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[00:00:00] **Speaker 1** When he was a pawn. It was the first time I was elected. So we were in Judiciary College together, so that's why we knew each other from there. But this is the first time we actually by the second time in all those years, we had to sit down next to each other and chat.

[00:00:12] **Speaker 2** You look like old friends.

[00:00:13] **Speaker 1** It was like I feel like it was a bromance going on.

[00:00:16] **Speaker 2** Exactly.

[00:00:18] **Speaker 1** Well, I mean, you know, I try I have to make this I try to make it more by the policies, not personalities. You know, these we got different policies going to diverse perspectives. But at the end of the day, you got to be at work with people who don't think like you, who don't see the way you see it. So it's not if you turn it into that kind of, you know, where you just draw on people's personalities, then I think we've missed it. And I think that's what politics has become.

[00:00:42] **Speaker 2** So you asked if this was adverse or friendly. Have you done adverse interviews so far?

[00:00:48] **Speaker 1** Well, I think there's I've had some I've had some places where, you know, you can tell it's not as friendly. And so they're trying to get you to, you know, say certain things or give me the trip me up like.

[00:01:03] **Speaker 2** Talk radio or Dan Bice.

[00:01:07] **Speaker 1** That was yeah, that's a whole.

[00:01:10] **Speaker 2** Nother then kind of in a category by himself.

[00:01:12] **Speaker 1** I realize it. I realize that he, he he he frames is very interesting that you know how they chose to frame this story. Very interesting.

[00:01:22] **Speaker 2** I don't know if you probably interact with Bill leaders over the years.

[00:01:26] **Speaker 1** Yeah, a little bit. Yeah.

[00:01:27] **Speaker 2** It's just Bill was kind of the more liberal version of Dan for quite a while when they were both running their reporter analysis editorial columns when they had a little more latitude than most reporters to take the tips and run with them and frame things the way they did. So yeah, that was always an interesting contrast for me as a young reporter to see.

[00:01:48] **Speaker 1** How how you would.

[00:01:49] **Speaker 2** Frame things versus what I would be able to get away.

[00:01:51] **Speaker 1** With here. Yeah, I know.

[00:01:54] **Speaker 2** I'll be ready whenever you're ready. Okay. Did you want to shut the door? Oh, yes. All right. We're actually taping here. And now over in the big studio, usually, usually it's not real raucous, but, you know, all it takes is someone to walk by or talk and echoes.

[00:02:09] **Speaker 1** Through that sound up.

[00:02:11] **Speaker 2** So they give us these big doors to slide shut.

[00:02:14] **Speaker 1** So you. Yeah, I still I'm still grateful to Frederick. I mean, when we did that documentary, not enough apologies. I mean, she didn't believe me when I first told her how and when we went when she broke the camera, man, I mean, she was like, Oh, my goodness.

[00:02:27] **Speaker 2** I was sharing an office with her at the time when she was producing that. And she would come back and just talk about what she had. And so we brainstorm ideas and like, here's what we could do, here's how you could do it. And, you know, of course, she was anchoring at the time, so she didn't have the freedom of a lot of, you know, reporters would if they were just set on a documentary. Yeah, no, it's all she could rave about was, you know, this is the kind of access you don't get. These are the kind of stories that don't get told.

[00:02:51] **Speaker 1** Don't get told.

[00:02:53] **Speaker 2** So we good?

[00:02:54] **Speaker 1** I mean, that's why we write.

[00:02:55] **Speaker 2** Yeah, Well. Well, thank you for joining us. Give me a sense of your judicial philosophy, if it can be boiled down.

[00:03:02] **Speaker 1** Well, I think for the most part, my judicial philosophy is kind of rooted in two pieces. One, it is an understanding of a living document so that we the way we view the Constitution, really is about making sure that we look at it to expand and cover the current issues that we do and that the current issues that we will encounter as a future generation. And I think our Constitution was written to be able to give us the flexibility to be able to expand that. But as there are times when I think you need to have like what I call a bifocal approach, where you need to be able to understand the original intent of the Constitution, but don't let that original intent stop you from being able to expand it to include some of the things that are important for our state moving forward. I just I live in Constitution perspective as a judge that allows for, you know, flexibility when making decisions that impact everyday Wisconsinites.

[00:03:50] **Speaker 2** When a strict constructionist or a constitutional originalist will hear that. They'll say, well, that allows you to bring your politics and that allows you to read into the Constitution what you want to. How do you respond to that?

