much as a direct appropriation as it is at the state level. The state level, there's a lot of restrictions specifically aimed at public institutions, because they receive those direct appropriations from the state government.

And we've seen those ramp up. And those are the kind of restrictions that only a state government can issue. But the restrictions we've seen at the federal level have been aimed both at public and in some cases, especially at private institutions, which is a really new element in all of this. So, yes, they are continuing at the state level. They are increasing, but the state and federal approaches have been different. And I think we're seeing both continue to advance.

Michelle Deutchman:

Well, of course, you're anticipating where I was going to go next, which was to talk about the different levers that are being used. And so, you've already mentioned one of the mechanisms that we see the Trump administration using, which is about loss of funding or the threat of loss of funding and the coercion of that. And then two, the focus on not just public institutions, but also private ones. Are there other things that you want to mention about what the current presidential administration is doing that might be different than what we've seen in the past?

Jeremy Young:

I think there is an increasing focus on regulatory measures around things like accreditation bodies, trying to use regulations on military academies and other types of institutions that the federal government has more direct control over. But I really think whether this has expanded into a broader set of attacks, not just on a particular subset of concepts, but on the very idea of what we at AAC&U refer to as a liberal education. Now, that's not an education in liberal politics. In fact, it's the opposite of that. It is an education that prepares students to have broad minds, and to understand perspectives that are different from their own, to engage in dialogue, and discourse, and really to become citizens in a liberal democracy.

And it's really becoming more and more clear that the restrictions that we're seeing are part of a broader package intended to really take higher education back to a time when there was an accepted set of ideas, or perhaps an imaginary time when there was an accepted set of ideas in something called the western canon. And that was the only thing you could learn or study, instead of being a place where all ideas can be heard, and be debated and be learned from. And so, really, I think this is becoming a fundamental disagreement over the very purpose and essence of higher education. And that's really troubling as an advocate for higher education, that there are these kind of restrictions being aimed at the very nature of what makes American higher education special and unique.

Michelle Deutchman:

I think that's really helpful, the way that you've explained the broadening nature of what I'm going to call an assault on higher education. And I'm wondering if you can expand a little bit on this idea of the very

nature of higher education and why that is important, especially for people who maybe aren't able to access higher education or who choose not to access higher education. And I think one of the things that we've seen, especially post the presidential election, is this question of the messaging about higher ed maybe doesn't seem like it was particularly effective. And I don't know if you have thoughts generally about what that means for the sector and what that means the sector needs to do to be more connected to the public.

Jeremy Young:

I think you're absolutely right. And I talk fairly regularly with a former president of a system in the Midwest. And he told me when people ask him what the value is of academic freedom, he just immediately points to the corn blight that was cured a few decades ago by scientists working at an agricultural university, at a public university in the Midwest. The value of having a place in a university where ideas can be debated, where minds can be opened, is not just for the people who attend. It's for the communities who can participate in programming, and activities, and community partnerships. It's for ordinary people around the country who benefit from the knowledge that is created and transmitted in those institutions that solves real world problems. And it's also for the benefit of employers, frankly, who are looking for employees who can understand people and the world around them in complex ways, who can talk to people who are different from them, speak a different cultural language.

There is value for all of society in having higher education institutions exist in a place of intellectual freedom. And the value of that institution really depends on it being free from direct government control of what ideas can be present. Free from the kind of granular restrictions on university governance, that mean that a university can't decide to create an office for certain types of student success, or can't decide to go out and have certain speakers on campus, or entertain certain ideas in college majors, or minors, or the general education curriculum. When you have the government interfering with the intellectual life of a university, even if it's a public university or university supported by public funds in some way, you are diminishing what that entity can do, what that institution can do, not just for its own students, but for all of society.

Michelle Deutchman:

Yeah. I think at least for me, watching what has been happening with medical and scientific research, I feel like if that doesn't make the case to people in the public. I mean just reading about how this huge grant about dementia research is being stopped in its tracks. Something yesterday came out about HHS and a longstanding research about women's health. These kinds of things that are no longer going to be able to be done in our American universities and what that will ultimately mean longer term.

