

Geoff: Hello, and welcome to the Inequality Podcast. I'm Geoff Wodtke. One of the biggest drivers of inequality in the United States over the past half-century has been mass incarceration. Today on the show, you'll hear from two scholars who have studied the history and impact of mass incarceration. In the first segment, you'll hear my conversation with Chris Muller. Chris is a sociologist at Harvard, and he studies the political economy of incarceration. In our conversation, he traces a more than 150-year history of mass incarceration and its interplay with the demand for labor. After that, I'm joined by my co-host Damon Jones for a conversation with Hedy Lee. Hedy is a sociologist at Duke, and her work explores the impact of mass incarceration on the families of those imprisoned. But first, here's my conversation with Chris Muller.

Geoff: It's a pleasure to welcome you, Chris. Thanks so much for joining us.

Chris: Thanks for having me.

Geoff: Maybe we'll begin with just the historical background of this problem. I wonder if you could start by telling us a little bit about the long-term trends in incarceration over time in the US and how racial inequalities and maybe also class inequalities in imprisonment have evolved over the long run.

Chris: The most well-known trend is the trend in the US imprisonment rate. From the 1920s to the early 1970s, the US imprisonment rate hovered around 100 per 100,000 people. Then beginning in 1973, it exploded, reaching five times its 1970 level in the year 2000. That's typically the trend that people talk about when they talk about mass imprisonment. The other trend people talk about is that as the imprisonment rate increased, the ratio of the Black and white imprisonment rates remained extremely high. For most of the four decades when the imprisonment rate was rising, Black Americans were incarcerated at about six times the rate of white Americans. What's less well known is that the racial disparity in incarceration actually long preceded the prison boom. In some of my earliest work, I showed that the racial disparity in incarceration in the North actually exceeded six to one as early as the first decade of the 20th century. In some of my other work, I looked at the state of Georgia, where the Black to white ratio in imprisonment was actually greater than 12 to one as early as 1880. There are also some geographical patterns in incarceration that a lot of people are surprised to learn. One of those is that the Black incarceration rate was lower in the South than in the North for much of the 20th century. And even more surprising to some people is that it was lowest in the South's cotton belt, the same region where slavery had been most prevalent. On the class story, I think we've begun to see some recent changes. Since the beginning of the 21st century, we've begun to see declines in the imprisonment rate of Black Americans, particularly those with low levels of education.

And we've begun to see increases in the prison admission rate of white people with no college education. That's led for the first time to declines in racial disparity in imprisonment and increases in educational inequality in imprisonment. The other thing I would say is that racial and class inequality are tightly intertwined. Even though the racial inequality in incarceration is falling and educational inequality is widening, it's still the case that Black Americans with high levels of education and income are more likely than white Americans with low levels of education and income to experience the imprisonment of a family member or to live in a neighborhood with a high imprisonment rate. There are reasons for that that we could discuss.

Geoff: What might help us explain some of these broad historical trends? In some of your past research, you've referred to concepts like exploitation and exclusion as central to the trajectory of incarceration rates. What do these two concepts mean to you or maybe to sociologists more generally, and how do they relate exactly to changes in racial and class inequality in incarceration that we've seen historically in the US?

Chris: In sociology, when we talk about incarceration, we often talk about broad terms like oppression, but I think it's really important to distinguish exploitation on the one hand and exclusion on the other, because the empirical implications of these two different kinds of domination are really different. If you take the simplest possible picture of the economy, you have employers competing over market share, you have workers competing over jobs, and you have employers hiring workers. Employers are effectively trying to exclude their competitors, and one way they do that is by trying to produce things using fewer or cheaper workers, often by introducing new technologies, and that can lead to fluctuations in the demand for labor. Competition between working people, on the other hand, especially when combined with ideas of group difference, can exacerbate group-level divisions. But relations between employers and workers are different. Employers derive economic benefits from the labor of workers, so when their demand for work is high, they want to exploit, not exclude workers, because they depend on workers' labor. How is all this related to incarceration? There are a few ways. Competition among employers can lead to changes in labor demand that can affect crime. But beyond that, there were periods in US history when employers could directly affect the incarceration rate, particularly in the US South. When their demand for workers was high, they actually tried often to prevent workers from going to prison, which had the side effect of lowering the incarceration rate. And lastly, competition over jobs and necessities like housing can lead working people to support punitive measures directed against their perceived competitors.

