

Michael Poliakoff ([00:00](#)):

Welcome to Higher Ed Now. I'm Michael Poliakoff, president of the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, and today ACTA has the honor of doing an interview with Ilya Shapiro, senior fellow and director of constitutional studies at the Manhattan Institute. Previously, Ilya Shapiro was vice president of the Cato Institute, director of the Robert A. Levy Center for Constitutional Studies, where he published the Cato Supreme Court Review. He served as special assistant/adviser to the Multi-National Force in Iraq. And listeners of Higher Ed Now will undoubtedly be familiar with the saga of his almost appointment to Georgetown University Law School. That's really where I want to begin.

[\(00:54\)](#):

The podcast is, of course, not a video recording. Our listeners can't see that behind me is a statue of Diogenes holding his lantern, searching for an honest man. He's not yet gotten up and walked out of my office, but I am certain that he is delighted this morning to have as our guest Ilya Shapiro. I thought perhaps it would be best if you could briefly recap the long saga, the 122 day investigation that Georgetown subjected you to, that brought you to this point of resigning from that appointment at Georgetown and joining the Manhattan Institute.

Ilya Shapiro ([01:41](#)):

Sure. Good to be with you, Michael. I'm glad there's no video here, because my hair is a bit of a mess today. But anyway, yeah, this lived experience of mine, as they say, has been interesting. I was at Cato for nearly 15 years and got an opportunity to join Georgetown. Randy Barnett, the famed constitutional scholar, founded the Center for the Constitution. And as the joke goes, even more pointedly now, that's because the rest of the law school is the center against the constitution.

[\(02:15\)](#):

I was to be the executive director and a senior lecturer, which combined both public and inward-facing roles to communicate about originalism, about constitutional interpretation, to teach one class each semester, one more practice oriented, one doctrinal, and otherwise to build up the Center's programming oriented towards students, alumni, practitioners, judges, and otherwise. I was excited to take my career in a new direction to have a different kind of impact.

[\(02:47\)](#):

Four days before I was due to start at Georgetown, five days I guess, news of Justice Breyer's Retirement leaked. I was in Austin, Texas, and I did media throughout that day, Supreme Court politics, judicial nominations, this is my area of scholarly expertise. My book, Supreme Disorder: Judicial Nominations and the Politics of America's Highest Court just came out in September 2020, with an updated paper back that just came out this past July. This was my wheelhouse. Whenever something like this happens, I drop everything and put out statements and talk to the press.

[\(03:22\)](#):

That day, I did that and then I attended a friend's dinner in Austin, came back to my hotel room and I was still upset about one particular aspect of this whole thing that President Biden was fulfilling his campaign pledge to appoint a Black woman to be Breyer's replacement. I thought, "Even if you're going to do that eventually, don't just say you're cutting off your candidate pool by race and sex." That's offensive to me. I think that's a bad practice. Forget any legal or constitutional analysis if you're hiring someone, let alone for one of the highest offices in the land. That's repugnant to me. It turns out 76% of Americans shared that view in a poll by that rabid right-wing organization, ABC News.

[\(04:07\)](#):

But anyway, with that upset, I was doom scrolling Twitter, not a best practice, not recommended late at night and shot off a hot take, as they call it, that if I was a Democratic progressive president, I think my number one choice would be Sri Srinivasan, the Chief Judge of the DC Circuit. The second most powerful court in the land, Sri is a towering intellect, progressive, also happens to be an Indian American immigrant, so checks off all sorts of diversity boxes, too. But according to, as I put it, the hierarchy of intersectionality, he's disqualified as is everyone else. And we would end up with, as I put it, a "lesser Black woman."

[\(04:52\)](#):

It's those three words, by which of course I meant a less qualified, everyone in the universe by my operation of logic is less qualified than Judge Srinivasan. It's those three words that opened up a firestorm. I went to bed right after tweeting, I woke up and all heck had broken loose online, mobs had been activated, outrage, manufactured, and people were calling for my job at Georgetown. I saw this, I thought, "I really phrased that poorly. I apologize for my inartful tweet." And tried to try to put an end to this distraction.

[\(05:26\)](#):

But the genie was already out of the bottle. Later that day, Georgetown's dean made a statement about my appalling words and how this was antithetical to what Georgetown was doing. Thus started four days of hell. I've documented this on my Substack Shapiro's Gavel, the emotional, psychological, physiological effect on me and my family as this became rapidly national news, debates, letter writing campaigns, I got a crash course in crisis management, PR, friends and allies coming out of the woodwork, making public statements back-channeling to the dean, a whole rigamarole.