[00:04:02] **Speaker 1** I'll say that is not that's really not given. I mean, we have amendments for a reason. I didn't make up amendments. We have a whole bunch of amendments that allowed for them to expand the kinds of things that our Constitution did not envision. It didn't envision women voting in the united vision. Black people who were enslaved being freed did not envision access to certain voting rights. It didn't envision all those things. So then if we only reflected on history, constitutionalism, it's almost as though you're going to disregard all those other members that have allowed our communities to evolve and continue to meet the needs where we see people meet. So it's not disregarding. It is actually embracing what the spirit of the Constitution was meant. And that's why we were able to have all those amendments to to give access to things that the original intent and original framers did not give access to.

[00:04:46] **Speaker 2** So when you see the divides that exist in judicial philosophy today, what happens when you have a court with some people believing it has to be interpreted very strictly and others that believe it's a living document that should reflect the times?

[00:04:57] **Speaker 1** Well, I think that's gives us great debate. I don't. I don't I know it has become politicized, but there are always different ways in which different individuals bring a perspective to certain certain questions that are being asked before them. And we reason why I say it's kind of like a bifocal approach is because not every question that you ask being asked can be answered in one or two terms. So if you only have one view all the time, you may miss what those questions that are coming to. You need need in order for you to answer those questions. There may be certain questions where you have to refer back to the original intent of the Constitution. And I will say that as a circuit court judge, when I talk about the flexibility, we're talking about judges who get a lot of discretion to make decisions on people's everyday lives that are not written in the Constitution, nor are they written in statute. And so you have to have some values that you bring to a conversation for which they are not like nobody tells you, Well, well, when is it when do you give a child back to a parent? When do you take a child out of home? When do you terminate a parental rights? All of those discretionary values or things that you bring to the conversation and you have to have some flexibility because you can't always go back. Well, what is the original intent of Child Protective Services? Well, that wasn't the thing in the original intent. So you have to have some flexibility so that you can make decisions in real time and hopefully make the best decision that you can based on the facts that are being presented to you at that time.

[00:06:19] **Speaker 2** Your campaign has highlighted your work with young children in your court. Can you describe how that influences you and what you would want to bring from that experience to the Supreme Court?

[00:06:28] **Speaker 1** Well, I think of, you know, you want to be able to have in a Supreme Court that have a very varied experiences among those who are in the court system so they can have an understanding of the types of issues, the types of struggles, the types of legal consequences, and things that judges and families address through the court system, and how those court systems need to be empowered to give an empathy to it. So even working with the young people that I have, I think our children of Wisconsin are the most precious gift that we have. And so how we treat our children, how we give them the things that they need ultimately will reflect not only their perception of the court systems, but also their perceptions of the justice system. Is it fair? How do you explain things to them so that they understand the consequences that are happening to their young bodies? And if we cannot explain those things, what can we do to make sure that we're listening to them in a very transformed way? So none of none of the individuals who are running have the kind of experience that I'm bringing to the Supreme Court. And most importantly, I'm bringing a heart to the Supreme Court that really does see our young people as a most vulnerable population. And reforming our system means we're making it fair for everybody, including the most vulnerable, which is children. So things that are taken handcuffs off of children or or coming off the bench and taking my robe off for kids and putting it on them and putting them up on my bench and say, this is who you are, this is who you can be and not someone we lock up in prison, or just hugging young women who have been victimized by human trafficking and letting them know that, you know, you're not alone in this world. And we have a team of people here to support you. To me, that is the flexibility and the energy that judges can bring, and that is the energy that I'm bringing to our to our state and to our Supreme Court.

[00:08:06] **Speaker 2** There are a lot of judges that have that remove in a courtroom the way they dress, the way they're titled, just the distance and the physical height. There's a difference between them and the people that they're dealing with that creates a remove. You seem to want to remove that distance and get closer to the people. Will the Supreme Court allow you to do that, or would you make more of a difference in people's lives by being on a circuit court and doing what you're doing?

