



**SPEECH LIMITS IN PUBLIC LIFE:  
AT THE INTERSECTION OF FREE SPEECH AND HATE**

**SPONSORED BY** The Institute for Humane Studies at George Mason University and the University of Delaware's Office of the President, Office of the Provost, Office of the Vice Provost for Diversity, the Class of '55 Ethics Endowment Fund, College of Arts & Sciences Dean's Office, and the Department of Communications.

**CO-SPONSORED BY** Heterodox Academy and the University of Delaware's Center for Political Communication

**SESSION 5:** Non-legal responses to hate speech on college & university campuses

**PANELISTS** Alex Amend, independent researcher on the far-right and former research director at the Southern Poverty Law Center's Intelligence Project

Deb Mashek, Heterodox Academy Executive Director

Glyn Hughes, University of Richmond, Director of Common Ground

Trisha Prabhu, 18-year-old innovator, social entrepreneur, a global advocate, and innovator of the patented ReThink technology, an effective way to detect and stop online hate. She has spoken at various global platforms, universities, schools, and communities in more than 30 cities across five continents to raise awareness about the scourge of cyber bullying. She is currently pursuing her undergraduate education at Harvard College.

Transcript of Event

Date: March 15, 2019

Place: Embassy Suites, Newark, Delaware



UNIDENTIFIED: Please and thank you.

[Background noise.]

MS. BELMAS: Thank you. Thank you for returning after our break. It's tough to follow that act but we're going to do our best here aren't we? All right. Um, I'm Genelle Belmas from the University of Kansas and I'm here to, ah, introduce our esteemed panel for this afternoon on non-legal responses to campus hate. Ah, to my far left Alex Amend is an independent researcher and writer on far-right extremism. Previously he served as the research director of the Intelligence Project at the Southern Poverty Law Center where he led efforts to track and study domestic extremists' movements on the ground and online. He is the author of reports including *The Alt Right is Killing People*, *Analyzing a Terrorist Social Media Manifesto*, the Pittsburgh synagogue shooter's posts on Gab, and *From Eugenics to Voter ID Laws: Thomas Farr's Connections to the Pioneer Fund*. Glyn Hughes, immediately to, well, to my, third to my left, I don't know – there's a word for that probably – is a sociologist and community organizer working as an administrator at the University of Richmond. Glyn is the founding director of UR's Common Ground initiative focusing on diversity, justice and community. Glyn works at the intersection of academic inquiry, administration and student development integrated by a justice centered approach to institutional and social change. Glyn's scholarly interests include racial justice, sexuality and gender, and organizational change. For the past three years Glyn has taught a course called *The System – behave yourself, computer – System as part of* – I really wish I had a tablet right now – as part of the university's sophomore scholars and Residence program. A class I would very much like to take. Debra Mashek is the first



Executive Director at Heterodox Academy, a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization that partners with professors, administrators and others to create an academy eager to welcome people who approach problems and questions from different points of view. Deb has spent over two decades studying how people form relationships with each other. Her academic background includes a PhD in social and health psychology in quantitative methods from Stony Brook University, over 30 published academic articles and 13 years a professor at Harvey Mudd College where she won multiple awards for her teaching. Joining Heterodox Academy in early 2018, Deb describes herself as a Heterodox enthusiast who values, seeks out, and creates open inquiry, viewpoint diversity, and constructive disagreement both professionally and personally. And we are moving Trisha from the last panel. Trisha Prabhu is an 18-year-old innovator, social entrepreneur, a global advocate, an innovator of the patented rethink technology, an effective way to detect and stop online hate. She has spoken at various global platform, at various global platforms, universities, schools, and communities in more than 30 cities across five continents in three different languages to raise, raise awareness about the scourge of cyber bullying and engage adolescents to spread positivity and tolerance around the world. She has also used these platforms to advocate for the power of STEM education especially for young women. She is currently pursuing her undergraduate education at Harvard College in Cambridge, Massachusetts. I'd like to welcome our panelists and we will start [indiscernible].

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

MR. AMEND: Let's see if I can get this. Good afternoon, everybody.



Um, thank you University of Delaware, thank you Jenny for having me and this is my second time here actually and meeting with the students and the faculty is always a pleasure, um, and I've only had wonderful hospitality since, since coming onboard. Um, I'm going to talk you guys about, ah, a new generation of white supremacy. Ah, what I want folks to take away from this – administrators, um, and other specialists – is that, ah, students aren't imagining things. Um, that there is a new, ah, and unprecedented, um, attempt, ah, to infiltrate, um, university spaces and recruit, um, on universities, ah, mostly white men into the ranks of a new generation of white supremacists organizing. Folks, you know who this is? This is David Duke, ah, on the University or the Louisiana State University campus in the late 1960s. He made his debut in the free speech alley there at LSU. It still exists but it is a public forum where people can basically get on a soap box and speak whatever is on their mind. Um, I show this just to say that, you know, this is not obviously a new issue but also that far right extremists, um, are well adept at marshaling free speech arguments in order to get their more hateful messages across. So, this is from the SPLC where I used to work. Ah, the most recent numbers – every year the SPLC puts out a census of active hate groups. Um, last year was the highest year ever that we counted. And this, this represents any groups that were active for any part of 2018. And so, there was a jump, there – basically you can see a, a decline towards the end of the Obama years and then a steady rise, um, which we've written a lot about in the broader context of the Trump phenomenon. Um, a lot of, um, basically his appeal to, ah, white fragility, um, as, and, and his victory and, um, really, ah, set, set the white supremacists alight. Um, this is a horrible graphic. I am not



a graphic designer, but what I want to point out here is that in three categories of the SPLC's hate census white nationalists, neo- Nazi and general hate, um, most, 60 percent of white nationalists – these are the, this is the highlighted, ah, rows – 60 percent of the neo-Nazi category and 63 percent of general hate, ah, category are from groups that were established in, ah, since 2015. So, we've basically seen a replacement, ha, of the old, older guard of white supremacists organizing with new blood. And, it has come with attendant violent consequences. This is from a report, ah, that was published a year ago, um, looking at murderers, ah, who have been influenced or left trails of, ah, interaction with ideas or, um, venues that are common to the Alt-Right. Um, and we're starting back, ah, with Elliot Rodger in 2014 who killed seven, ah, on the campus of UC Santa Barbara where my brother went to school. There was also, ah Christopher Sean, Chris Harper-Mercer at, um, ah, Roseburg Community College in Portland or outside Portland, um, and then there's Sean Urbanski who stabbed a young African American, ah, lieutenant going into, um, the academy on, on the campus of the University of Maryland. And so, we all kind of average the age here, these are younger white men, um, who left trails of interacting with, um, ideas and venues of the Alt-Right. And of course, that has only continued in 2018. Um, the ADL also more broadly outside of just specifically the Alt-Right found in 2018 every single, ah, extremist murderer came from the, the radical right wing. Um, and looking back, ah, there was plenty of violence around, um, campus appearances by, ah, Alt-Right figures. Um, Richard Spencer at the University of Florida. Some of his people that were on his security detail later that evening and after the event were riding around with a loaded weapon and encountered some