Geoff: Continuing on this theme of exploitation, exclusion, and the role of employers in shaping incarceration: you mentioned that

throughout much of US history, the incarceration rate for Black Americans was lower in the South than in the North, and within the South, lower in the cotton belt. How might we use the concepts of exploitation and exclusion and dynamics in the demand for labor to explain this seemingly paradoxical pattern?

Chris: It's well known that during slavery, the South's Black incarceration rate stood out mainly for how low it was. People like Du Bois and others recognized that because slaveholders depended on the labor of enslaved people, they had little reason to send them away to be punished through state prison systems. One of the things I've tried to show in my work is how the same dynamic actually carried over into the post-Bellum period. When people talk about incarceration after the Civil War, they mainly focus on what's called the convict lease system. This was a system in which states punished people by leasing them to private companies. It was an extremely brutal form of punishment; people caught in it worked in terrifying conditions and in many cases, were literally worked to death. Because of its brutality and because of the fact that people caught in it were often bought and sold, the convict lease system has often been compared to slavery, and it's really hard to look at pictures of people in the convict lease system and miss that resemblance. But some people take the argument further, arguing that convict leasing was a kind of functional replacement for slavery, and it's this argument that's a little harder to sustain, for two main reasons. The first is that the scales of the two systems were completely different. Before the Civil War, the vast majority of Black people in the South were enslaved, whereas after the Civil War, just a small fraction were confined in the convict lease system. The second is that slavery was a predominantly agricultural institution, but most people in the convict lease system were leased to industrial rather than agricultural employers. Just like slaveholders before them, planters had an interest in keeping workers out of prison rather than in it. Planters had several different ways of doing this. Some of them served as character witnesses or used their influence over local courts, intervening in prosecutions. Other planters just punished workers themselves, oftentimes using violence. But they also used courts to procure a supply of forced labor: they would gather at courthouses and offer to pay the fines of people who had been convicted. Then they would force these people to work to pay off the debt. Defendants in these courts faced the impossible dilemma of choosing between the brutality of the convict lease system on the one hand and the trap of peonage on the other. Because people whose fines were paid didn't enter state custody, this form of peonage, which is sometimes called the criminal surety system, had the side effect of holding the South's Black incarceration rate down. Another way to put it is that it was the threat of incarceration, more than its realization, that enabled planters to establish a coerced labor force after the Civil War. Rather than view the South's comparatively low Black incarceration rate as an indication of the region's mercy or leniency, we should instead view it as an indication of continuing

Black exploitation outside of the prison.

Geoff: It seems pretty clear that the demand for labor is closely linked with some of these trends we've been discussing. One of the major shocks to labor demand that you've written about, in the US South in particular, was the boll weevil infestation. What are boll weevils, and why did they wreak havoc on the US South's agricultural sector in particular? And how did this impact incarceration rates?

Chris: The argument that planters' demand for labor held the South's, and particularly the cotton belt's, Black incarceration rate down implies that declines in agricultural labor demand should have pushed the Black incarceration rate up. I teamed up with Dan Schrage, who's a fantastic sociologist at USC, to study the boll weevil infestation, which was one of the most notorious shocks to agricultural labor demand in the history of the South. Boll weevils are small beetles, and their life cycle completely revolves around the cotton plant, which means if they infest land planted in cotton, it could cause great destruction to the cotton harvest. We paired maps of the infestation from the US Department of Agriculture with archival records of prison admissions. We found that the infestation increased the Black prison admission rate for property crimes by more than a third. Because there are no data on crime or peonage in the early 20th century, we couldn't definitively determine how much of the effect was driven by increases in crime versus decreases in peonage. But we did find that the infestation only affected Black prison admissions for crimes that could be punished with a fine, not admissions for crimes that had to be punished with a prison sentence. It was only these fineable crimes that allowed planters to entrap workers in peonage. This fact, together with qualitative evidence we gathered from historical sources, suggests that planters' practice of paying fines fell along with cotton yields and led the Black incarceration rate to rise.

Geoff: A few decades after the boll weevil infestation, there was another major shock to labor demand in the US South: the mechanization of cotton harvesting, where basically cotton gathering by human labor was essentially displaced almost entirely and very rapidly by machines. Could you tell us a little bit about this process and how it may have affected subsequent trends in incarceration in the South?