[\(06:06\)](#):

Ultimately, the dean decided that I would be onboarded but immediately suspended with pay pending investigation to whether my tweet violated university policies on harassment and anti-discrimination. This investigation, so called, ended up lasting more than four months, as you alluded, even though this is a law school after all, and the policies are pretty straightforward, the tweet is even shorter, shouldn't have taken a lawyer very long to apply lot of facts and come up with a decision.

[\(06:37\)](#):

I was interviewed about three weeks into the process. There wasn't much fact finding to do. But then we just waited and it became clear that this was a farce on top of being a travesty. And that they were just waiting for students to get off campus to make the next move, so that there would be less of a risk of protest and such.

[\(06:56\)](#):

Ultimately, the decision came that I was being reinstated, because when I tweeted, I was not yet an employee, so not subject to the policies under which the investigation was pursued. Yes, it took high-powered lawyers and two university bureaucracies four months to figure that out. I celebrated that technical victory, but then I got the report from the Diversity Office. I was investigated both by human resources and the Office of Institutional Diversity, Equity and Affirmative Action. I got this report, 10 pages of turgid prose with the ultimate conclusion that I had caused great harm to the university. And even though I couldn't be sanctioned, because I was not yet an employee, if I said or did anything like this in future, that caused offense to anyone, that would create a hostile educational environment subjecting me to discipline.

[\(07:45\)](#):

Clearly a shot across the bow, and not just to me, but to any faculty or staff who would dissent from certain orthodoxy. So, I realized, in consultation with my lawyer, with Professor Barnett, and with my wife, who's a better lawyer than all of us, that I had to resign, put together a four-page resignation letter, probably my best lawyering, and also prepared a summary of that letter for The Wall Street Journal as one does in this environment. That went live, that was submitted four days after I was reinstated. For once, I took control of the media narrative over that weekend, Manhattan Institute was gracious and efficient enough to put together an offer for me. The day after resigning, I announced on national TV, again, as one does, that I was moving to Manhattan. Thus my new life as a free man began. And here I am three months later as the director of constitutional studies, writing, speaking, filing briefs, doing this very fascinating job at the intersection of the legal, political, academic, and media worlds.

[\(08:51\)](#):

Also, with this new platform and fame or notoriety, never sought out to be a poster boy for cancel culture or academic freedom, but man plans and God laughs. In addition to my standard constitutional analysis, I did a fair bit with a case argued yesterday about the Dormant Commerce Clause. Very important case about a state regulating national market. But in addition to that sort of thing, I'm now even more involved in debates about the freedom of speech, direction of university governance, academic freedom and all the rest of it. That of course is why you asked to interview me for this podcast.

Michael Poliakoff [\(09:30\)](#):

Well, thank you. Yes, there's a rabbinic precept that I remember that every person has his hour. The sha'ah, the hour. And your hour came and you stood firm on great principle. In contrast to the environment of the Georgetown Law School, I actually wanted to begin there to get your reflections. As far as I could tell, you were at least the third atrocity of Georgetown's virtue signaling. In the spring of 2021, poor adjunct named Sellers had, as best anyone can tell, just poured out her heart that her Black students were not doing as well as she had hoped. My guess is I don't know the person personally that Sandra Sellers is a liberal, a progressive, who is concerned and certainly a teacher who is concerned. The same dean, Treanor, got rid of her within the day. And her interlocutor, David Batson, felt obliged to fall on his sword, because he apparently didn't denounce her on this Zoom call that nobody was supposed to be party to.

[\(10:52\)](#):

Anyway, we could get into later on in this conversation the situation of Amy Wax at University of Pennsylvania Law School. She is still calling upon the school to present the data to show that she's wrong. So far, none of that data has appeared. But I wanted to get a little bit more of your reflection. I think you rather signaled it saying that you would be, if you were there, you would be manning the only center at the Law School that actually would take the Constitution seriously. With that, I want to turn this back over to you.

Ilya Shapiro [\(11:28\)](#):

Yeah, as it turned out, I thought I was going into this job with my eyes open. I regularly speak on college and especially law school campuses. I recognize the illiberal trends. But Georgetown, not only is it bad generally, but Georgetown in particular, you gave one example, there are others, has unfortunately not vindicated its vaunted free speech and expression policy, which on paper or on pixels actually is very, very good and makes the point that someone being offended does not make it unprotected speech and

so forth. There's a narrow exception for harassment, but of course I wasn't harassing anyone, except possibly President Biden.

