

bhtv-2015-05-15-loury-mcwhorter2

LOURY: Glenn Loury here at the Glenn Show, Bloggingheads.tv, talking with John McWhorter.

MCWHORTER: Glenn, thank you for having me back after a semester, when I had to dip out for a while.

LOURY: John, where have you been? John McWhorter -- Columbia University, and *Time Magazine*, and --

MCWHORTER: And Wall Street Journal and *Daily Beast* --

LOURY: -- Oh, he's just [punching?] all over the place. Where have you been? There are people writing in from our fandom saying, we want John McWhorter. We want John McWhorter, and all I've been able to do is find other conversation partners who are not John McWhorter.

MCWHORTER: Yeah. I felt stupid about that. I've been hearing that, too, but I had a semester where one, I had a new daughter, Vanessa --

LOURY: Congratulations.

MCWHORTER: -- and two -- thank you -- two, I taught music history for the first time, and since it's not really my area, I had to do a lot of class prep, and I just didn't have time to do anything, extra. But now school is over, and Vanessa is four months old, and so, I'm ready to jump back in. So much as happened.

LOURY: Allow me to tell people that you are a musician --
that I have seen you sitting at the piano, playing show
tunes --

MCWHORTER: Oh, that's right.

LOURY: -- and that you love it, and it's an abdication. You
are a linguist and a public intellectual, a Bloggingheads
personality, but you are also a musician --

MCWHORTER: That is --

LOURY: -- and I don't know that everybody knows that.

MCWHORTER: -- That is that another thing you can see little
pieces of me doing that online. I know you are a musician,
too. Although, I've never seen you do it.

LOURY: I am. I have a piano in my living room, and I play it
-- you know, I'm kind of self-taught. I'm not smooth, but
you know, it works, but jazz is my genre.

MCWHORTER: Exactly. I flirt with it. But yeah, one has to
do certain things on the side.

LOURY: So, we're talking exactly -- a lot has happened.
Baltimore and whatnot has happened. There was a big blow
out piece by Michael Eric Dyson in the *New Republic* taking
down --

MCWHORTER: The new *New Republic*.

LOURY: -- The new *New Republic* -- indeed -- taking down
Cornel West a peg or two, and --

MCWHORTER: Or three.

LOURY: -- and we've just come back, you and I from a conference with I put it those people, maybe why don't you explain to the viewers what that's about.

MCWHORTER: Well, that was interesting, because this was a conference on the 50th anniversary of the Moynihan report, and it was held by The Manhattan Institute, the think tank, the conservative, free market you can say -- the conservative think tank, which I work for -- was salaried by for the better part of 10 years, until 2010, and these are people who I was joshingly calling those people. These are people who you spent a lot of time with in an earlier stage of your career, and you and I were both there. I think you and I were both kind of happy to see people we had worked with and around again, but it was an interesting occasion, because at this point, I would say that certainly me, and I'm sure you, had disappointed many conservatives who thought that we were more purely on their side, and then turned out to not be in favor of this, that, and the other thing, and it was just interesting that we were there, because I had never adjured my task of being paid by The Manhattan Institute, and I'm not sure how you feel about what you sometimes called your flaming conservative past, but both of us now are just people who are sort of

caught in the middle, and I think I enjoyed that conference, and I had very interesting conversations with everybody there, including what I think was mostly black ones in terms of participants and the audience. It was a pleasant morning and afternoon. Didn't you think so?

LOURY: I did. I walked down memory lane, maybe a little bit. Yet there was so much packed in -- I love that word -- abjure -- I love that. I love it. But there was so much packed in in your little short segment just now. Yes, we are getaway former or recovering -- I mean, let me speak for myself -- conservatives. I don't know that you were ever a conservative. I certainly was one. You were --

MCWHORTER: I have --

LOURY: -- however, a fellow at --

MCWHORTER: -- never called myself --

LOURY: -- The Manhattan Institute, which is undoubtedly a conservative organization, and you left, and you're doing something else now, and I left. I was never on their payroll, John, but -- actually, yeah, when you think about the lecture fees and the invitations, and stuff like that, indirectly I didn't get a W-2 from a conservative organization, but I --

MCWHORTER: It's all of the body. Yeah.