Chris: Between 1950 and 1970, the percentage of US cotton harvested by machine rose from 5% to almost 100%. I think there were three main ways that this massive change in agricultural production might have affected the incarceration rate. The first is that it accelerated the decline of young Black men employed in agriculture. In 1940, almost a third of young Black men worked in agriculture, but by 1970 that figure had fallen below 3%. There's been a lot of work on the effects of de-industrialization on incarceration, but much less emphasis on the collapse in agricultural employment, and this is particularly

important because the share of Black men employed in agriculture actually exceeded the share employed in industry. But there are two more indirect paths through which mechanization could have affected incarceration. We know that it strengthened the ongoing Black migration North, and it also helped to create the conditions for the civil rights movement. There's a ton of scholarship arguing that the conservative reaction to both of these transformations was an important cause of mass incarceration. The way I think about it is that mechanization was a necessary but insufficient condition for mass incarceration. We could have responded in different ways to this labor displacement, but without it, we might not have gotten mass incarceration.

Geoff: So it's the intersection of this big shock to labor demand and then the political and social reaction to the civil rights movement that sort of arose at least in part out of that process.

Chris: That's right.

Geoff: I'm curious to learn more about recent trends. The incarceration rates shot up in the 1980s and 1990s and have tapered off a bit in the last decade, but still remain high in an international comparative perspective. Over this period, you also mentioned there's been a shift in the racial and class dynamics of incarceration, with rising incarceration rates among white Americans, particularly those with lower levels of education. Are these more recent trends linked with shifting dynamics of exploitation, exclusion, and labor demand, and if so, what's the story more recently?

Chris: I mentioned some of this at the beginning, but I'll rehash some of it. This is work I've done with Alex Roehrkaase at Butler University, a fantastic sociologist. It's descriptive work, so we can only speculate about the causes. What we found is that starting in the 21st century, the prison admission rate of low-education Black Americans fell dramatically, and the imprisonment rate of low-education white Americans began to increase. What that meant for racial inequality in incarceration is that there was a decline in racial disparity in prison admissions: it's now about two to one, down from above six to one in the mid-1990s. It's important to point out that this is still an extremely high disparity, but relative to the historical trend, there's been a pretty marked decline. At the same time, we've seen a massive explosion in educational inequality in incarceration. The no-college to any-college ratio in prison admissions rose from about six to one in the early 1980s to more than 22 to one for Black Americans and more than 28 to one for white Americans. Some things I think are probably related. I think some of the decline in the prison admission rate of low-education Black Americans was almost certainly due to the de-escalation of the drug war, and I'm doing some work right now desegregating the trends by

offense type, and we're seeing some evidence consistent with that. But I do suspect that there were some deeper causes related to labor demand, because we're seeing so many trends pointing in the same direction. The economists Anne Case and Angus Deaton have documented almost the identical pattern in life expectancy. And Raj Chetty and his co-authors have some new work finding very similar patterns in intergenerational mobility. Both of these teams have connected their results to declines in the demand for low-education workers that are hitting white Americans today much like they hit Black Americans earlier in the 20th century. But again, racial and class inequality are tightly intertwined. Because of the legacies of slavery, like the Black-white wealth gap and residential segregation, we do see a different story when it comes to patterns of exposure to neighborhoods with high levels of incarceration and exposure to family members who have been incarcerated. I think the racial and class inequality need to be thought about together.

Geoff: It does seem like at various points in both recent history and the more distant past, criminal justice policy has taken very different approaches to work: can you work while incarcerated, how much do you get paid, is it a reward or a punishment? It seems like recently, the ability to work while incarcerated has been dangled as a kind of carrot or reward for good behavior. Given everything we've talked about, where do you think that policy should head?