Jeremy Young:

That's exactly right. And we have to decide if we want to be a national leader in medical research, if we want to be, sorry, an international leader in medical research, an international leader in science and technology, or even in cutting-edge humanities and arts work. That is what we have been over the last century. We have been the global leader in those areas. And if the government decides that that is not what we are going to be, we're going to see all sorts of effects from that that I think people aren't imagining. We are going to see us no longer being a leader in society on a variety of indicators that are supported by the kind of research that's conducted at universities.

We're going to see issues with health, with life expectancies, with international competitiveness in technology. There really is a great risk to what is being done. I think it's hard for some people to see exactly how much of a risk that is, because it may not affect them today or tomorrow. But it is going to undermine the fabric of this country both in our global competitiveness and in our ability to benefit our citizens.

Michelle Deutchman:

I mean, I think what you've made clear is that the stakes really couldn't be higher. And I kind of want to go back to something that you've already touched on, which is what... as someone who thinks a lot about policy and policymaking, what are the ultimate goals of these efforts, legislative and otherwise? I mean, I think you sort of touched on it that it's to undermine the purpose and essence of higher education, but to what end? I mean, do you have any other thoughts on really what the goal is?

Jeremy Young:

I think there are a few goals. I mean, I think there is an interest in reforming some things about higher education that frankly do need reform. Is it true that there are parts of higher education institutions that can become liberal echo chambers? Sure, that happens from time to time. May not have happened in the rural institution I taught in, in a red state, but it does happen in some places. I think there is concern with the cost of college. There's concern with the sort of stratification of elite institutions versus the institutions that most students actually attend, community and technical colleges and regional publics. And I think there is concern that institutions, particularly on the elite end, have not always done the best job in interacting with their communities in the ways that they should.

I think there are legitimate concerns there, but what we're seeing instead is just an undermining of the institutions. We're seeing an undermining of the value of higher education, the autonomy of higher education. And I don't think that solves anything. I think that this is being done at some level just for the purpose of gathering raw power. And at another level, simply because people have convinced themselves that universities are something that they are not. That they are liberal indoctrination factories. That everyone at every university in the country agrees with whatever the most extreme example of a protest or a faculty member is that you see on the news, rather than that being an extreme outlier and that being the reason it's newsworthy.

So, I think if people in the leadership of our government would take a look at what is actually happening on college campuses, the actual knowledge and learning that students are getting, the actual conversations that are happening, the actual teaching that is happening and leadership from university leaders, I think they would have a very different picture of what's going on. And that's really what I would encourage them to do, is just to see higher education as a partner in trying to solve the challenges that we have, and also as an entity that can be effective and helpful at reaching out and doing the work that higher education is best at.

Michelle Deutchman:

So, I think this is a perfect segue to something else I want to bring up. And I just want to remind our listeners that AAC&U is an organization that represents thousands of colleges and universities across the country. And I know in the past months that many have been watching as individual universities, Columbia, Harvard, have responded to specific threats to their federal funding. But it really wasn't until yesterday, which was April 23rd, that the higher ed sector really spoke collectively through a letter that was authored by AAC&U, and then signed last time I checked by 250 college and university presidents, about the need for constructive engagement regarding education reform. So, I have a couple of questions. So, I think my first question is why do you think, and obviously I know you don't have the answer, it took the sector so long to speak with one voice, is my first question and then we'll go into the actual content of the letter.

Jeremy Young:

I think there was a lot of hope that it would be possible for leaders in the sector to reach out to and work constructively with members of the new administration. I mean, we really are not as a sector the kind of one note liberal echo chamber that people think we are. There are institutions of all types, many of which

have strong relationships in a bipartisan fashion, in Congress with lawmakers at the federal and state levels. And I think there was some hope that there'd be some ability to engage in work productively with the administration. I think there was also some fear at the possibility that students, particularly international students would be targeted on campus. The possibility that particular institutions would be singled out for funding cuts.