LOURY: -- Anyway, so we both used to be among conservatives

more than we currently are, and so this conference called by The Manhattan Institute occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Moynihan report on the state of the then called "Negro Family" --

MCWHORTER: Which is online.

LOURY: -- the conference is online, and it's worth a look, I think to people. We found ourselves in the company of The Manhattan Institute. You, your former employers and colleagues, and me -- people with whom I had been associating, you know, openly you could say 10 years past. So, OK -- there was kind of that, and -- yeah, I found it to be an interesting experience on a number of levels. They -- that is the conservatives -- are not Darth Vader -- they're not that bad. They weren't mean spirited. There was pretty much an open discussion. It was about serious stuff. Heather Mac Donald, your former colleague at the *City Journal*, was one of the speakers, and took the point of view that she did on issues of crime and policing in America's cities. It's a conservative point of view. She's well-informed, and, you know, I thought presented herself very well. They were other -- a panel on the family that [offered to state it in?] which again I thought was robust, and Ron Haskins, from the Brookings Institution --

MCWHORTER: Yeah. He was an excellent panelist.

LOURY: -- very well-informed. There was a panel on education

--

MCWHORTER: We should say who your panel was -- Ron Haskins
and Bob Woodson --

LOURY: Thank you.

MCWHORTER: -- Kind of sparring in a robust, although civil
way, over the issue of academics, and social uplift and how
incompatible the two can be.

LOURY: Yes. Indeed. Bob Woodson of the Center for
Neighborhood Enterprise, an old school African American
conservative, activist, who believes in grass roots.

MCWHORTER: Why is he old school?

LOURY: Well, first of all, he's probably 70.

MCWHORTER: Old, maybe. I'm sure he would agree, but what is
old school?

LOURY: Well, because -- what did Bob say -- something like a
lot of his friends are ex -- like ex-prostitutes, ex-drug
dealers, and whatever. So, he was like touting his street
cred at a certain level. There's something that felt kind
of old school to me about that, and Bob's line, and with
respect to him, I admire him greatly, and so I will in a
short summary not do justice, which is there's knowledge,
and there's power residing in poor communities. Don't

count them out. Don't write them off. There not simply there as subjects to be helped. They have resources within their own kin to pull themselves up by their bootstraps. They have more resources. They have the energy. Give them enterprise. Get out of their way. You know, welfare is a soporific. Is that the word? You know, almost drug-like, putting people to sleep. Killing their initiative. You know, liberals and then pimping the poor. This is Bob. It's old school in the sense that, you know, he's been saying this since the 1970s.

MCWHORTER: Yeah. That's an old line, right.

LOURY: And that you know, they use the condition of the poor as an excuse to get more programs, which are basically are from the foundations of the government funding their salaries, and getting them time on TV [and whatnot?] like that. So, there was that kind of feud over to where Bob was coming from.

MCWHORTER: You know, I should say Glenn, also, because I don't think you're going to mention it, but you did a wonderful response to a couple of guys who were there, who apparently believe that black people are mentally inferior genetically -- and I'm sure they would say on the average, but still to other people, and you had one of those people who, you know, very civilly asked what you thought of that

theory that's most closely associated with Charles Murray and Robert Herrnstein --

LOURY: Richard Herrnstein. Yeah.

MCWHORTER: -- Richard Herrnstein's book, *The Bell Curve*, and you as somebody who is in a position to understand the numbers, with let's face it -- most of us aren't -- which were involved in that argument, pretty delightfully filleted the whole notion without being contentious, and I'm sure you get asked about that a lot, and so do I. If anyone wants the answer, they should look at the recording of that particular segment of this conference, because I thought your answer was very, well done.