Chris: This is enormously complex, and I don't have especially well-formed thoughts about it. One of the reasons for the complexity is that it's hard to look at in-prison work and not see it as exploitation. And at the same time, you'll often find people who are in prison talk about the work they did while incarcerated as some of the most meaningful things they've done, which may just be a reflection of the fact that we as a society haven't given them enough opportunities to do meaningful things outside of prison. Take, for example, the fire camps in California: people doing the heroic work of fighting fires when they were raging out of control. A lot of people write about that as the best part of their experience while incarcerated, even though it's dangerous, exploitative work. When I was at Berkeley, I worked with an extraordinary team of formerly incarcerated undergraduates and people with connections to incarcerated people in their lives. They did an amazing project interviewing people who had worked in California fire camps while incarcerated. One of the big things they point out is that people do this work and then they get out, and oftentimes they can't get jobs doing that on the outside. I think there's also been a shift in thinking: a lot of the historical work on incarceration and employment has been about exclusion from the labor market. But people like Adam Reich, Sandra Smith, and Jonathan Simon are thinking about how a criminal record can actually facilitate exploitation, because precisely the exclusion from some forms of employment because of a criminal record makes people getting out of prison more exploitable.

So there's a relationship between exploitation and exclusion that I think people are just starting to investigate, and I think that's really important, promising work.

Geoff: That was fascinating, and I learned a lot.

Chris: Thanks a lot for having me.

Geoff: It's natural to focus attention on people most directly affected by mass incarceration: the people actually in prisons. But Hedy tries to get us to widen our scope. Her work reveals the emotional, social, and even physical toll that incarceration extracts on the families of incarcerated people: the mental anguish associated with thinking about prison conditions, the knowledge that a loved one is under constant threat of violence, and the literal costs like overpriced commissary and phone calls. Her work has been eye-opening for me, and I hope it will be for you, too. Here's Hedy.

Damon: Research tends to focus on the impacts directly on those who are incarcerated, but there's less attention focused on the spillovers to the families. Can you give us some context on how prevalent this is, how likely it is for someone to have a family member who's incarcerated, and how that might vary across different groups?

Hedy: We have extremely high rates of incarceration in the US, and that's, of course, going to have implications for the people connected to those who are incarcerated. I mean, we can think about a large range of people: family members, but also friends and other members of communities that have connections to these individuals. Family member incarceration, in particular, is pretty common in the US. We know from recent data that about 45% of all Americans have had an immediate family member who has ever been incarcerated. There are disparities: 60% of African Americans have ever had an immediate family member who has ever been incarcerated. But it's still high for white populations, at 42%, and for Latinx populations, it's 48%. So we're talking about a large swath of the population who has some connection to the criminal justice system, either directly or indirectly, and this is a group that gets lost in policy discussions often. In some ways, it makes sense because we have such a huge issue just in terms of addressing the overrepresentation of people of color in prisons and jails, and just overrepresentation in general, and the use of incarceration to address all kinds of issues in the United States that don't happen in other countries in the same way. But we also need to be thinking about how those experiences of incarcerated individuals have really important consequences for the people that love them.

Geoff: You have this really interesting paper called "Indebted by Proxy," where you draw on this analogy about how incarceration is like paying a debt to society, but family members indirectly pay a debt. What does that look like on the ground for families?

Hedy: When we're thinking about consequences for family members, they range from economic to social. Family members who are removed from households are often contributing to families, whether through providing additional income or sometimes child care support. So the removal of a family member increases the economic burden on those who are left behind, often women, especially if there are children, who do the caretaking. In addition to that, when individuals are incarcerated, prison and jail systems are not adequate in terms of providing food and other items that one needs. What that means is that individuals who are left behind are now not only dealing with having less income, but also having to figure out how they're going to provide for that family member who's now incarcerated in terms of providing money to the commissary. Staying connected to family members who are incarcerated requires additional costs: travel time and potentially missing work. Those things are often not thought about, but are a huge expense. And the emotional costs are also huge: the loss of a family member is a traumatic event, the loss of having a parent or a romantic partner, in addition to the worry that goes along with having a person incarcerated and wondering what's going to happen to them.

Damon: I just wanted to piggyback on two of the things that just came up. When you're talking about the financial costs, I always think about the fact that all the services that incarcerated people have are basically provided by monopolies. To communicate, to send an email, to make a phone call, they're paying absorbent prices to communicate with their family members. So, above and beyond whatever the sentence or the punishment is, there's this additional extraction of profits by companies because they can charge basically whatever price they want. The other thing I've been thinking about: there have been some recent studies looking at Ohio, where they found that when a father gets incarcerated, the kids' test scores and other educational outcomes showed some improvements. One way to interpret that is that incarceration removed a parent who was harming the child's education. But I've been thinking about it differently: if your parent is a target of many forms of discrimination or economic challenges or sources of disruption, the fact that they're not in the household could improve that child's outcome, not necessarily because of what the parent is doing, but because the parent faces a lot of things that then spill over into the household. And those things are policy decisions, or part of a greater interaction between many different factors. So when a parent is gone, and something's changed, we can think of it as all the parent's responsibility, all the parent's behavior; or it could be the constellation of things the parent experiences that are removed. But those things don't necessarily have to be there if the parent is in the household.