[\(12:06\)](#):

Yeah, I got a direct experience with the rot at the heart of legal academia, Georgetown specifically. The idea that you can't express again the adjuncts that you were talking about. One lamenting the lack of success by Black students. The other one not saying anything. I mean, this is people make allusions to totalitarian regimes lightly often, but this reminds me of the Chinese Cultural Revolution. Forget Stalin or the Nazis. I mean, I've had Chinese students come up to me and as I'm doing my round saying, "All this woke mania, my story..." In general what they see at their law schools, at their colleges, reminds them of stories their grandparents told them about the struggle sessions and renouncing the four olds and year zero and all of this stuff.

[\(13:00\)](#):

It's really frightening the surveys now about self-censorship of students that they feel they can't speak up in class, the toxic environment, if you don't sign certain letters, including the one condemning me from the Georgetown students and student groups, and then you're assumed to be guilty of the same ideological wrongthink, really frightening stuff. I mean, look, I'm not that old, when I was in law school 20 years ago, when I was in college 25 years ago, I don't think the ideological ratio of either faculty or students was all that different.

[\(13:33\)](#):

I think what's different now is you have university administrators and officials, deans, presidents, provosts, department chairs, placating and kowtowing to the radical illiberal mob, for various reasons, and I'm sure we can get into this, but the growth of I think university bureaucracy certainly is significant there and especially the DEI part of those bureaucracies, the diversity, inclusion and equity offices that are well-entitled, because it's against intellectual diversity, prevents equal opportunity and excludes those who deviate from accepted orthodoxy. It's that dynamic that is really poisoned the campus cultures with ramifications in various ways.

Michael Poliakoff [\(14:21\)](#):

I believe you're onto something there of great importance. We've done a little bit of scratching around to see the funding levels of DEI offices or whatever their particular acronyms might be. It's often colossal. Berkeley, last I checked, spends \$34 million a year on its Office of Equity and Inclusion. That is not scholarship money. I think any one of us who's been in the academy would know what to do with \$34 million to increase diversity. It would go into scholarships for deserving students of all races who would otherwise not be able to attend the university. And that would undoubtedly have a very positive effect in changing the composition, the demographic composition of the school. But that's not what's happening. I wanted to get some of your thoughts on the mischief of the bureaucrats. Bureaucrats like to stay busy and as Sam Abrams showed through his very careful research published in The New York Times, the ideological composition of administrators, particularly student life administrators, is even more skewed progressive than the faculty. Although that's hard to imagine.

Ilya Shapiro [\(15:42\)](#):

Yeah, that doesn't surprise me. When you think about who goes into human resources-type positions and especially someone who wants to be a diversity enforcer of sorts. There's a lot of faculty that are old school liberals. There might be a generational change where the younger folks are more progressive activisty than the older folks. I'm sure that's marginally true. But among the administrators and

bureaucrats, that's undoubtedly true, because they see their mission as different than the traditional academic mission of seeking truth in civic discourse and things like that. Just like in public policy in the government, each civil servant, bureaucrat, they face incentives under public choice theory of expanding their empire, growing their budgets. Similarly here with university, bureaucrats or educrats, as they're sometimes called, they want to justify their role, their office. Because the demand for racism and other sexism and other politically incorrect offenses far outstrips the supply, it spills into cases like those Georgetown adjuncts or stray tweets and what have you.

Michael Poliakoff ([16:59](#)):

There's a merging evidence, some anecdotal, some survey, that in fact students are not so volatile and so ideologically skewed, that in fact we're dealing with small pressure groups that have outside influence. Then, of course, as you suggested before, the virtue signaling of the administration knows no bounds. That does lead us to really the most important question that we could explore today. How do we get out of this mess? The number of fine people who have been really harmed, not harm in the sense that's so often used on campuses for imaginary things that people might find disagreeable, but the real harm to people like Joshua Katz, who I know you spoke up for, is something that's of tragic proportions. How do we get out of this mess?

Ilya Shapiro ([18:02](#)):

I'm optimistic for society at large, for America, to quote Justice Kavanaugh at his confirmation hearing, "I live on the sunrise side of the mountain," and we are seeing pushback to some of these radical excesses as normal people who don't obsess about politics all the time, but they're seeing weird things and calling out the nonsense that it is or the progressive fascism that it is.