counter protestors who were at the event earlier and shot, ah, fired shots at, ah, at the protestors. Um, even before that, and this was before the election I believe in 2016, or maybe it was after. I guess it was early, early 2017. The Milo Yiannopoulos who has been mentioned several times, you know, was a very hot commodity, um, was defended by lots of people who should know better, um, at, at very prominently institutions like the American Enterprise Institute, um, and other places, ah, was a major popular riser of Alt-right ideas. And also brought plenty of violence and violent fans to his events and at the University of Washington, um, one of his fans and his wife actually, um, brought a weapon and were talking about, ah, violently, ah, counteracting the counter protestors and shot one man through the stomach. He had stitches. They had to open up his whole chest cavity in order to, ah, saved at the hospital. Um, back to my original point about white supremacists organizing and targeting campuses – again, this is from ADL; the SPLC also tracks this and corroborates this, this type of data – um, that campus flyering is a major tool for, ah, these younger white supremacist organizations. Um, ADL actually interestingly finds in 2018 there was a lot more off campus flyering and flyer drops. Um, but on campus too rose slightly from the year before. And really, we saw all of that kind of take off at the beginning of 2016. There's an infamous, um, hacker named Weev who is, ah, the main brains, ah, technical brains behind one of the biggest neo-Nazi websites, ah, in the world called the Daily Stormer. Um, but he had hacked into open printers on university campuses and just printed thousands of flyers, ah, Daily Stormer flyers with swastikas and so on. And that was in early 2016 and through that and especially right after the election we saw a huge bump, um, in, in flyering on



campuses. One of the most prolific organizations and really representative of this new generation of white supremacists organizing is this group called Identity Evropa. Um, they did just the other week, um, rebrand themselves to be called the American Identity Movement. Um, that's, we're talking about white identity obviously. Um, this group, ah, actually came out of another group that was active before kind of the real rise of the Alt-Right called Youth for Western Civilization. They had a number of chapters on universities across the country. A lot of people in that organization have since gone on into conservative media and elsewhere. Um, but Identity Evropa was founded in the height of, um, the rise of the Alt-Right in the last three years and they've been prolific flyers, ah, they've organized events on campus and they're very deceptive because they are, they're not wearing boots and swastikas but they are very clean-cut young men, um, who make, ah, a persuasive appeals to other young white men about taking care of their health, about being proud of this idea of western civilization that is their inheritance, their heritage, um, and ah, they were responsible for the, the majority of campus flyering. Um, they rebranded quickly. Um, the leader said that it was long in the works, but it actually came out right after a hack, a leak of their slack discussions. Slack being a, you know, productivity, productivity tool, a group chat space, um, again like Facebook, like any other technology that anybody else is, uses for normal reasons, white supremacists have been very adept at using for their own. Um, but these chats came out and this was in a Daily Beast report, um, I think this is five examples of them talking about their very deliberate strategy to infiltrate college republicans, um, and their success doing that. One of their main spokespeople is a, a, a young man named James Allsup, um, who



similarly came from college republicans and college republican organizing on the campus of the University of Washington, I believe. So, I want to stand up for students as best as I can and say that, um, I believe in large part there is, ah, an element of moral panic around the debate of campus free speech and that student, that young people no longer care about the principles of free speech. I really, really appreciated this morning the comments from Rodney Smolla. Um, you know, the contact theory discussion that we were talking about in terms of like needing, ah, having white supremacists' people actually need people who they hate and then seeing that kind of hatred dissolve. His, his, a, analogy of that or at least talking to his college age kids and understanding that they actually care about free speech just in a different way, I think that that is absolutely right. Um, and so I think – I, I stole this from, ah, a New Yorker writer on Twitter but, um, you know, this is from the Atlantic, the Atlantic has given exceptional, ah, ink space for, you know, this, this obsession about campus free speech being under threat and by disempowered young people who are taking on incredible amounts of debt in order to start out their lives hopefully ah in the direction that they want. Um, and, here is John McWhorter, a very, ah, popular, ah, intellectual arguing that the virtual, virtue signalers won't change the world and how are all these strategies that young activists are, are taking on that are so grating to this, um, older generation it's, its just not going to be effective but there is a lot of evidence in polling, ah, this is Pew Research, about shifting racial attitudes in a direction towards recognizing, ah, that there is still racial justice, ah, riven throughout our country. Um, I wanted to pull this out too. It's just on the same point that this is Reason Magazine. They also have a, ah, full time campus free speech, um,

you know, reporter. Ah, and I think this is his argument actually in showing that this generation is less tolerant than generations before where he says young people went from once being the age group most tolerant of racist speech to the age group least tolerant. I read that as progress not, ah, kind of backtracking. Um, and then of course where is this moral panic really led us to but very powerful organizations and people making these types of arguments which are truly threatening to free speech; that the government should step in and hold over funds for the education of, ah, American college students, um, based on a rubric of their, ah, interpretation of free speech. And of course, let's trust, ah, this person to do that. To conclude, um, this is a photo of a nine-year-old Derrick Black and folks who got to hear Christian Picciolini talk last night about being a 14-year-old recruited into the movement, Derrick Black, his father, ah, was, is name, his father's name is Don Black. Um, a highly influential former Klansman and neo-Nazi who, um, created the website Storm Fronts, one of the oldest and largest white supremacist forums on the web. Um, his father remarried a, a, David Duke's first wife. Anyway, and he was born into the movement. He was movement royalty. He was trained, he had a radio station, he was highly effective, he was the future of the movement. And this was before the dawn of the Alt-Right. However, what made him see the light and change his ways and leave this, this type of hate was coming to a university like this and meeting all the great diversity of students, ah, who attended. And he met orthodox; an orthodox Jew invited him for, for regular dinners; he met black people and talked to black people for the first time and he is now, he has been interviewed all over the place but is a very, very effective communicator in talking about the appeals of white



nationalism and white supremacy and how to counteract it. But, I, I think this is a great story again of showing the, the real value of liberal education, of, of, of valuing diversity, um, and creating spaces like this especially for young people to get together and, and learn. So, thank you for coming. Thank you.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