LOURY: Thanks, John. I really appreciate that, and I'm not going to reprise my answer, but you've probably peaked people's curiosity a little bit, just to say --

MCWHORTER: Reference --

LOURY: The man's name is Jared Taylor, and he is well-known, where in Tory, as you might say for various right of center writings contra the claims of, you know, progressive African American, on the one hand, and also immigration, and one of his main arguments is that well, there are genetic differences and intellectual capacities of populations, and then, with respect to African Americans, their laggardly status is to some degree due to that, and

that needs to be -- we should be man enough, woman enough, honest enough to acknowledge that, and it has implications on the limits of various efforts we're going to be having, you know, this conversation 50 years from now, unless we get honest about [the pity] like that. So, to which I responded that he asked me two questions, he said, do you believe it's legitimate to talk about this? And then he said, and what do you think about -- his view was the evidence was that there were such significant differences, and my response was, yes, it's legitimate to talk about this. I wouldn't want to be a part of a society in which questions that were amenable to investigation on fact and scientific inquiry and careful study were taken off the table purely because it was politically unacceptable to raise them. This way lies tyranny. On the other hand, I was not afraid of the facts with respect to this question, and I didn't agree with the thesis that genetic inferiority figured in any important way and accounted for racial inequality in contemporary America, and I basically declared you can't snow me about this. I can read the statistics. I am trained. I'm MIT, PhD. I'm a fellow of the Econometric Society. You know, I took that book *The Bell Curve* in my bag, when I went for a month-long trip to India, and I spent a lot of time --

MCWHORTON: I liked that part --

LOURY: -- and I spent a lot of time with it [per force?].

But in any case, I had the book, I read the appendices. I know Charles Murray. He's not exactly a friend of mine anymore, because I've written quite vigorously -- my critical reactions to *The Bell Curve*, and so on. But in any case, I wasn't afraid of the question, and I tried to answer it -- rather than running, screaming from the room -- rather than playing what might have been a certain kind of race card by getting offended -- how dare you? You know, I mean, you can see the performance that I might've rendered there --

MCWHORTON: And it wouldn't have been an answer.

LOURY: -- It would not have been an answer, and he would've basically, won, on his terms.

MCWHORTON: Exactly.

LOURY: See he's afraid to even engage the question. He has to come out of that bag, you know, and he's used to being called a bad name, and whatnot. So, I think my move was the better move.

MCWHORTON: You know what? You know what we need to say about this -- come to think of it -- to the extent that what we're doing right now is as if we're writing something, and we're referring people to things, and in

this increasingly oral society, as I wrote in a piece in *The Daily Beast* last week -- something needs to be said about those people. The Manhattan Institute -- we're going to talk about this conservative think tank world, and what the hell you and I were doing in it. The Manhattan Institute did not invite them, and during the break, I asked the head of The Manhattan Institute, who were those two people, and he was completely perplexed that they were not invited. They were not on any kind of panel, and it actually reminded me of something, which is that The Manhattan Institute, in particular, you can talk about what's wrong with conservatives, etc. One of my earlier events with them, one of the board members, who was like something out of a John Cheever novel -- he was drunk -- drunk in the old style way, at some of event, and he said -

-

LOURY: Only a WASP can be drunk --

MCWHORTON: -- in that kind of you know, he was from before alcoholism was considered a disease --

LOURY: -- mad men --

MCWHORTON: -- Yeah. This was a very mad man, except the year was about 2001, and I think he either didn't know I was in the room, or forgot, and on like drink six, he held up his glass, and he said, and here's to the propagation of

the white race.

LOURY: Oh, no!

MCWHORTON: He did say it --

LOURY: Oh, wow.

MCWHORTON: -- and the room went silent, and to be honest, for me it was like -- anthropology was like -- there was no mad men yet -- for me it was like so this is what somebody like that actually sounds like.