([18:29](#)):

In academia, the solutions I think are easier and less likely to happen, because we see all too rarely that at institutions where the leadership refuses to placate that radical minority, refuses to play it being thought police, these things dissipate. University of Chicago, my law school alma mater, is a good example of this. There are few, they're too far between. But all it takes is a dean or a relevant official to instill a culture of free speech and civil discourse.

([19:09](#)):

Institutions are very good at instilling cultures, whether that's a dedication to public service, to DEI, to whatever the goal of a given institution might be, the mission statements, the search for truth, whatever you want, all it would take would be that direction and then instilling of that culture from the top. I think things would turn around.

([19:34](#)):

Now, not quite that simple, because students, the way students are raised, especially in graduate programs, they come from collegiate atmospheres already mostly formed and what have you. But I think deans have asked me, "What can we do to not be the next Yale or Hastings?" To note two law schools where there were massive protests and shutdowns of events, myself at Hastings, there were a few others, "We don't want that. What can we do?" I did an event at the University of Oklahoma Law School where the dean sat through the whole two-hour event taking copious notes as I had a discussion with an esteemed constitutional law professor, standing room only, people are concerned, some people are in administration are concerned about this.

([20:24](#)):

Like I said, it's about what you convey as your priorities. At Georgetown, Dean Treanor was quite clear, both in his initial statements condemning me and the eventual statement reinstating, yet again condemning me, that there's a supposed tension between values of freedom of speech and people being welcomed on campus and not discriminated against. I think that tension is ephemeral. But nevertheless, when you put it that way, that only leads to a breakdown in these classical liberal values.

Michael Poliakoff ([20:59](#)):

In your resignation letter, eloquent and lawyerly, you gave examples of the sorts of things that could be off limits and you're absolutely correct and it's preposterous for a law school. Could you talk about *Roe v. Wade* without giving "harm" to some students? Could you talk about the pending SCOTUS case, Harvard and UNC, in the interest of full disclosure, I'm the father of two Asian daughters. I can tell you what side I'm cheering for right there. But yes, would you then be sanctioned for bringing up that disturbing, as it were, subject? There's no end to the sorts of things that could silence a professor and even take things off the syllabus. I'm not sure where this ends.

Ilya Shapiro ([21:56](#)):

Or require professors to incorporate various kinds of statements in their syllabi, compelling speech. Like I said, I see parallels to the Chinese Cultural Revolution, where universities are not places of education or truth seeking or debate over timeless values or the search for new knowledge, but rather indoctrination centers and social justice incubators and activism shops. That's where this is going.

Michael Poliakoff ([22:24](#)):

One rather encouraging moment, I agree with you, we've got to look at the skyline or else we will fall into the kind of despair that will render us ineffective. But your Georgetown colleague, Carol Christine Fair, actually School of Foreign Service, had made a inflammatory tweet. It was of course one that was against Justice Kavanaugh. The school took no action, although there really was a nasty Twitter mob that went after her, which is certainly reprehensible. But I noticed that she came to your defense and I'm always heartened when we can find those on both ends of the political spectrum, who are willing to say our common ground is the free exchange of ideas. Are you finding people who would be politically progressive who have come forth as your allies?

Ilya Shapiro ([23:24](#)):

Some. Although, a lot of those were of the line that what I said was offensive and possibly racist, but I shouldn't be fired for it. Thank heaven for small favors, I guess. But there are certainly old school liberals that, you mentioned Berkeley, the '60s liberals, the home of the free speech movement going against, at that period, the conservative fuddy-duddies. Now the threats to speech of course are from the left. But then they were from the right. There was some of that.

([23:53](#)):

In addition to Professor Fair, in my resignation letter I detailed three other Georgetown law professors who tweeted much more inflammatory or offensive things. And of course, they weren't investigated or punished, nor should they have been, but it's free speech for thee, and not for me. I had a very good event at the University of Michigan in March. It happened to be the week after there was one of these disruptive shutdown protests of the architect of the Texas Heartbeat Bill, SB 8, that was, you take the wrong position on abortion or affirmative action, it's outside the academic Overton window of permissible policy views.

[\(24:32\)](#):

But anyway, in the wake of that, which did not make national news, because I guess nobody was live streaming the video on Twitter, but the deans there were like, "We are not going to become Hastings, this is unacceptable. Here are the rules." They got all the student organization heads together and said, "Here are the rules we will not tolerate, you can protest, you can ask questions, but you cannot disrupt events." So, they changed my event, which was going to be about the Supreme Court nomination, to a discussion of the importance of academic freedom and free speech. They brought in Andy Koppelman of Northwestern Law with whom I agree on little or nothing besides the importance of free speech and civil discourse and we had a wonderful event.