MR. HUGHES: Oops. Thanks Alex. Um, so I don't, I don't have a PowerPoint presentation so I'm going to opt to stay seated and be conversational with you. Um, again, I'm Glyn Hughes from the University of Richmond and I, like others I want to just start by expressing gratitude for, um, being invited to participate in this discussion. Um, and, and I have learned a great deal so far from the folks who've been speaking up here, in formal conversations that I've had. Um, I mentioned to Emma earlier and I'm thinking out about Alex now, like, I have, I was very confident about what I wanted to say on my train ride up here from Richmond but since I've been here that has all kind of, you know, shifted –

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MR. HUGHES: – and now I'm not, I, I really, I don't have a clear sense. I don't have as much confidence, um, about that in a good way. And I'm going to be thinking about the ideas and stuff that I've heard for a good while. So, I'm going to make an attempt to cut through all that confusion and still, um, give you something. Um, so my topic related to these non-legal, um, campus responses, um, I'm, I'm going to focus on, um, bias responses on campus. So bias internet responses, um, I, ah, I created and pulled, you know, pulled together and have led our campus bias resource team for about a dozen years. Um, and, but I'm but I'm going to contextualize that a little bit to also try

to make a larger point about the way that I see, ah, this discussion playing out. Um, and, in particular, um, what's happening to the concepts of whiteness and white supremacy as we talk about it in certain ways. Um, so, um, in terms of bias incidents and also the, the framing that we have here for the conference of, um, pairing the, the urgency of free speech and the, and the urgency and crises of hate speech. I mean, these, these topics and the weight and the tensions that they're bringing to campuses in particular do warrant a kind of urgent attention. Um, and I, I completely agree with that but, um, but we, I want us to think about the ways that crises work, to focus our attention in certain ways and maybe distract us from other kinds of things. So, I'm borrowing from a French theorist to make this point. I'd be happy to tell you more about who these people are if you want. But, um, there's an idea, ah, that, um, crises conceal the crisis-like nature of every day life. So, the example I'm thinking of is Watergate and that this person talks about and it's like, oh, but the crisis of Watergate, right, was that politicians were sneaky and doing backdoor stuff as if that's not the norm of politics. Do you see what I'm saying? So, the crisis conceals the normality of the crisis in many ways. Um, you know this is, you know, ah, just to take another example. Malcolm X famously said to somebody who, I was asking him a question he said, you know, ah, you know when I was in prison and Malcolm X interrupted him and said you're still in prison.

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MR. HUGHES: Right? To sort of make the point, right, that prisons work that way too. To conceal the ways that everyday life is prison-like for some of us. For some folks. Um, so, I'm, I'm thinking about that way, um, um and I've



done some, some writing and thinking about this, um, in terms of bias incidents. And so, I'll get to this. Um, bias incidents are certainly crises that warrant urgent attention. Right? So, I'm not denying that. But I'm trying to make a different point about how we respond to them. Um, so, one of the ways that bias incidents can work on a campus, um, is as an opportunity for the institution to perform it, to do a performance of being on the right side of say racism. Right? So, incident happens. University has a high profile kind of response to it, maybe something comes from the president about this is not and, and all of that may well be warranted, right, but it can also set up a dynamic where the institutional response to the crisis takes attention away from the, say the normal everyday experiences of say people of color on a traditionally white campus like mine. Um, does that, are, are you, you all following me? I'm really doing that teacher thing where I'm kind of counting on, you know, the, some nods and stuff if you're following.

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MR. HUGHES: Um, um, and in the process too it sets up certain administrative disciplines or fields as being kind of the expert responders. Right? So, you get a, you can get a, usually you kind of get the law enforcement folks, maybe the general counsel or the lawyer, you'll also get the branding folks in the room, um, and, and what institutions don't have typically is a kind of, um, way of centering in a really robust way something like community caretaking as a priority. Right? So, not just how do we respond to this incident but what does, what, how is this incident symptomatic of something that we ought to be paying larger attention to and how are we implicated in that? Right? Um, and, this is a; in, in my view especially in terms

of race, that's a kind of typical kind of whiteness kind of thing. Um, I think about my own, my own life and kind of trying to come to consciousness around these issues and I remember say my feminist friends and my friends of color when I was like a 20-something white guy who were calling me on my stuff and my response was like okay fine, can you just tell me what it is I'm supposed to say because I don't want to be racist. I mean I'm not racist. I mean I don't want to be racist so I'm just, so tell me what to say.

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MR. HUGHES: So, and I'll say it and then you can, and then I'd like you to leave me alone because I've figured out how to say it so now, I'm not racist. Right? I; now you know I'm not racist. Right? Because I'm saying the right thing. I'm saying what you asked of me. And that's; and so, there's a way of responding to sort of manage it, right, so that you protect and insulate the self against those critiques but performing correctly. And that's very different than, and, and you get that I'm moving through the metaphor of my self and the institution, right? So, that of showing up and responding and saying, you know what, this, this thing that you're calling me on or this thing that happened, this is a provocation for me to, like, ask questions about who am I. I don't even know who I am. How did I come to even, like, think that I was a person or a place that where this wouldn't happen or where this wasn't, wasn't an issue? How did that come to be? Um, and, um, that kind of vulnerability and listening I think is a better institutional mode. But it's one that most institutions do not have the capacity to do. Um, I am; to just extend this, and I know I'm probably getting close to my time or I'm at risk of getting close to my time, um, I was thinking about the way that we've at this conference been talking about the



concept of white supremacy. Um, and, I'm at the University of Richmond which is just down the road from Charlottesville which has been a place that's been invoked numerous times, um, over the last day and a half, um, and when our campus was, um, responding to that – I was, I'm part of the, I was part of the team of folks that was getting together and thinking about what do we do, right? This, you know, ah, um, how do we talk to families and students who are coming onto our campus at such a, a geographic and temporally proximate, um, time to when it happened at Charlottesville and we were thinking about that and it occurred to me that a similar thing was happening. White supremacy was something that was embodied by the people who were showing up in Charlottesville and limited to them. They were not only embodiments of it and, and warranting a real like it's a crisis that warrants a kind of response but white supremacy it occurred to me goes much beyond that, and includes a lot of the normative assumptions of how do we even, how do we plan for a crisis. How do we decide who's coming to the meeting? Um, how, what's the normality of our operations that is also a kind of white supremacy? And I was thinking we have got to, there's a way in which you've got to reframe this so that the kind of urgency and, and fretting that I saw my white colleagues having when there were folks with, um, silly tiki torches down the road that we ought to bring that same kind of urgency and self-inquiry to ourselves about any, any kinds of, um, rationales in our institution to not hear the voices of those who we've historically excluded, to critique ourselves, um, to stand in the way of, um, a, a critique of how we operate normally. Um, and then of course, this is a very white guy thing I've thought for a while, like, yes, we've got to do that and of course somebody has written about that. And so, I