LOURY: From that era.

MCWHORTON: And everybody just went silent, and I should say, that The Manhattan Institute was embarrassed and they fired him from the Board the next day, and so it isn't that The Manhattan Institute harbors people like that, and that you and I are walking around in the room tolerating -- I should also say that he dropped dead about a month after that, which was just some sort of dramatic, you know, [due condensol?], but that is something. So, The Manhattan Institute does not foster people like that.

LOURY: That's worth saying, John. I think that's good. Actually, you know, The Manhattan Institute separated from Charles Murray, when Charles took up the project of that ultimately became *The Bell Curve*.

MCWHORTON: Exactly.

LOURY: I don't know exact chapter history of, you know,

chapter in terms of that history, but I'm pretty sure I'm accurate in saying that they disassociated themselves, and Murray moved to the American Enterprise Institute from The Manhattan Institute, roughly at that time, and maybe, he would've moved anyway, but --

MCWHORTON: No. I heard that many times that they disassociated themselves, because of that --

LOURY: And Larry Mone you mentioned, the head of The Manhattan Institute, in the elevator on the way out the building, he apologized to me for that question coming from the floor, saying, as you just reported, he had no idea those people were in the room. They weren't invited. Those people quote on quote. So, and I told him, no, I wasn't offended, you know, continuing not play the race card, continuing to be a level headed, objective scholar, who doesn't believe that the IQ deficiencies of African Americans is a socially significant, you know, explanation what do you call it. Anyway, yeah, so OK. I think we've done Manhattan Institute. Let's --

MCWHORTON: And what everybody wants is Baltimore -- the

LOURY: Everybody wants to hear from us about Baltimore. I don't think I need to summarize as a prelude. Baltimore, Freddie Gray. The convergence on Baltimore of the protests. Some indigenous. Some coming from outside. The

civil unrest. The reactions of various authorities, including the local prosecutor there. The indictment of police officers, and the discussion back and forth around the country about what it all means, on the op-ed pages of everywhere, and since John, you've not been available to do *The Glenn Show*, we've fallen behind in our commentaries, so --

MCWHORTON: And now it's peaked, but in a way, that's better, because nothing's going to catch us off guard, and I hate to say peaked about something so tragic, but it is no longer at the forefront of the news, and you know, to tell you the truth, it's really a good thing in a way, what has happened, because I'm not sure people realize if Freddie Gray had had his neck broken in a squad car, one year ago, just one year ago -- and I'm maybe jumping the gun a little in assuming that's what happened --

LOURY: Yeah, you are -- I don't think the jury's in on that, but in any case --

MCWHORTON: -- but let's say that happened. If that's what happened, this outcry, that sort of thing was happening all the time -- the country is at a point, where something like that can attract this much attention, which I think ultimately can go in a good direction, and a better one than Mike Brown. I think we both agree, because the facts

are rather clearer, and much less ambiguous in terms of who is to blame for what happened. So, I see that partly that we're at the point, where it's one thing after another. It's much harder for anybody, anywhere to get away with this sort of thing, because of the combination of cell phones, and social media, and I see that we might really be moving towards a change, which I was not sure I saw in the wake of Mike Brown last fall. Do you see something different going or just more of the same thing over and over again?

LOURY: Well, I don't know if we could have what we had in Baltimore, and by that I mean, if we can have the responsiveness and the attention to the possibility of grave injustice perpetrated in the case of Freddie Gray's taken into custody, placed in a police van, and somehow in that process comes to be fatally injured, and the police officer now going to be tried under, you know, criminal penalty threat, for what happened there, and we don't know, but the change that you call attention to, which is that now that's in the news. Now, that gets attention. Now, that gets a response.