What has happened over the past few months is that all of those hopes of constructive engagement have been frustrated. And all of the fears about the administration punishing institutions have been realized. And so, I think for many institutions there is no downside in calling for a reset. And constructive engagement is what the statement calls for. And it calls for that, because that is manifestly not happening. And I think there's no point in pretending that it is or hoping that it will in the future without some kind of a reset.

Michelle Deutchman:

Well, that's one of the things that I thought was interesting about this letter, was that its call was not just stop doing what you're doing and the way you're doing it. It was both that and we know that there are things that need to be fixed in higher education. And I really felt like the folks that wrote and signed that letter were taking more of a high road to say, "Okay, we're willing to come to the table and admit that we have places we can improve." And I thought that was a big step. I don't know. Do you think it's going to be met with something different than the levers and coercion that have been used previously?

Jeremy Young:

I think that hope springs eternal. But in reality, I think the most important purpose of this letter and value of this letter is being a rallying cry for the sector to come together around in a way that it may not have come together in the past, or may have generally find challenging to come together in the future. I think that everyone can agree that having the goal of having a better relationship with the administration is a good thing. Will benefit students, will benefit institutions, will benefit the sector, and the value that that sector brings to our society. So, really, I think the value here is just in demonstrating that there is somebody on the other side of that table. It's not simply individual institutions being singled out or punishment with their peers standing silent. But that instead, this is the sector that is going to speak, as the statement says, with one voice, in favor of trying to come to the table and calling out, I think, the lack of a negotiating partner that we've had so far.

Michelle Deutchman:

I don't want you to give away any strategy points, but I am interested from your perspective, what you think collective action or speaking with one voice might look like moving forward, especially as different universities potentially come to the negotiation table. And there's ways to put wedges in between people. So, I don't know if you have thoughts about how to continue, people can continue to pull on that thread of collective action.

Jeremy Young:

It's an interesting question because this is an incredibly decentralized sector, which is the reason both for its incredible variety and success. There isn't a higher education institution out there for everyone. No matter what your interests are, no matter what your focus is, where you live, what kind of tuition you're able to pay, there is something out there for you. But it also means that it's very difficult for the sector to avoid those wedges being put in place. And really, I think that is the key to maintaining the sense of unity that you see in the statement, is that an attack on Harvard is an attack on every community college. And an attack on a community college is an attack on every Ivy League institution. I mean, this is one sector.

We do one thing, which is we enrich minds, we promote the values of a liberal education, and we benefit students, society, and our communities. And that is the business that we are in. And we need to understand that every institution in this sector is in that business, and they need to be protected, and they need to be protected by each other, if not by anyone else. So, I think maintaining that ethos of solidarity is really what's going to make a difference going forward.

Michelle Deutchman:

And I think it's especially critical that you mentioned not only elite universities, because I do think that sometimes with the coverage we can get to media, and social media, and coverage of that story about higher education. It might appear to someone who isn't in the sector that everything that happens is happening at a very few handful of universities, when in fact there's hundreds, thousands of universities that are serving students all around the country and that they are threatened as well, community colleges, regionals, state publics, privates, et cetera.

I'm thinking about putting together your experience in responding on the state level, what's happening now. And I mean, it's recent history, but are there any lessons or takeaways you think from what happened on the state level, even though that was legislative, and I understand this is more executive in the way that it's being applied, that we might learn from that iteration of threats to academic freedom and autonomy?

Jeremy Young:

I think the most effective response to what happened at the state level came when everyone was pulling in the same direction. The grassroots organizers, community leaders, faculty, students, staff, and the leadership of universities, as well as community organizations that might not even have a connection with higher ed formally, all working together in their separate spheres and coordinating to make sure that messages are being heard, and people are speaking in the right places at the right times, and the value of higher education is really being promoted. And we saw that in some places and we didn't see it in other places. And it really made a difference in terms of what the outcome was.