want to pass on to you a really good, um, resource that you can just search for online. It's called White Supremacy Culture and the author is Tema Okun, I think that's how you pronounce their name. T E M A O K U N. And, it goes through this great list of sort of normal organizational and I, normal is in quotes there. Right? Sort of normal is, I'm saying is re-inscribes the norm of whiteness and white supremacy in our organizations, um, through these very mundane practices. Um, I'll just conclude by saying I think we have to ask and I hope I can come back to this in the, in the discussion later, of how the very framing of free speech and hate speech is also concealing a number of forces, um, at work that we ought to be bringing attention to as well. Thanks.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

MS. MASHEK: Okay. So, I know we are here to talk about hate speech but I'm going to offer a bit of an inversion in part because it's not totally clear to me where the lines are for what counts as hate speech, um, versus not. So, I want to talk about speech we hate so I'm going to flip that a little bit, um, and we might hate it because it's bigoted which we've heard a lot about with, you know, white supremacists' movements and what not. Um, we might hate it because it's at odd with the core belief we hold. So, for instance, if you think about notions of justice. Um, you think about what someone who is very pro choice might view as justice is very different from what someone who might be prolife uses justice. So, when people speak and have speech in a way that's at odds with our core beliefs, um, we can really hate that, and it might be because what someone is saying is just plain wrong and I can hate that. And it could also be because its coming from the mouth or the pen of someone who's in a, a tribe that we oppose. So, Jenny mentioned the New York Times



article that came out a couple of days ago that's referencing a, a published piece of research from January that 42 percent of democrats and 42 percent of republicans, um, say that people on the other side are downright evil. If you did a little bit deeper in that same article it also talks about roughly 16, 18 percent depending on if you're asking the republicans or the democrats say the world would be better off if a large, um, a large group of those others would just die. So, it could be, you know, I might hate you if you or what you're saying and if you're, if you're just from this other tribe so I don't know where, whoa, my notes just went off. I don't know where the line is necessarily but so I want to talk about our responses when we come up to that line in our daily lives and to think through what concrete options do we have in those moments as individuals. Um, so two nights ago I had the opportunity to interview Arthur Brooks, president of the American Enterprise Institute about his new book titled *Blog Your Enemies: How Decent People Can Save America From the Culture of Contempt*. And then last night like many of you I sat in the audience absolutely riveted when Christian Piccolini talked about his path into and out of the white supremacist movement. And to me the message shared; the overlap is tremendous across these two texts, um, by both speakers is that we need to take the time to see and to know the humanities of other, the humanity of others even those you hate. Um, so I'm, as Genelle mentioned I'm the executive director of a non-partisan non-profit organization called Heterodox Academy and we work to create college classrooms and campuses that welcome diverse people with diverse viewpoints and that equipped learners look at habits of heart and mind to engage that diversity in open inquiry and constructive disagreement. And so, I want to reflect a little bit on what I mean



when I say the habits of heart and mind. And there are, there are at least three. First of all is intellectual humility. So, I've spent the past 14 years at Harvey Mudd College out in Claremont, California and my students get a chuckle, um, when I, yeah, I play this hypothetical. I'm like what are the chances that I am up – so here I am, a 40-year-old cis-gender, bisexual white woman who spent her formative years in, growing up in a trailer park in Nebraska. What are the chances that I was uniquely ordained to be right about everything all the time? And of course, it's ridiculous. Of course, I wasn't. And I point out to them, and chances are you weren't either. And they nod. I mean, we, we all know that experience of, of being wrong or at least of discovering we're wrong. Um, Katherine Schultz talks about those as two very different psychological spaces. So, she says like when, when we, um, what, what is it f like being wrong, she says it feels exactly like being right up until the point that you discover that you are actually wrong. So that certitude –

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MS. MASHEK: – of, of holding a viewpoint is not really good information about how, how right we may or might or may not be. Um, and once we recognize the truth that there's really no way any of us could possibly know everything there is to know about the world it opens up the door for the second habit which is curiosity. Um, this notion that I genuinely want to know how do see it especially frankly for me if your ideas, if your intuitions, if your belief system is so anathema to, to the core of who I am and how I understand the world I'm kind of thinking in my head, what, tell me about that. I want to learn more. And not necessarily because I want to take on your belief system or your ideas, and not because I want to change your belief system or how you're

thinking about the world but because it's, it's new. It's a novel perspective to me. I want to lean in and understand. Um, I, I genuinely believe there is a chance not with all, like there's some of the, the topics that we've talked about over the past day or so where they feel really concretely wrong to me but on some of the open questions out there in the world, some of the ,the tricky twisty problems about social issues and I'm not sure I've got it right. And I think there's a chance you might have a part of the truth. And I believe that, um, if we can, whatever the object is of our inquiry, whatever we care enough about within our disciplines, within our classrooms that we're actually going to give it some air time. I believe we really have a commitment or a, a desire to actually understand and to know and I think the only way to do that is to be able to hold that object up, twist it and turn it and it's not that I'm just going to tolerate you that you look at something differently, it's not just that, blah, you know okay you, you see it different so I'll put up with you. It's that I'm excited to learn alongside you because you see it differently, because it's only through engaging with you and hearing your perspective that I'm actually going to get to see the nuances, the texture of that thing that I care enough about to understand deeply. Um, so that, that's my, my cheer leading for curiosity. And then the, the third one is that of empathy. Um, other people believe what they believe for a reason. Just like you believe. Just like I believe. What we believe for a reason. There's a pathway into knowledge and the, the whole idea behind like the feminist viewpoint of epistemology is that all knowledge is situated, all knowledge, or all knowers are situated knowers. And we, we came to our understanding of the world, ah, for, for some reason and so giving other people the space to share their path when we disagree with them, ah, is