[00:08:30] **Speaker 1** I think as Supreme Court level, you still get the chance to be able to make sure you're addressing bigger issues throughout our state by addressing them. I mean, you're making decisions that are rooted in values that are important for all Wisconsinites, but you also have the capacity to come off the bench and spend your time how you choose to spend them. I will I will continue to be a person of the community. Our statues really require judges in order for us to be effective, judges, to be involved in the community, to be connected to it. So me coming off the bench is really a reflection of what we all can and just do. Just because personalities don't do it don't mean we can't. That bridge between us is often the thing that causes people to feel that, that they can't be connected to the system. And so even when I did the the drug court and I had the guy challenge me to chance and he was saying that me that, you know, if I stay clean, will you play me in chance? And we fight to stay clean. I came down off the bench and we play chess. Now. He beat me in 5 minutes because he was a junior chess champion. But it just shows you me being vulnerable to him allowed for me to see somebody who's in drug court, who has a criminal history, but is also a junior chess champion. And he got sober enough just to be able to beat me in a game. And that is a reflection of what we can do in order to a the idea of justice and fairness in our communities.

[00:09:49] **Speaker 2** Justice Lewis Butler was the first African-American man to serve in the Wisconsin Supreme Court, and when he ran for reelection, he faced one of the most racist campaigns we've ever seen launched against a justice.

[00:09:59] **Speaker 1** Probably what the first.

[00:10:00] **Speaker 2** What have you learned from him and what in preparing for this race for you?

[00:10:06] **Speaker 1** Well, one, I think I've spent a lot of time thinking about. Well, first of all, he's endorsed me. So I listen to him. I learned from him. I talk to him about what things he would have done differently at that time. And really as a judicial career. I spent a lot of time investing in the things that make hearts matter, you know, making sure that we're clear about our message with our young people, ensuring that we are, you know, focused on the right messaging in communities and then being transparent with people because, you know, having conversations about race, having conversations about the things that are really do incarcerate the minds and imaginations of so many different people who have been infected by racist cultures really allows for me then to be able to have those conversations. And I think Justice Butler at that time, you know, he was getting hit with something nobody had ever been done before. The darkening scanned the tones. So I've had great conversations with helping, you know, many, many members of our community for years, really helping them understand that all of us have been programed with this super predator myth. And anytime they want to scare majority white individuals in our communities, all they do is darker skin, place them undertones and it sends people back to the eighties and nineties when they were programed every night to think about young black men as dangerous. And it sits in our subconscious. So for me it's explaining to people you have a choice. You don't have to continue to let that ruin your subconscious. Or you can listen to who people are and not let to scare you into believing that the person can't represent your particular interests.

[00:11:34] **Speaker 2** When you compare what Justice Butler went through to what we saw last year in the US Senate race with Mandela. Barnes Has there been a change and what have you? What can you learn from that race just last year?

[00:11:45] **Speaker 1** Again, I think you go back to the same, you know, same perception, right. This idea, what makes you dangerous, what makes you afraid? And people will make things up in order to create that. It's really up to Wisconsinites and all people really to say, you know, we're not going to allow these kinds of images to deter us from understanding who people are, listening to their ideas, listening to their concerns, and making our decisions based on that. I think we've learned a lot from it. I think, you know, watching the Mandela race is a reminder that these attacks are still out there. But I also say the same thing about Wisconsin. We elected Obama twice. So this narrative can be broken because we broke it twice and we broke it to elect our first African-American president. And Wisconsin was the ones who gave him their victory twice. So, yes, we have that history, but we also have a history of being progressive on ideas and using character as opposed to color to define who individuals are.

[00:12:42] **Speaker 2** Do you see hints of this same strategy when you hear that Republicans are going to put on that same ballot in April a reform for a bail reform, and they're going to put on something about welfare work reform. Does that have those same old undertones?

[00:12:56] **Speaker 1** Yeah, you definitely, definitely get this sense of, you know, bringing people out because they want to almost racialize these these different types of conversations. But again, you know, as many times as we can say this, you know, let's make this about the issues that are in front of us, rather than trying to allow the race come in from the outside and distract us from making sure we have fundamentally the right people in position that will move our court systems for them, our state forward at the same time.

[00:13:22] **Speaker 2** What do you think of the other candidates in this race? Are you running against them in the primary? You try to distinguish yourself. You know, one of the two so-called liberals versus two conservatives.

[00:13:32] **Speaker 1** I think what defines me differently is that we all have our values that make a difference. Right. Former prosecutors, elected as judges, you know, committed to the rule of law. What differentiates me between them is my leadership, both on the bench and off the bench, you know, rather using my voice and my power of the black robe to, you know, take handcuffs off of children to make it more fair or, you know, the rules to see caps so that we can remove the cap and move remove, you know, people who've been charged and been dismissed or evictions that have been dismissed. In fact, I just found out that UW Law School created an app that allows for people to more easily get those charges that they've been found not guilty of all those evictions off of their seat cap record even easier. So now people are actually having an easy access. But if I had never made that motion and fought for that, then we wouldn't be these many years later being able to give relief to so many Wisconsinites. So it's those kind of actions and those kind of values that really differentiate me from the rest of the field of individuals who are there, because I'm really trying to make sure that the system is fair. And none of this stuff about talking about I'm going to be fair because it's not fair and there's a whole bunch of inequality built into the system. But it's our job as judges to ensure that those who come before us do receive due process in a fair and balanced way, and that we're not just simply repeating, are we doing the system that sometimes can oppress and hurt those that are there in front of us?