[\(25:08\)](#):

So, it can be done and there are people, the problem is a lot of regular folks or folks in the middle politically that certainly think it's manufactured outrage and placating the illiberal radical minority. They want to just keep their head down lest they be caught in the crossfire. It takes courage to speak out. Certainly, a lot of people I don't necessarily blame for not publicly coming to my defense, but those with a platform I would hope, because that's how we change this thing. Cultural influencers, politicians, other high profile people speaking out against, in support of people with whose perspective they might disagree, but whose right to utter it needs to be protected.

Michael Poliakoff ([25:57](#)):

Of course, that should, by all rights, put the burden on college and university governing boards, the trustees, the regents, the visitors, to be absolutely clear and firm about their expectations that our heritage of freedom of speech, and indeed, for public institutions, the constitutional right to free speech will be zealously protected. That's not happening as fast as it should. We're working hard at it from ACTA. We now have this Campus Freedom Initiative and we're doing intensive work on campuses one by one.

[\(26:36\)](#):

I would invite you to share with us some thoughts about how the law, whether it's legislation or contract law, could be used effectively. I just want to give one other counterfactual as sort of what if, picking up on your thoughts about leadership, what if Peter Salovey at Yale, right after the Halloween Day massacre, as it were, had said to that group of students that came to his house at midnight with their list of demands. "Let me just make things absolutely clear. You do not tell me to fire a professor or to demote a college master," as they used to be called. "If you all want to have a conversation, we'll do it next week in the student union. But you don't come to a man's house at midnight unless there's a national emergency, there's a fire on campus, some dreadful event. Everybody needs to leave right now. We have this thing called courtesy indeed, even rule of law, and you are arguably trespassing."

[\(27:40\)](#):

What would've happened, and indeed if the Yale corporation had made it clear to him, "Stick to principles, you've got to protect the right of free speech of Erika and Nicholas Christakis." I've given you a jumble of things, law and leadership.

Ilya Shapiro ([27:57](#)):

Yeah, I mean leadership statesmanship, as I said, if university leaders held firm, then a lot of this would dissipate. But instead they give what the Mayor of Baltimore, after the George Floyd protest, was talking about giving the rioters a space to destroy. I think that's not the way to go. As far as the law is concerned, all of these university free expression policies in most places now, thanks in large part to the

wonderful work of my friends at FIRE, the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression now, it used to be education, but they've expanded their purvey, which is not a good sign, it means there's lots of impositions on free expression even beyond college campuses. But what they've managed to do is most universities now have very good, on paper, free speech policies, but those policies are now part of the contract. So, if they're violated, students or faculty can sue for a breach of contract.

[\(28:54\)](#):

Apart from that, when we're talking about constitutional issues for public institutions, when public institutions censor or punish for speech, that's a First Amendment violation. So, there can be legal cases that way. Legislatures can, certainly, again, with respect to state public institutions, restrict budgets for all of those exploding DEI offices or other bureaucracies that don't seem to do much to enhance the educational mission. They can govern in various ways. Trustees, in terms of corporate governance law, can enforce both background state rules and university's own policies on various things. There certainly is room to maneuver even though a lot of this stuff is cultural. We'll take the age-old debate over whether law follows culture or vice versa. It's a symbiotic relationship, clearly, but there certainly is room for policymakers, both in terms of university officials, trustees and state legislators and courts to enforce private contracts.

Michael Poliakoff [\(29:59\)](#):

You've been very gracious with your time and I realize you have important essays and presentations to prepare. Two other questions that I want to ask you. One is exactly that. What are you envisioning now, related to that, whether you're hoping to get to the classroom one more time and to be able to share these thoughts and insights with students? The other, a narrower question, I'd be very grateful, and I realize it's a delicate issue, since you are indeed a lawyer, to get your thoughts on the case of Amy Wax, which has been a very painful episode for her and for those of us who are committed to free speech.

Ilya Shapiro [\(30:41\)](#):

Well, to take your second question, Amy is a friend. She expresses herself provocatively at times, even more provocatively than me, probably. She's gotten herself in hot water over the years for saying politically incorrect things with respect to racial issues and immigration. The latest one, that has been the pretext for the straw that broke the camel's back to get the Penn leadership to try to get her fired or stripped of tenure and fired, that she talked about how Asian immigrants vote Democrat, so we should have less of them. I'm botching exactly what she said, but it's along those lines.