important, um, and ultimately – so I’m a, a close relationships researcher by training so I study, you know, I taught a class on close relationships where it was like hooking up, breaking up and everything in between, um, and, and so this might just be totally self-serving but I believe all of this is ultimately relational. Um, and we have to have the courage, I think, to see others as fully human with hopes, with fears, with possibilities, with potential, um, at least on, on par with our own. And I think this is what Brooks and Picciolini both tap into, the notion that there is a shared humanity and it’s written on our hearts. Um, so now in terms of some concrete suggestions for non-legal responses to speech we hate on campus and drawing from these three ingredients of intellectual humility, and curiosity, and empathy. I’ll offer a couple ideas into the mix and I think you’ll experience these as very micro, um, interpersonal sorts of ideas. So, these are, I’m just going to put them out there. Um, I think it’s important for all of us to have a, a, and actually in my little notebook, um, I, I don’t know if I’ve written it on the, I didn’t write it on this one so now I feel like a total hack. Usually in my little notebook that I carry around all the time I, I write remember to ask how do you use it. So, I think we should all have the set of phrases that we can turn to in those moments where someone’s saying something that just is blowing my mind or is so counter to what my intuition is. So here are some of mine. Tell me more about that. I see it differently. How do you see it? I don’t know much about that topic; where do you recommend I start? These are two of my favorites: I don’t know; I’ve never thought about that. So, we were talking, u, um, earlier in one of the panels about the density of information that’s coming out there. Um, you know, that we’re all just digesting an incredible volume of information every day. Yeah, I’m baffled that



so many people in my world seem to have really strong opinions on a, on an incredible number of topics and I stand in awe because either they're absolutely brilliant and they're really able to read all of those things or perhaps they're making proxy decisions about, um , about what they believe perhaps relying on somebody else's intuition, some; and, and if we all believe that other people are actually digesting more information than we are and we just rely on them on the proxy then it's, it, um, it's a house of cards and, and it falls down. So, this idea that I want to be, um, I want to own my own knowledge and take responsibility for if I really don't know something to say it. And I say it a lot. I have a, when I, when I'm teaching in front of students, I make a commitment to every class at least once say the how do you see it and at least once say I have no idea. How would we, how would we find that out. Um, and then the second one is I changed my mind so, you know, asking yourself and, and Nadine you mentioned this earlier, this idea of what would it take for you to change your mind. If you think about your core most central beliefs what would you change? What would it take? Frankly a lot, for a lot of us they are so foundational they won't change and that, that's okay too but we have to own that as, it's a belief system as opposed to its necessarily, you know, always all about the facts. Um, I, this one is hard. This next piece of advice. This little tip for how to respond. Um, but when we feel that [indiscernible] swell up when someone has said something that I am ready to react to I can feel myself going into the fight or flight mode. Trying to move back into cognitive space and asking yourself the question I don't, and I'm not saying oh just go into reason and ignore empathy and emotion. I'm a very, um, emotional person. My, my poor staff, they, they laugh because I cry like every

day about something; like something makes me emote. Um, so its not that I'm anti-emotion. By no means am I that. But if we can pull ourselves into the cognitive space and convince or ask ourselves this: what do I stand to learn here? Maybe about the idea but some of the ideas are horrifying, I don't actually want to learn more about, you know, your hate for instance. But what can I learn about myself by observing my reactions here? What can I learn about another person's pathway or another person's experience by asking questions and by trying to be present with them in this moment? And I think for our students and for, actually for all of us – but I, you know, I have a hard time taking the professor hat off as well – um, thinking about what are our opportunities for practice, um, of these things. So, engaging with people who see their role differently whether its go to a meet up about a topic you know nothing about or that you care nothing about; visiting, visiting another place of worship or a congregation; going to an expo. Um, so, you know, for me I lived in Ontario, California for a lot of years and there was a, a gun expo down the road, um, from me that popped up like every quarter – it was at least every three months – and I kept telling myself I would go and I never got myself there. And to me that was a, a, a failure on my part to go engage across lines of difference. Um, so maybe you can do better than I did there. And, I think for our students making sure that when we're creating our courses giving us all a chance to play around and encounter difficult ideas in a space of trust, um, and in a space of goodwill and knowing that chances are we're going to probably make some mistakes and say the wrong word and that that doesn't mean people are necessarily bad people but that we're all on this path of learning and discovery. Um, I, so I think we need to really take on the



challenging ideas in class that way when somebody's hacking the printer system and all those flyers are, are coming out or when someone shows up on campus or when these external agitator groups approach our students and say you know what, you should totally invite me to campus, yeah, we're, we'll do like this co-sponsored event. And time after time I hear from the college presidents that yeah, the, the student group says yes, I'll, I'll, we'll co-sponsor this event, they get this, um, you know, they get the release to have access to the room and then the, the student group is absolutely cut out of the system. They have absolutely been used and as a, a motive, or a conduit of access to campus. But when those approaches happen, I think we, if we've practiced those habits of heart and mind in our classroom the students will be better able to respond to it and to see through the, um, the hateful rhetoric. Um, I'm going to skip – well actually I want to mention this. I'll mention this one. Um, the open mind platform. So, [openmindplatform.org](http://openmindplatform.org) is a free, um, hour and a half tutorial that takes you – um, and I've used it in my classrooms and anyone can use it; you can use it in your place of business, your place of worship, your; it, it's, its, its available; it's great – um, it's an hour and a half workshop that takes you through the moral psychology of why it's so dang hard to engage authentically and, and it, and being fully present with people who see the world differently than you do. And then it makes the case for why it's actually really important for us to be able to do so and offers concrete tools and practice for doing so. So, I'll give a shout out to [openmindplatform](http://openmindplatform.org) there. Um, and I, and I think this one's super important to me so I'm going to – how am I doing on time?

MS. BALMAS: Um, soon.



MS. MASHEK:       Soon, okay. Good.

AUDIENCE:         [Laughter.]