MCWHORTON: Now, the cops actually, possibly, will be held responsible --

LOURY: Will be held responsible, whereas, before it might

have been swept under the rug. I think many people would say, well, no, Freddie Gray, and Mike Brown are different cases, and maybe Freddie Gray's case is more clear cut, again the facts aren't in, but it would not be implausible to imagine a finding that could come in. One thing we know, Freddie Gray didn't jack up any convenient store, you know. Freddie Gray didn't attempt to fight any officers for his weapon, and I think we're pretty clear on that. So, whatever might've happened there it contrasts with this other case. People would say that's a second order significance. What's important is that this profile began to be raised, and that this nascent movement that has been stimulated, and that has changed attitudes. That has demanded attention. That has gotten the response of politicians. That has gotten, you know, more ink, more TV, and whatever. So, that the environment within which the fair degree incident happen, which has had more desirable outcome then perhaps would've been the case in passing -- is an environment created by in large part the movement that came out of Michael Brown. So, they wouldn't want to separate it or even contrast the two.

MCWHORTON: Right.

LOURY: That's what I'm saying.

MCWHORTON: And you know it means also -- I think you and I

both agree that you were on it faster than I was, because in some ways, you were less sentimental than me. You were less sentimental about Obama, and I think you were less sentimental about Ferguson, and there's a part of me that wants to join the quote on quote good thinking view until it's absolutely impossible, but the Mike Brown case, I think we can see out loud, now, that what happened between those two people was not what everybody in a way wanted to think. Yet, the mood that it created -- the awareness that it created -- and despite the fact that there are people who are now going to go on forever, insisting that what they want to happen, happen. It did create something that could create change nevertheless, and will become a matter of historical footnotes, that what went on in Ferguson is not as clear cut as many people said, but nevertheless, a mood hit, and maybe that mood can create a more general change even if the initial circumstances were not as logical and morally easy as we might think. Would you agree with that -- that as disgusted as you were by the response to Ferguson, that maybe something came out of it?

LOURY: Yeah. Well, put John, and thank you for the complement, and not even a back handed compliment. I mean, I regard not being sentimental as a compliment, and I regard being out early on something that I get to be proved

more or less correct about, you know, as a [compliment to?] things. I'm not sure I entirely agree, but let me just respond briefly. One of the things that concerned me about Ferguson was the extent to which the quote movement was becoming vested in a particular narrative about what happened, which might be false, and I think that narrative proved to be false. Let me call it the hands that don't shoot narratives about what happened. Michael Brown the victim of -- just willfully unjustified, and then his body left to rot in the street. You know, the contempt -- black lives matter is an expression of, you know, revulsion in the face of the contempt presumed to have been had for the life of Michael Brown by that police officer, Darren Wilson, on that street in Ferguson, Missouri in August, and I feared that that narrative might be false, and I believe has been declared to have been false, and not only did the local grand jury there, but also by the Department of Justice of the United States of America's investigation of the incident itself concluding that the non-indictment of Darren Wilson was the correct response to the evidence and the facts as best they could be.

MCWHORTON: Exactly.

LOURY: So, I didn't want to see the kind of, you know -- I'm just going to hold on to this idea of what happened no

matter what, because I thought above all, it's kind of intellectually disquieting to me. It lacks in integrity, but it also that it might ultimately be ineffective. That it would allow, you know, it's conspiracy theory-esque, to the extent that the evidence would contra-- but you know people are going to be arguing this for a long time. I mean, my son, [Alton?], who lives in Chicago, is in his forties, and is a journalist, came to visit recently, and we would talk about this, and you know, talking about it carefully, because I think he wants not to give offense, you know, but he disagrees strongly, and when I said, you know, well, they didn't indict, you know, and the Feds back that up. His response was, well, he corrected me to say, what they said was evidence was insufficient to indict.

MCWHORTON: Right.

LOURY: OK. But I mean, he's reading that as, well, it still might be true, it's just that they didn't have the evidence to indict.

MCWHORTON: Exactly.