And I think that we're seeing the same thing now. I think there are people who hope that it's not as bad as it actually is, and there are people who want to see things go further than what this statement was willing to do. And I think the most important thing is that we all recognize that everyone has a lane and everyone's doing different work, but all for the same goal of preserving the flourishing of liberal education in the sector. And so, I think as long as people are working together, as long as they're communicating, they don't all have to have the same message. They don't all have to be doing the same thing, but there is a real need to put up at least a coordinated front, if not a unified front.

Michelle Deutchman:

Okay. I like that, the coordinated front. And so much has to do with communication. And I feel like it's hard to get through conversations about the moment today without mentioning social media and online platforms as a way to communicate. And I just wonder if you have any thoughts about whether or not higher ed should be using this tool more potentially as it coordinates and so forth, or whether we're better to maybe use other kinds of tools to bring people together.

Jeremy Young:

I think social media can be very productive, but I'm not sure anyone is taking their advocacy or activism cues from the Twitter feed of their alma mater. I think it may be the other way round, actually, that people who are working on the ground, students for instance who want to stand up for higher education, can be particularly effective at using social media, including of the venues like TikTok, that big institutions are

not good at yet for the most part. I think that whether or not it makes sense for a university to use those tools, it really depends on the particular context of the university.

Michelle Deutchman:

Yeah. I mean, I don't know how to use TikTok.

Jeremy Young:

Neither do I.

Michelle Deutchman:

One of the reasons I like you, right?

Jeremy Young:

Exactly.

Michelle Deutchman:

So, I do want to talk a little bit about what I think we refer to as the chilling effect, that there's plenty of things that are actually happening, but just the fear of something happening I think is leading many people in many different types of universities to, one might call it preemptive compliance. Just the idea that someone might be coming through and looking at syllabi or firing a lot of people, or dismantling departments, has such a huge chilling effect on both what happens inside the classroom and outside the classroom. And I'm wondering how we might encourage folks across the sector not to preemptively comply. Or what thoughts? I think it's a hard question. And I'm struggling with it, because it's also a time of great risk. And I think people need to be transparent with students and others about what the risks are. And so, I guess, I'm asking, how do we balance those two things?

Jeremy Young:

I think it's a tough balance for sure. But one of the things that really stands out to me in the wake of this statement, the unified action on the part of institutions, is that the more institutions can be on the same page about compliance within the context of what is possible. Given that different institutions are very different, and have faced different pressures both from the federal government, and from other entities. Within the context of what is possible, the more that institutions can be on the same page, can be working together and drawing strength from one another, in pushing back against unreasonable restrictions on their autonomy, the more effective it's going to be. And I think that that is true at the very granular level of an individual institution.

It's a lot easier for a president to convince their board that it makes sense to take a certain action if they can see and point to other institutions taking the same action, either collectively or in their individual capacity. So, I think being able to work together or adopt similar approaches to responding to these restrictions is important. I also think that institutions need to understand. And many of them do understand that many of the restrictions that are put into place are immediately walked back or stayed by a court within a matter of days, that there is no certainty that those restrictions will be reimplemented or reimposed during the current administration. A full court examination of some of these restrictions could take longer than the next four years or the next two years. And that complying with something that it's not clear is going to be enforced, is not necessarily a productive avenue.

Michelle Deutchman:

That's such an important point. I had a mentor or have a mentor who taught me this phrase that the law is a very blunt instrument. And I think this is one of the moments where we see that, that that lag time, even when it's going quickly, you can't stop the damage that's done during that lag time. And sometimes that lag time, like you said, can be months or years. And that is something that is endemic to the system and I don't know that it will change. And so, you're right, we got to work in the gap that's left there. Before I get to our last question about what people can be doing, I want to ask you.. I'm sure there's many things that are keeping you up at night, as with many of us. But is there anything that you have been thinking about, whether it's at night or during the day, that you feel like people maybe are not paying enough attention to, that you would like to share with the listeners? And it can be more than one thing.