MS. MASHEK:       Okay. So, I've got two more points here. Um, knowing to, when you've reached your limit – I don't think any of us have a perpetual obligation to engage nonstop with people, um, who are saying things that we hate. And we do need to take care of ourselves. We need to oscillate, I believe, between leaning into the challenge of encountering the difficult ideas but also retreating, um, back to our, back to our comfort zones, back to our secure bases, our relationships, our people who ,who know us and embrace us unconditionally to ready ourselves again for that exploration. Um, those of you who know anything about attachment theory that might have just sounded really familiar. Um, and I, I, I really don't want to give the impression that I think any of this is easy. It's incredibly hard. Those of us who are on campus, which I gather is most of us in this room, the questions are tricky. I, I totally agree with Glyn; like I'm feeling, um, that that nice sense of unsettledness. Like, I'm seeing more questions and I love that that's popping up. So, I'm grateful to everybody in this room. Um, but our, our students, there, there's no doubt that they're going to carry with them the habits of heart and mind that they learn in our classrooms and on our campuses that they've practiced here out into "the real world" into their lives as parents, as policy makers, as teachers, as scientists, as business leaders. And I feel that we must enable them to practice those habits of heart and mind while they're with us, um, and to help – and it's not just about the student, I mean, I, I think of the students as like the, the most important piece of a, a campus but its true for all of us that we all need to practice this. Um, and I, I; they're going to be engaging; we're



all going to be engaging from here on out with people who see the world differently than we do and even people who say things we hate. So, I will leave it there other than to plug really quick that Heterodox Academy welcomes, um, applications for membership from professors, administrators, graduate students and I'll be out at the reception if anyone would like to hear more about that. Thank you.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

MS. PRABHU: Good afternoon. Ah, my name is Trisha Prabhu. I am 18 years old. Ah, I am an undergraduate at Harvard and I'm so excited to be able to be here today. Um, as was mentioned earlier, I wasn't supposed to on this panel. I was supposed to be on the next one looking at legal responses to, um, to this issue, or non-legal responses to this issue, um, from a more technical perspective, right? So, how can we use technology to tackle issues that a lot of us would agree technology itself has created. Um, but, I'm hoping that I can bring kind of a youth perspective, um, to a conversation that talks a lot about youth, um, and also, um, kind of maybe bridge, um, kind of a little bit of a gap between this panel and the next panel because a lot of the work that I do deals with, um, young teens and adolescents, um, individuals who are in college or heading into college, um, and yet I do a lot of work, um, in the tech space to try to tackle online hate. So, I'm going to start, um, just by kind of stating a fact which is that I am a member of the generation Z. And, what does that mean? Um, I was born, um, either at, the numbers are, people have different opinions of what it means to be in generation Z; what I last read was if you were born in 1997 or later – I was born in 2000. Um, so less than two decades ago. I mean what does that mean then for, you know, the world that I



grew up in? What are the implications of that fact? I've never known a world that doesn't have technology. Um, and I've certainly seen an evolution. I still remember when my dad had, like, the Verizon flip phones and a Blackberry and he, he sailed that ship until it sunk. Um –

AUDIENCE: [Laughter.]

MS. MASHEK: – but [chuckle]; but you know I've, I've, I've never known a world that didn't have technology. Um, I grew up in a world of laptops and computers. I honestly do not know how to use a paper dictionary. Um, and that means that my world has always been situated, um, in, in a technical context. Um, and so for a lot of people who talk about back in my day when there was some X, Y, and Z, for me its just there's always been Amazon, there's always been two-day delivery. And I don't really know a world that doesn't exist without technology. So, you know, for me, um, my world is everything we do, we say, we communicate is, you know, via a phone and for me that's completely normal. Um, but I think that also means that I, as a member of the generation Z I've been presented with a lot of unique challenges, um, in my life that come with having to grow up in a world where technology is so central to almost everything I do or say. Um, and I think that that isn't just something I experience, it's something that a lot of young people experience. I think one of the best examples of that, um, is the story of Rebecca Sedwick. She was an 11-year-old girl, um, from Florida who had been cyber bullied for over a year and a half after getting into a feud with a bunch of other women over a boy. Um, so the cyber bullying continued on and, and on and on. She tried to shutdown social media pages. She switched schools two or three times. Um, already at home, you know, it was, it was a

poor home situation, um, difficulties between parents, um, and, in a relatively low-income family. And one day on her way to school she decided she just couldn't take any of it anymore and she climbed to the top of her town's water tower and jumped off. And I remember when I first read that story because I was 13. I was just one year older than Rebecca. And I remember thinking how is this acceptable? How have we reached a place where the types of things that we say online are the types of things that push people to decide that they don't want to exist anymore. Right? It's a really scary reality but it's something that we often don't want to talk about because it's an uncomfortable place and because frankly it's a space that's dominated by a lot of teenagers and not by a lot of the adults and the experts that, you know, have the technology or the resources or the funding to tackle issues like this. For the most part teenagers don't talk about the fact that it's happening to them. It's an embarrassing situation and a lot of adults don't get involved. A lot of big social media's, you know, tech companies, don't want to admit that it, it's a problem. And so, it's one of those things that just gets swept under the rug, under the bed. We don't need to talk about it, it's not happening. But as someone who is a former cyber bullying victim and for a very long time wanted to forget me experiences like any other victim I know or have talked to, Rebecca's story completely changed my perspective because for the first time ever I realized just how lucky I was. Yes, I had been cyber-bullied for a long time. Yes, it had been one of the most terrible experiences in my lifetime. But I was so lucky because I'd had a family, I'd had a support system. I had opened up to counselors and to my parents. And, at some point the cyber bullying stopped and it became something that was in the past, not something



that was the present every day part of my life, 24/7. And from people I didn't know because that's another big part of technology is sometimes it's an anonymous user. You don't even know who's targeting or harassing you. And so, I looked at Rebecca's story and I said I can't be a bystander to this problem anymore. I need to be an upstander. So, I started to do some research. This is me as a teenager, kind of like, this is an issue I care about. I don't have anything to do after school today so I'm going to investigate a little. Um, and I remember thinking, okay, I have two fundamental questions. The first one is, why do teens cyber bully, why are teens posting these messages on social media, and if cyber bullying is as big of an issue as people say it is – and it is, almost 52 percent of adolescents in the United States alone have been cyber bullied. The three most common side effects is depression, low self-esteem, and anxiety. Um, and, it's pretty stunning to see the kinds of impacts this has on people's lives. Um, just normal bullying, not cyber bullying, can have scars that, research shows, lasts well into a person's 50s or 60s. So those are really impactful experiences that hurt people for, for years and years after the bullying or the cyber bullying stops. So, I thought, okay, if this is as significant of an issue as it seems what are the existing solutions to try to tackle a problem like this? So, go to my first question, why do teens cyber bully? Right, I might be biased but I don't think that teenagers are bad people. Um, I don't think that we are fundamentally, you know, because of technology we just fundamentally don't understand empathy. People like to make that argument. People, you know, teenagers don't understand empathy the way that we did. Maybe that's true to some extent but I don't think that teenagers know that saying something like go kill yourself or I hope you drink