LOURY: And my idea is that all they could ever find by way of clearance -- some of they're not cleared -- it's his conclusion. They're not cleared, because all they said was they didn't have suff-- all a query can ever do is come to the conclusion that there's not sufficient evidence.

That's the only kind of clearing that's available to us -- is the conclusion that no charges are justified. So, my point is, you know, we're playing with words here at a certain level, because you know, a lot of people still want to believe what they want to believe about what happened there.

MCWHORTON: Yeah. I mean, that's interesting that the Mike Brown's friend, who gave a lot of importance to the hands of the --

LOURY: Who lied. OK. Come on, John. Excuse me for interrupting. He lied.

MCWHORTON: Well, yeah. It's clear that --

LOURY: Come on. He stood in front of the camera, and he said, I mean, I can't quote chapter and verse, and I don't want to get it wrong. Anybody can look it up, and this guy has a name, and I can't remember it -- Johnson.

MCWHORTON: Dorian Johnson.

LOURY: Dorian Johnson. He lied.

MCWHORTON: And you know something? Talk about sentimental. As soon as he first gave his account. I remember telling my wife, I get the feeling he's not telling the truth. Just the story he was telling seemed like something out of a movie, rather than something that an ordinary two people would go through, but I thought --

LOURY: I reached through the car window, and grabbed him by the throat.

MCWHORTON: -- Yeah, it never sounded right, but my inclination was that --

LOURY: He shot him in the back -- again, excuse me for interrupting, it's coming back to me now --

MCWHORTON: -- Yeah, and it didn't sound right to me, but I thought to myself, but I thought to myself, who am I to judge. This is somebody who goes through life dealing with a whole lot more than me. So, I went with it, but I must say that at the beginning I remember turning to my wife on the couch, and saying that story sounds like something somebody would write in a book, but then I gave in, and I didn't listen to myself for a long time. Yeah.

LOURY: So, Jonathan Capehart -- you know, Jonathan Capehart, the journalist at *The Washington Post* --

MCWHORTON: Who got torn to pieces for --

LOURY: -- He wrote a piece that people may not know -- he wrote a piece that basically -- apologizing in the wake of the justice department's --

MCWHORTON: In *The Washington Post* --

LOURY: -- because he had initially bought the narrative that Michael Brown was victimized in a way that proved ultimately not to have been the case, and believed the

testimony of people like Dorian Johnson, when it was initially offered, and then he said, basically, hands up don't shoot was a lie, and I'm sorry that, you know, I built in on the lie. Let's acknowledge the fact, and move on with our movement, and he got pillory for saying that.

MCWHORTON: Yeah. His Twitter feed just went crazy, and it ended up being a media story how much he was being ripped into, which to me, I guess this is sentimental, says to me there's such a pain in the black community about the police to the point that people are willing to bend facts, and therefore, the whole thing needs to be addressed, for people to look went on in Ferguson, and to look at the facts, and it's kind of like the O.J. episode, people are obsessed with these facts and everybody of all levels of education is studying this like tile mud, so everybody knows what the facts are and to come away from these facts with the idea that somehow, someday that kid must've been shot down in cold blood means that there's a hurt going on, and so we have to get beyond these particular facts and deal with the hurt in the black community about the cops, and I think if we got beyond it, we would see a very different America, as I have often said, and written. That's what this is all a symbol of. It's not that easy for any of --

LOURY: OK. So, now I'm going to disagree full-throatically, John. The hurt in the black community about the cops, etc., etc. --

MCWHORTON: You're kidding.

LOURY: -- Yeah, I know. I mean, no. I know. I can't believe it myself.

MCWHORTON: What is the disagreement with that?