[00:14:52] **Speaker 2** Daniel Kelly's an interesting candidate for this position in that he has been on the Supreme Court but then lost his reelection. Effort and is running again. Do you think that the voters spoke once on that case and that should be used against him or the voters should keep that in mind? Or is it come with a clean slate?

[00:15:10] **Speaker 1** I think voters have to keep everything in mind. I think you have to look at the entire, you know, tapestry of people's lives, especially as a professional lives, in order to make a decision. So whether or not they run before lost, before who appointed them, who did not. I think that's all fair for consideration for anybody who's running these races. And, you know, his his profile. You know Janet as well as Jennifer. All of those are similar profiles we must consider.

[00:15:37] **Speaker 2** No, this is technically a nonpartisan race, but we know that the parties are heavily involved. There's multimillion dollar backers. There's outside groups that have already decided how they're going to define each of the candidates and who they're going to support. How does that influence how you run in this primary?

[00:15:53] **Speaker 1** I think, you know, I try to treat this as nonpartisan, which means that I'm open to having conversations about the values and the way I see the judicial system, regardless of who I'm in front of. And so I've had good conversations among those who lean liberal, and I've had great conversation with those who lean Republican as well. And, you know, of course, there may be certain issues on both sides for which we don't necessarily agree. But the goal of a judge is to make sure that you have a lens that allows people who can present facts to you that are unbiased, that you can hear everybody, and you're committed to making sure that you hear everybody. You don't ask when they come in or you Republican or Democrat, you want to make sure that everybody has the curiosity that you need to lean into these conversations and lean into them with a sense that you're going to make sure that however you rule, you're doing it without the influence of other people in your ear, pulling you from one side to the other. You want to be able to ensure that they will get their due process. A fair day in court, and it's up to you to be able to make sure that you do that.

[00:16:51] **Speaker 2** I want to look back at some of the cases that have come before the court in the last few years have been pretty significant. Wisconsin legislature versus Andrea Palm was the case that overturned Governor Ivers stay at home orders during the midst of the COVID pandemic. Daniel Kelly was the deciding vote in that case. If you had sat on the court at that time, how would you have ruled?

[00:17:11] **Speaker 1** I think given the extreme nature of what we were facing then as a country, it was very important for us to have some consistency. So I think in many ways, having, you know, not having seen all of the facts that was presented to the court at that time, I think the intent of the administration was to make sure that we had rules in place that impacted and created safety among our entire entire state and to make sure that people were safe. And I you know, the fact that Governor Evers, you know, these things were appealed directly to the state court underscored the significance and intensity of these moments. And I think it was a unique, unique situation. The pandemic brought to us. But I think given the severity and the deaths and the information that was there, I think there was a need to be flexible to give the executive branch an opportunity to actually run the state and not have the Supreme Court be the ones who are trying to act in an executive role.

[00:18:06] **Speaker 2** Do you think there was room for flexibility in that case, or did the court have to decide one way or the other? Either the rules went away or because they didn't have the authority to keep them in place or they had the authority and it was up to them to decide how long those rules stayed?

[00:18:19] **Speaker 1** I think, you know, courts have discretion to decide if they really would take the case in or just let the executive do the executive job. The mere fact that they didn't have to take the case. So it's just once they take it, then they have to make a decision. But they didn't have to take it. They could have allowed the executive to continue to work itself out and allow that question to be answered by the people as a rather than, you know, seven justices sitting on a sitting on the court.

[00:18:44] **Speaker 2** That same spring. Dan Kelly lost his reelection bid and we saw Justice Brian Hagedorn take a much more prominent role, becoming a sort of swing vote, so to speak, often differing from his conservative colleagues and occasionally siding with his Liberal colleagues. What's your assessment of how he's ruled and how he's managed his role on the court?