bleach and die is a bad thing. Right? I, I think that that is a pretty clear line. We understand that's not something that you should say to someone online. The question is why is it that we are so willing to post and say and tweet and text those kinds of things? And so, my research kind of let me down this avenue, um, to specifically brain research and how the brain develops. Um, so I'm sure a lot of you know this but for those of you that don't, a refresher, um, the brain's kind of fascinating the way it develops. It actually develops from the back to the front. So, when you're born the first part of your brain that develops is right back here, your visual skills. Um, that makes sense. And by the time that you're 13 almost 90 percent is done. So, by the time you're 13 everything is done except for this front part of the brain up here that we like to call the prefrontal cortex. And it focuses on decision making skills and impulse control. But that 10 percent takes itself another 13 years to develop. So your brain isn't done until you're about 25 or 26 and it's the reason why we see teenagers do sometimes rash things that later they're like, oh, I don't know why I did that, or, I mean, I've had this moment so many times with my parents: why did you do that? I don't really know, I just did. You know, and it's just one of those things that sometimes we don't evaluate decisions the same way that an adult who's seasoned, who's, you know, been through a lot of challenges, been through a lot of tough moments, can. And I thought, hum, that's really interesting because we know that a lot of the cyber bullying that happens online is one done by 15 to 16-year-old women. So, perpetrators and victims are more likely to be 15 to 16-year-old women and it's almost always about boys. There's almost always an issue an emotional, an emotional situation about boys. That's another reason we don't like boys. [Chuckle.]



Um, it's always about boys. And so, I thought if this is an emotional impulsive, you know, I mean, like an emotion charged moment for these people, right, and they are young teens who often don't understand the implications of what they're saying online, what if I could give them a second chance to think about what they were doing. What if I could force them to stop and review and reconsider and be like hold on, is this actually worthy of you. If your grandmother saw this message would she be proud of you? Right? Like, actually force them to think about what they were doing. I thought, that might be kind of a unique concept to explore. So, I put that on hold, and I was like, okay, but let me go see, like, what's currently happening, what are social media sites, what are advocacy groups, what are they trying to do to tackle this issue. And, the, the common denominator is there are a lot of efforts out there right now to try to tackle this issue, but they are almost across the board reactive. Right? So, after the bullying happens let's try and do something about it. Let's tell kids to tell their parents that it's happening. Let's tell, you know, college campus students to tell their parents that it's happening. A good example, um, Tyler Clemente was an 18-year-old student who went to Rutgers University, um, and ended up jumping off the George Washington Bridge after having, um, some intimate with him and his boyfriend. He had just come out recently as gay, live streamed on Twitter, and some of like, the official, the official, um, advice given to Mr. Clemente from, you know, people he reached out to was like, you know, tell your parents, tell a school administrator, report, et cetera, et cetera. The problem is 90 percent of young people don't tell anyone when it's happening to them. So how can we promote these reactive solutions to try to tackle this issue of, you know, hate speech and online hate



when we know for a fact, the data shows, its not going to work. And so, a lot of these solutions were very reactive, right? Stop, block and tell. Stop what you're doing, block the cyber bully, go tell a parent. I was like I want a proactive solution. I want something that stops the online hate before it happens. So that is really how ReThink was born. So ReThink is, is an app that you can download onto your phone, um, and with every keystroke on any app that you're on whether its Twitter, your mail, your text messages, um, it can, one, detect that you're about to post something offensive on social media, like go kill yourself; and two, it gives you a second chance to think about what you're doing. So just a little alert on your phone pops up, stops the message from sending. If you try to hit send it goes ho, hold on; are you sure you want to post that message. It could be offensive. When I first came up with this idea, I mean, I had very practical expectations. I was like, I'm a teenager; I know how teenagers operate; I don't know if this is going to work. Right? So, um, I ended up conducting this 1500 trial study that was then later acclaimed by Google, MIT and Northwestern. Well, basically I looked at how does; if we put teenagers in different environments on social media but one of them has access to a tool where they're, where they're being forced to rethink what they're doing on social media but one of them does, how, how can we compare these differences. And did we find? When a teenager has a second chance to think about what they're doing on social media, over 93 percent of the time they change their mind. Decide not to post these messages. So, the willingness to post a message like you are so ugly in any number of contexts actually drops from 71 percent for the average 13 to 18-year-old to four percent. And, that to me was stunning because it seemed like such a simple



solution, such a simple concept but I think fundamentally it's a really good example of how very simple concepts and ideas can be very powerful to address complex issues, um, like online hater cyber-bullying. So since, um, you know, ReThink as a concept was developed, um, its grown. We are now a fledged app available on the Google Place Store and the App Store. We've reached three million students, um, over the last three years. So, we work with 2500 schools globally. Um, and basically, we work with a number of, um, high schools but also a few campuses. We're starting to move into that space. Um, its more with high schools because they have Chromebooks, they have iPads. Um, these are devices that the schools own that they're giving to kids, um, and believe it or not it's a huge liability. Um, there have been a ton of you know instances that have popped up, um, in the news media as of late of students cyber bullying other students on school devices. Um, and for schools that's a scary thought. How do you introduce technology into a classroom in a way that makes it safe for teenagers? Um, it's a question that right now we don't have a great answer to, but ReThink is one of those things that can help bridge the gap. Um, so we work with a lot of schools. We work with a lot of parents, a lot of law enforcement who are now seeing issues like sexting, um, become something that is, um, you know, a pervasive legal issue, um, because, you know 13 and 14-year-old kids don't understand that you can go to jail, huh, for sending these types of things. Um, and I think that also reflects why we do the second part of what we do which is educational curriculum. Educating kids about technology because believe it or not you might say, oh kids know so much about technology. That's not true. There's a big difference between education and exposure. We are exposed to technology. We are not