[\(31:23\)](#):

I think her political enemies have been trying to get rid of her for a long time. A while ago she was disciplined by not being allowed to teach mandatory first-year law school classes. I mean, look, she deserves academic freedom, we can debate whether what any of her particular commentary, whether it's correct, that's a proper intellectual debate. But I think she's being pilloried unjustly. There's a legal defense fund that's been organized to support her and she's probably the highest profile person now. Of course, a longtime tenured law professor at an Ivy League Law School, that'll get you that kind of notoriety. So, I hope she prevails, even though she and I might not see eye to eye on everything. In general, she's been a great heterodox exponent of academic freedom.

Michael Poliakoff [\(32:14\)](#):

Well, in the interest of full disclosure, I will say that I have donated to her legal defense fund and still remain appalled, if I can, as a non-lawyer, use a legal phrase, the way Penn took everything she said at

as mens rea, including what many would argue was a very reasonable defense of what she called bourgeois culture. The advantages that one can actually document of finishing school, getting a job, getting married, having children after you get married. This is not rocket science and demonstrable.

Ilya Shapiro ([32:53](#)):

The success sequence, absolutely, nothing ought to be controversial about that.

Michael Poliakoff ([32:57](#)):

And that's when Dean Ruger first began to put pressure on her, that she had offended the sensibility of Penn Law and everything then follows in sequence after that. Yeah. Well, thank you for those insights and let's-

Ilya Shapiro ([33:15](#)):

So, what am I up to now? I'm writing and speaking, it's the new Supreme Court term that just started last week. So, a lot of commentary about this term's big cases. You mentioned affirmative action. There's a big property rights case, and environmental regulation, there's the independent state legislature doctrine and an election law. There's a graphic designer who didn't want to produce a website for a same-sex wedding, sort of like the Masterpiece Cakeshop issue, but without debating whether baking or floral arrangements is protected by the First Amendment.

([33:48](#)):

So, it's going to be a big term again, and I'm back to that bread-and-butter discussion. I tour law school campuses regularly debating and discussing various issues typically for The Federalist Society, and other organizations as well. I just got back from a week in Hungary doing panels and lectures on constitutionalism and perspectives from America. And perhaps most importantly, the people asking me whether things are settling down now, it's kind of the calm before a whole different kind of storm, because my wife and I are expecting twins next month. My family is growing from two to four kids. So, that's going to be exciting and terrifying at the same time.

([34:29](#)):

Maybe during my paternity leave, I'll write my next book. Some publishers are interested in, not surprisingly, taking advantage of this experience I had with Georgetown and this discussion that you and I are having to talk about the illiberal takeover of legal education. So, a lot on my plate, a lot of interesting things. But I'm working from my home office. I thankfully no longer have a reason to cross the river Styx into the District of Columbia back this year. I've been to Dulles and Reagan airports more often than into the district. I'm here in Falls Church, Virginia, leading up MI's elite Falls Church office, I like to say. Just trying to raise my kids and use this platform moment that I've been given to shine a light on various kinds of issues, both legal, constitutional and social-cultural.

([35:21](#)):

In terms of the classroom, I have been an adjunct in the past, I'll no doubt go back to that next school year. I've enjoyed teaching at the University of Mississippi Law School, for example, I've taught a seminar there on economic liberty under the constitution every other year. So, I might go back to doing that next fall or other area schools around here, although the football around here isn't as good as the SEC.

Michael Poliakoff ([35:44](#)):

This transcript was exported on Dec 06, 2022 - view latest version [here](#).

Well, I know my colleagues joined me in wishing you and your family great joy as it grows. I want to extend my thanks to you on behalf of ACTA for what you are doing to vindicate these principles that are the lifeblood of not just higher education, but of a free society. We salute you for everything that you're doing and wish you the greatest of success. Thank you for taking the time to be with us today.

Ilya Shapiro ([36:14](#)):

I appreciate that greatly. And if any of your listeners want to invite me onto their campuses, I'm totally willing to do that. Once my travel resumes again, after the newborns come, I think probably end of February or so, my wife is allowing me to travel again.

Michael Poliakoff ([36:29](#)):

That's actually generous to let you go so early, but I'm sure the campuses will appreciate seeing you. Well, thank you again. Thank you so much. This has been a real pleasure to talk with you and to hear your ideas.

Ilya Shapiro ([36:43](#)):

Thank you, Michael.