Hedy: I think those are really great points. It reminds me of a paper written by Michael Massoglia in the American Sociological Review,

where he was looking at neighborhood attainment post-incarceration for Black men and white men. What he found was that for white men, the neighborhoods they returned to were worse than the ones they had lived in before entering prison. For Black men, there was no difference, but that's because they were already living in neighborhoods that were highly segregated and therefore under-resourced. So I think we really need to think through when we're interpreting results, especially when we're thinking about racial variation: we need to be thinking through the other policies that put people at risk of being policed, and that also increase their risk of incarceration, and also how those are impacting their other family members who are being exposed to these same stressors.

Damon: To continue with these effects on family members: can you talk in particular about the health consequences for family members of those who are incarcerated and how that might vary by gender?

Hedy: There's a growing body of research that has identified many kinds of health impacts from having a family member who is incarcerated, ranging from mental health outcomes to physical health outcomes, including things like cardiovascular disease. Mechanisms that have been discussed to help us understand how these experiences get under the skin include things we've talked about before: economic stress, but also other forms of social stress that can then impact physical well-being through health behaviors and also through direct biological pathways. One of the things that is less focused on is the gender-differentiated health consequences. The research is a little more mixed here, depending on the papers you read. There has been work to suggest that there are health consequences for all family members across all demographic groups, but there are things we should be thinking about that may be particularly impactful for women and that might therefore make them potentially more vulnerable to these experiences. One is that women in our society, at least in many societies, are socialized to be the caretakers and are expected to be the caretakers of family members. That means they have additional burdens in terms of expectations for caretaking of those who are behind bars, and also those who are not. This leads to mounting stress for women that may differ from the experiences that men might have. If we believe that chronic stress is the mechanism that might link these experiences, women are potentially experiencing more of it.

Geoff: We've talked a lot about the consequences of incarceration for family life and the health of family members, but as you note and have grappled with directly in a lot of your research, there are some really thorny methodological problems tied up with identifying effects of incarceration on the health of family members. I wonder if you could tell us a little bit about what some of those challenges are and what the frontiers are in this particular area of research.

Hedy: There are definitely some big issues, not just in terms of

thinking about these sorts of indirect contacts and the difference between actually being incarcerated versus being somebody connected to somebody who's incarcerated. I think these are issues that span the gamut for work where we're trying to understand and disentangle the impacts of criminal legal contact. The carceral system is just one system, and it's connected to many other kinds of systems that serve to replicate, amplify, or substitute for some of the same functions of the criminal legal system in ways that can be harmful for family members as well as individuals who have direct contact with the criminal legal system. What that means is that it's sometimes hard to identify the actual effect of the criminal legal system because it doesn't operate alone. I think people who study structural racism would say this is a big part of the argument: that we treat these systems as separate, even when, as we talked about in the earlier question, criminal justice policies are not the only policies we need to be focusing on to understand the rise in mass incarceration. Some people would ask, what about the economic policies that also led to some of these increases? That makes it really tricky to say, this is the treatment; this is just the treatment here. There are more intuitive examples in terms of thinking about the ways in which school systems also serve as populations of control and surveillance, through school resource officers, for instance, that scholars have written a lot about. There's other work from scholars talking about the ways healthcare systems serve some of these same functions. Identifying the treatment is really, really hard, harder than I think we want to believe, and it also might be why we don't see what we expect to see when we hypothesize. Thinking about educational outcomes, I think about the work of Roland Fryer, who sometimes finds no effects for Black kids or sometimes positive effects. The other thing, which may also be hard to identify but there is some work now trying to get at it, is the macro treatment of the criminal justice system. We talked about the huge proportion of the population impacted by incarceration when we're thinking about who's connected: 62% of African Americans have had a family member incarcerated. What does that mean for the neighborhoods and communities they live in? Could that be depressing the actual relationship you might be interested in? There's also just the realities of attrition in a lot of the datasets we use to try to understand these relationships.