educated about technology. Right? And if you don't understand how this thing works, what kind of information can collect about you and then how it can be used against you later on in your life; where the limits are. Do you really know how your phone operates? I would argue no. So, that's kind of, kind of what I focus on and, and the work that I spearhead. And, you know, looking forward I believe we have a very bright future where we're looking to, we're currently available in English, Spanish and Hindi. We're looking to release in a bunch of other languages and kind of explore the image detection space. Um, but how does all of that relate to you? I kind of want to kind of end my, my piece, um, with, with more of a, less of a theoretical, um, application and more of a practical application which is I think a lot of people look at me, me myself looking back at myself, you know, ten years ago, probably wouldn't have been like, I think you're the person to do something like this. I mean, I'm a woman of color running a tech startup. You know, it in, in no way am I the stereotypical person to tackle a problem like this and when I first started ReThink so many people were just like, you know, we need kind of someone tough to handle this issue; you're, you're so young; you know, you don't really look like the type of person we usually see. And I've been in a lot of VCs room, your boardrooms and this and that and, and they'll always get some sort of version of, you know, it's really great but there's just something off and by something off its just, its just you. [Chuckle.] You know, it just, it, it doesn't add up because we've never seen something like this before. And so, I guess, my advice is one, there isn't the right time or the right person to do something. Right? I, I'm a young person with, you know, a lot of promise but I also talk to a lot of adults who are like, well, you know, I don't really know that like I am the



right person to start something new. You know, I already have like X, Y, and Z and how am I supposed to navigate this and how am I supposed to figure out, this out. And I have this interesting idea to try but I don't really know, you know. My, my takeaway for all of you is I'm living proof that someone with, frankly, like, no special talent or skill or ability or, you know, the right type of background can make a huge impact and for me it is the emails that I get every day from teenagers that use the technology, schools that have seen it transform their students, and I think it's, it's a great example of how you can be exactly who you are and touch the lives of people you don't even know.

[Chuckle.] So, um, that's kind of my, my big push to all of you., If you have an idea and if you have a dream and if it's in this space, you know, take what we have, we've given to you today and go out there and forge that dream. And make it happen, um, because you're not too young, you're not too old, and you're not, um, you're not supposed to be a specific someone to, to make a change. Thank you.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

MS. BALMAS: All right. Fortunately, I think we only have time for two questions.

UNIDENTIFIED: We do [indiscernible].

MS. PRABHU: [Chuckle.]

MS. BALMAS: I don't even know how to follow that. So –

MS. PRABHU: We can [Indiscernible.]

MS. BALMAS: [Indiscernible.] All right. Questions? Let me just [indiscernible.]

Q: I have a question and a comment for the last speaker. I

loved your talk. Um, the comment is this: this maybe a coincidence but the example you gave of the suicide and my own memory of when someone I knew said mean things and acted as a bully was age 11 – 12. So, not teenagers but middle school.

MS. PRABHU: Um-hum.

Q: So, I wonder if you've thought about intervening at the middle school level? But my question, my question is sort of about how you're Re (sic) app works. Can it tell that the message is offensive or scary or something like that? Is that, it somehow decodes the language?

MS. PRABHU: Yeah, so, ah, so these are two really good questions. So, the first one I'll kind of tackle the issue of, um, you know, bullying and cyber bullying in the middle school context. So now more and more we see kids getting phones at earlier ages. Um, I mean, I know like three or four-year-olds that have their own iPads. It's crazy. Um, and I got my first phone when I was 12. Um, I got it because I was starting to stay home alone and it was one of those little slide out phones, ah – [chuckle] with the keyboard. Um, so it was way back when in the day. But um, but that's a really good point. Um, we focus a lot of our work on 13 to 18-year-olds just because we find that, um, that's when cyber bullying incidents like tend to crop up the most. But it is definitely true that its starting to gain a lot of traction in middle schools, so we have curriculum that's really focused on middle schools and we work with a lot of middle schools, um, who also have, um, technical devices. Also, a lot of school districts across America schools are prioritizing high schools, um, for, um, classroom technology first. So, it's a lot, you know, freshman and sophomores, juniors and seniors who are getting laptops or iPads, um, or



Chromebooks, um, as opposed to like elementary school where they tend to start with high schools and then work their way down. So, um, a lot of the schools we work with tend to be high schools but, but it's definitely a great point. Um, so for now for the tricky question. How does ReThink work? That's always the question I get is well how can you tell what is offensive? I mean, we've, we've had like a whole conference where we haven't decided [chuckle] what is offensive, right? This is literally the question behind, um, you know, why we are all here today. So, it's a work in progress. So, what we do is we have one, keywords that we as a company have decided, based off our values and our private core mission, we, we think are offensive no matter what context you use they in. Um, so, like, the N word, um, there are other words that we just feel like are derogatory and you should never say that to someone. There is no context where we privately believe that's appropriate. Um, that's just a decision we make. We have the kind of the, we kind of the, you know, the ability to say that that, that is offensive and we do, um, and a lot of – we check in with schools and we're like, hey, these are our, you know, this is kind of our base, um, and a lot of the schools agree. We don't want teens sending words like that. Um, the other thing we do is we have machine learning algorithms, um, that are self-learning so, um, we train them to try and detect what offensive language is, um, and then, um, over time they get better and better at it. Now, is it a perfect process? Absolutely not. And I think, um, some of the speeches today have highlighted kind of the dangers of that and that's something we're 100 percent very, very conscious of is the fact that language is tricky and especially moving into international languages they got trickier. Um, I understand what English slang is. I don't know what Spanish

slang is. Um, you know, and so working with, um, ah, working with, um, natural language process, like, experts in natural language processing and other languages linguistic experts. Um, those are kind of like the extents we go to to try to make it accurate. And then we don't just have the algorithm teach itself. We also have technical, um, employees who work, um, every day to manually train, um, and correct issues. So, we are very attuned to the fact that that's an issue. And we don't believe cyber bullying is a problem that can be solely tackled by technology. I see ReThink as something that is an add-on to curriculum, to parents, to having an important conversation about the issue of technology and online hate. But, um, that is how ReThink operates. And, we find that it tends to be relatively accurate. Um, anywhere from 89 to 91 percent of the time it'll get it right. Um, and, but that isn't 100 percent and we're aware of that. Um, so that's something that we're constantly working to make better.

Q: I want to thank everybody on the panel for bringing your perspective, your experience, and for me your panel here today just kind of brought the heart and humanity of what we're talking about. You know, I've, I've been listening to the legal and the historical and all that and so I just really wanted to say thank you to each of you for the, the humanity and the heart, um – that gives me hope as an educator that there, this generation is going to be the best. Thank you.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

MS. BALMAS: I think that's, that's it.

UNIDENTIFIED: It's a good one to end on.

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you so much. Thank you so much.



UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you so much.

AUDIENCE: [Applause.]

UNIDENTIFIED: [Garbled speaking.]

[Background Noise.]

MS. BALMAS: We have a ten-minute break and then we'll be back for the next panel. Thank you.

# # #