Jeremy Young:

I mean, I think that people are not paying enough attention to the effect that these restrictions are having on schools that aren't the 30 most elite and most famous institutions in the country. I think you really hit the nail on the head there. The vast majority of schools in this country are public institutions. Two-year colleges enroll more than half of all students in the country. Technical colleges enroll a number of students. Regional publics enroll more students than flagships. There are a ton of tiny religious colleges, tiny secular colleges. I mean, all these institutions are affected in different ways by these restrictions. And sometimes you see restrictions that are aimed specifically at something that somebody read about an Ivy League school. And they aren't falling on that school. They are falling on the regional publics within the state that is able to pass them. And so, that's where the real impact is happening.

There is a problem in higher education where people like their hometown institution and don't like the sector, or whatever their nebulous understanding of higher education means. And they need to think about when they consider the impact that a restriction on an institution has, they need to think about what would happen if that happened to my alma mater. What would happen if that happened to the school that I want my kids to go to, or the school that is in my hometown, five minutes from my house that employs some of my friends? What would happen to that institution? And how would I feel about that? I think if we can personalize this and really help people understand the impact that it could have on their communities, I think that's really going to make a difference.

Michelle Deutchman:

Okay. Thank you. Yeah. Now, think of it as your town, your life, your school. I guess, I'm not sure that I'm going to end on this, but let's go there, which is something we always ask all of our guests, which is a lot of people are working in higher education. I know they're eager to think about concrete things they can be doing to really ensure the wellbeing and longevity of their institutions. And I'm wondering if there are things that you might share with them, because I think it can feel very overwhelming to feel like you're dropping a stone in a huge sea makes a difference.

Jeremy Young:

I think that one of the challenges we face as a sector is that higher education, because it's so decentralized, institutions are optimized to advocate for themselves and to promote themselves in the public consciousness, but not to promote higher education as a whole. And that I think is where we have to get to, to understand that higher education is a system and that attacks on part of it attack all of it. And we need to spend some of our time as individual institutions advocating for the entire system and not just for our own institution. And part of the way that we do that is that we tell the story of why higher education matters. We talk about what the mission is of these institutions. There is so much nonsense flying around right now about what higher education is and does. And we have to just shut all of that out and tell the story of what is actually happening in our institutions.

Tell the story of how students are benefiting, communities are benefiting, knowledge is benefiting, employers are benefiting, global interconnectivity is benefiting, all of the things that these institutions do. The reason we get up and go to work in the first place, because we value what our institution does and what the sector does. We have to tell that story to people who aren't directly involved in higher education. We have to make that case to them. Why does this industry matter? Why is this a uniquely valuable component of American society? I think if we can do that, then I think we can start to turn the tide that we see in public polling about higher education, and that we see in legislation and executive orders.

And we can hopefully return to a time, and this was a real time, when higher education was broadly popular across the partisan divide, when there was a sense that even if higher education institutions didn't always do what we wanted them to do, that they were a net value and that they were a site of contestation, where we could fight for the sector to be better without trying to tear it down. I think if we can get back to that point, then I think we're in good shape.

Michelle Deutchman:

Well, that's certainly a goal that I would be happy to subscribe to. And I like that it's something that everybody can do. Everybody who had an experience, either in higher ed or working in higher ed, has some story to tell. And so, even if it's after you listen to this episode, spending five minutes and writing down one thing that was impactful in your life that happened in your higher ed experience, to put that nugget down and then be able to use it, like you're saying, at the dinner table, at your community meeting, talking with friends. And that's the way that we either change hearts and minds or bring them back into believing in and having confidence in the benefit of higher ed for democracy and for society. It's so kind of you, especially starting a new job, to spend some time us. Is there anything else that you want to add before we wrap up?

Jeremy Young:

I don't think so. I'm just really glad for the chance to be here. And looking forward to talking with you more in the future.

Michelle Deutchman:

Okay. We will have you back. Listen, thanks so much, Jeremy.

Jeremy Young:

Thank you.

Michelle Deutchman:

That's a wrap. A huge thank you to Jeremy Young for sharing his insights and time with us. It's been a truly valuable conversation. And thank you all for tuning in. Be sure to join us next month for our conversation with Jean-Claude Brizard from Digital Promise. We'll dive into the intersections of technology, speech, and education, and explore a more optimistic perspective on the role of social media. Talk to you next time.