Damon: Yeah, I think you make a really good point: just as we talked about the stress and how that affects health, me being an economist and looking at the applied work in economics, we want to say, okay, an individual gets incarcerated, what happens next? That's a lot of the focus of the causal literature. But if I'm at risk of being incarcerated, but I'm never incarcerated, that can still generate stress. As you're pointing out, there's a difference between individual incarceration and the effect of mass incarceration, which is more of a systemic type of apparatus. One question I want to ask you: you've mentioned before that you think you want to integrate more humanities into sociology or sociological research. Can you talk a

little bit about what that looks like or what that has looked like for you?

Hedy: I'm not trying to discount the strong associations that some parts of sociology have had with the humanities for a very long time. When I talk about this, I'm often talking to a particular audience: social scientists that are studying and trying to understand population health outcomes, and maybe also some parts of sociology that are using quantitative approaches to understand racial and social policies. There are a lot of pieces to this, but one for me is that we often talk about the need for improving our empirical or quantitative work by really thinking through the human condition in ways that will help us to better model and understand what's happening. I think that if we read more in the humanities and understood the work coming out of there, not just in history but even in literature, we could draw from those insights to inform our work in really meaningful ways, and even how we think about measurement and modeling. The idea that only people who run regressions understand measurement and modeling is a fallacy. There is a lot of work we can draw on to help us understand many different things. I'm even writing about floor effects and thinking about Toni Morrison's book *Sula*. She uses the term "the bottom" to describe neighborhoods that have been negatively impacted by racist economic policies, particularly in urban segregated areas; that's the setting she uses to describe the character in her book. There is even language that we can internalize and use to really inform our work that we're just not doing right now, and I think it just makes our work so much richer. There's so much evidence in the human experience in literature that could be really useful in thinking through some of the complexity, especially when we're looking at anomalous pieces, or when trying to understand outliers in our work. There's just this world of information that I think we could use to enrich our work.

Geoff: Your response reminded me of when I was in grad school, James Cook, who was a sociologist at Northwestern, came to give a talk about causal inference and he said something that's always stuck with me, which your comments reminded me of: basically that anyone interested in drawing causal inferences from quantitative data ought to be at least an amateur ethnographer, because it's so easy to misunderstand the data, what's missing from the data, what the data actually means, without having some understanding of the human experience on the ground that generated the data. We've talked a lot about the consequences of incarceration for family life and for the health of family members. I'm wondering if you could talk a little more about the policy implications of your research on this topic.

Hedy: I think there are some real issues that have to be dealt with as it relates to conditions of confinement. The conditions of confinement need to be addressed because at least some part of what creates stress for families is knowing or feeling as though their family members are

in a space that is not helping. Also, the cost of being connected is a huge issue. There's also the ways in which so many parts of the system, especially as it relates to how family members interact with the carceral system to stay connected, are outsourced and controlled by for-profit, sometimes quite predatory, outfits. I should probably also say that there is definitely a huge movement of scholars and civic leaders who have provided some compelling evidence about alternatives to the carceral system, i.e., let's abolish the system completely, because there is no way to fix it with any kind of policies; it's already broken and needs to be removed. I think that's an important viewpoint that needs to be critically examined when people are talking through these issues. That being said, there is also a lot of scholarship suggesting that replacing the carceral system with another system may lead to the same kinds of consequences. There's work by Dorothy Roberts, for example, suggesting the child welfare system operates pretty similarly to the carceral system, and so whatever another system is going to look like, it requires some really critical thinking around the vision of what that is. We are definitely unique as a country in many ways, but there are definitely models from other countries that can be drawn upon to think about different visions for what it might look like for a person to be incarcerated: visions that don't completely isolate them from society and make it really difficult for their family members to be connected.

Damon: Well, Hedy, thanks so much for joining us.

Hedy: Thanks for having me.

Geoff: The Inequality Podcast is a production of the Stone Center for Research on Wealth Inequality and Mobility at the University of Chicago. I'm Geoff Wodtke. I'd like to thank our producer and engineer Shane McKeon, our assistant director Gerardo Espinal Franco for production oversight and more, and lastly our executive director Grace Kolavo for her support. You can get in touch with us at stonecenter@uchicago.edu. Thanks for listening.

This transcript has been prepared with the assistance of AI.