[00:19:03] **Speaker 1** I think in many of his rulings, whether I'm looking, you know, reading him both in the majority or sometimes in the dissent, and I think his dissents give some insight more so than his than his the majority opinions and his dissents at times when he's defending against sometimes the you know, whoever the majority is gives them some interpretation of how he sees his role in the court. Right. To pay attention to the rule of law, not be so influenced by the pool of politics, but allow a lot of for him to pay attention to precedents, how the policies in which courts have often functioned, you know, given discretion to, you know, to district courts. And what does that appellate view look like, you know, from a Supreme Court level rather than the Supreme Court becoming a body that's basically relitigating cases in real time when they don't really have the facts or the temperament or the actual individuals to be able to weigh and give that judicial determination at that time. So I see him. You know, doing what judges and justices hopefully do is not become so rigid in an ideology that you can't even listen to the facts or be moved by the facts that are in front of you. And I think that is where we all should aspire to be able to do, is move inside that space because the facts that, you know, so can sometimes pull you in those different directions.

[00:20:20] **Speaker 2** It's interesting that conservatives have bemoaned the fact that he's not more consistent in their views on how he rules. Yes. But he's also surprising to a lot of court watchers because they don't know what he's going to do. Would we be better off if there were more justices in that mold?

[00:20:35] **Speaker 1** Yes. I think the idea that you can anticipate where people rule is why our courts lose legitimacy. It should always have some. Again, that curiosity of the facts that are being brought before you, not people saying, well, I know exactly what they will do and exactly how to frame this case based on who's there in their seat. That really diminishes our capacity for us to understand what the rule of law is supposed to be about. Then it's not about the facts. It really is about an ideology that people bring to a already predetermined case. And they've already had a predetermined outcome even before the facts were being brought to them. Mind you, he's in appellate. He's in an appellate rule. So, you know, most of the facts that they're going to get to kind of come from briefs, maybe some brief oral arguments and may be added to how they discuss the briefs if they're having additional questions before they go back in the briefing. But I think you still want to be open to the curiosity of it rather than bringing your ideology so fixed that no matter what facts you see, your outcome is already determine.

[00:21:37] **Speaker 2** What would you say to the voters out there who would look at you and say, well, you're a black man from Dane County, so you clearly are going to be a liberal. I know how you're going to vote all the time.

[00:21:46] **Speaker 1** I would say to them, I would say, just pay attention to my judicial record. Sometimes you vote with you vote with the facts that you have in front of you. You make sure you make decisions that you want to rule so that everybody has a fair shot, not just one conservative or liberal. You want to make sure that you are paying attention to the body of work. And I have, you know, at times when I have had liberal litigants and probably would have won their respect had I rule, but their facts did not support it, know that the rule of law support that. So you make a decision based on that. And all of my decisions really have been rooted in understanding the facts in front of me and following the rule of law, even if it doesn't mean even if it does mean that I'm not necessarily ruling with someone who who leans more liberal.

[00:22:31] **Speaker 2** There's a good chance that if you win that redistricting, there's some issues surrounding that could come back to the the Supreme Court. What what do you think needs to be done? How how should the court interplay with the politics surrounding redistricting in Wisconsin?

[00:22:46] **Speaker 1** You know, I can't speak on all those issues, but I will say that quite honestly, the issue of redistricting really is I think that has been felt by so many Wisconsinites. And as you kind of traveled throughout the state, you get a sense of how people are feeling that, yes, they have the ability to vote and they have that ability to go and cast a ballot, but they've lost their voices. And they this is the concern and anxiety among so many Wisconsinites is that their voices have been being taken away based on how states have been gerrymandered and these maps have been drawn. So I think it's value, always value, you know, making sure that people have access to vote. And I think they want to make sure they have access to voices. These cases around gerrymandering and maps have really brought the community into a more engaged conversation in their communities about why this why this is important, and a hope that the Wisconsin community keeps this energy and learns more and learns more and more about maps and why it's important for us to make sure that we have equal representation across the board.

[00:23:49] **Speaker 2** Another important issue that's likely going to come to this next court has to do with abortion, the 1849 law. You've already spoken out how you feel that Dobbs was an incorrect ruling. Is there a correlation between Dobbs and any abortion related case that the Wisconsin Supreme Court could hear? Or are they separate?

[00:24:05] **Speaker 1** I mean, it was, I think, separate. DOBBS The overturning Roe, you know, sent it back in many ways for states to define, you know, the role in understanding what that state's constitution says related to reproductive choice and access. The Dobbs decision was one of those decisions where it was the first time I saw in my lifetime that the Supreme Court went back and removed a right that it had granted before and used the idea of precedence in order to enable to do so is different than all the different ways in which they have used precedent before to overturn bad decisions that were inconsistent with where the public was going. The public wasn't against, you know, reproductive choice and access in many places the court was. And so when it comes back to the Supreme Court or comes back to the states, it's going to really be up to the states to be able to have a conversation about what that looks like. And again, you know, they're going to be many facts that will be brought to bear to understand. What exactly in our state constitution looks at this level of privacy and what that privacy may mean for reproductive choice. And so those would be conversation that we haven't had yet, but we'll see them coming through probably this upcoming, if not this Supreme Court, then the next next one.

[00:25:17] **Speaker 2** One of the phrases that gets tossed around a lot is the judicial activism. What does that mean to you? Does it have a meaning that you think most people can agree on?

[00:25:24] **Speaker 1** I think it just basically means that judges are involving themselves in creating legislation from the bench, that they are not just following the rule of law, but they're actually taking a more proactive stance in their rulings to impact decisions that are being made. So, you know, they you know, an example of judicial activism in some way, in some ways is the Roe decision overturning Roe, because in many ways, they were asking for and doing something that the world wasn't really asking for. It was a conservative group as an act of what I thought was an act of conservative activism. So judicial activism really is that is, you know, legislation in creating legislation from your decision, which kind of interesting because in many ways, if anybody has ever been a circuit court judge, you're always asked to make decisions for which there are no answers, both in statute or case law. And so you have to be active, you know, in creating fairness. You have to be active in creating justice outcomes for people. You have to be active in the community to make reforms to make our community better. And so, you know, as in many ways, there's a political term that's made to distract us away from the role that judges really in every day just really do, because they're not it's not always defined clearly what you're supposed to do and how you're supposed to rule and make these decisions.

[00:26:47] **Speaker 2** This is going to be one of the most highly anticipated Supreme Court elections in the state's history. Are you getting that sense from people you're talking to that they understand the magnitude, the fact that there are a lot of people outside of Wisconsin paying attention to the significance of this race?

[00:27:02] **Speaker 1** I think they are. I think what you've got to understand, a lot of Wisconsinites, you know, of still struggle with inflation, you know, jobs and joblessness and rents that are skyrocketing. I mean, how much it costs to get a carton of eggs now? I mean, it used to be go to quick trip eBay to get something that now since those days are gone. So I think the everyday struggles that a lot of Wisconsinites are facing, that's what I've heard when I travel throughout the state. When it's sucking up that energy and I think as we kind of turn more toward February, it'll give us more ability for people to say, okay, well, how does this matter to me? How how is it? And I think if a campaign is effective, and I think we've been effective in many different places, helping people understand that court systems have a direct impact on your life, how does it impact you? Well, you feel that in November with Jerry Manning, How does it impact you? You fill it with incarceration and the impact of incarceration has on minority communities. How does it impact you? Well, the Supreme Court is reviewing Equality India Child Welfare Act and its potential impact on our native indigenous communities, translating the need for having people who understand the world of issues that so many Wisconsinites feel is going to be important to getting people to understand why this race is important and significant.

[00:28:17] **Speaker 2** Finally, the most difficult question Can you say Janet's last name?

[00:28:20] **Speaker 1** Protasevich. I really do hate that. You know, I'm not I think everybody should be paying attention to ever. MITCHELL But I do think out of respect for people, you know, that just comes from my own level of pain that my ancestors dealt with when people just didn't respect your name and, you know, intentionally disrespected you. But, you know, Protasevich is a last name.

[00:28:42] **Speaker 2** Very good. I'm pressed because we were struggling that with the newsroom all over. Yeah. All right. Thank you so much for your time.

[00:28:47] **Speaker 1** No problem.

[00:28:48] **Speaker 2** You made it through. Now, was that adverse? Was that friendly? I don't know how to define.

[00:28:51] **Speaker 1** No, it was good. I mean, I can ask all those questions, so.

[00:28:55] **Speaker 2** You know, the answer is, yeah, that's what I'm going to need. Okay. You know, do you know what the clap is? The the soundboard thing from Hollywood. Do you want to do that? You know, we can sync up the two audio and video channel, so the branding in frame up in the shot and give you the big alligator clapping. All right, whenever you're ready. All right, We're good. We're good. All right. Well, thank you again. All right. We'll see you. Thanks, John. Oh, we did. Okay. Oh, yes. Let me run upstairs and get a thing. I'm glad.