LOURY: That there is hurt in the black community? Yes. OK. Who could deny that? That people, you know -- one way of encapsulating this is, you know, this reference to the talk, you know that blacks have to have with their sons and daughters about how to deal when they encounter police, and so forth and so on -- just about anybody in front of a camera with a suit and tie, or a woman dressed well, who's got some high position, who's African American addressing this issue has said, they have themselves got personal experience with profiling. They can relate to what people are talking about, because they -- including the president of the United States, the attorney general of the United States have both made these personal declarations --

MCWHORTON: Jonathan K. Park has written a column himself about the talk, before --

LOURY: -- You know, and I could tell -- Lord knows I can tell stories about me and the police, OK. Not all of them my

fault either, you all, but in any case, I grant all of that. I'm not disputing that, I'm not. The foundation of my full-throated disagreement with you, my friend John McWhorton goes back to this idea that, well, something good is coming here, because, you know, we finally got the covers pulled off, and we're calling attention to these things, and whatnot, and I think it misdiagnosis the problem. The problem is not police brutality. Although there is a problem of police bru-- but the capital T problem -- I mean, the problem here, I'm going to put it in broad terms, and narrow it down, and I'll try to be concise is that an incompleteness in the work that was supposed to be done by 1954 to 1970 -- OK -- and a lot of folks in that Baltimore community are left behind. Now, we can trot out the reasons why, but I can tell you, the Supreme Court's Rulings on Affirmative Action is not one of them. OK. That's not one of them. The indifference of a republican Congress, or whatever to the needs of the -- is not, in my opinion, one them, and, you know --

MCWHORTON: Why 1970? What's that?

LOURY: Well, I'm just trying to -- all these civil rights bills, and all this -- I'm just trying to state that --

MCWHORTON: The late '60s era.

LOURY: -- teach our transformation.

MCWHORTON: OK.

LOURY: I'm saying second reconstruction, if you like. OK.

From Brown all the way through great society. OK, and what I'm saying is those neighborhoods in Baltimore and the conservatives at (inaudible) have said this, but they're not wrong about everything. OK. A lot of money has been put in there. They have been under the governance of basically liberal democratic, at the local and state level, for a long time. The conversations about opportunity, jobs having fled -- I mean, I read an op-ed on the page of *The New York Times*, I wish I could give you the date, but it wouldn't be hard to find, in which they were citing, William Julius Wilson's 1996 book, *When Work Disappears*, chapter and verse, basically recapitulating the argument in the 500 or 750 words, accounting for the problem of Baltimore will always be with us, when we're in the 1996. Not that it's not right to the extent that as far as it goes, but I thought intellectually, man, you guys are exhausted. You guys being the liberal progressives, who are now, Baltimore's in flames. I heard what I regard to be idiotic and dangerous arguments about how you say, we don't get no justice if we do have peace. In other words, the civil unrest, the looting, rioting, and arson were the necessary counter point to a kind of low grade violence

against black people that's been going on for 300 years, and the only way we've ever done anything about it is to make a fuss, and whatever. I mean, these are in my mind just unbelievably dated and in some way irrelevant arguments to the situation that's going around. Why don't we, you know, start acknowledging -- and this goes to the Moynihan report, again -- the devastating consequences of fatherlessness, when it's combined with no money. So, we got a lot of families with kids, and then they don't have the resources. Yes, they're impoverished. The schools have failed. No, there aren't any jobs. The role models are terrible. The connection to the prison is intimate. The people are going back and forth, back and forth culturally. Relationships and whatnot across the prison wall -- gangs, drugs, the war on drugs, and violence, unbelievable violence. So, life expectancy numbers are moved by the homicide behavior of 18 to 35 year old African American men. They actually have first order effect in the life expectancy and the demographic tables. It's a major fact of our lives, now. In cities like Chicago, and like Philadelphia, and Baltimore, and so on. And yet, this failure, OK, gets assimilated to a 50-year-old account that basically, discrimination, racism -- it's not structural racism, it's been dressed up in a latter day -- but it's

just sophistry, and it's avoidance of the real issue. The issue is not police privation, though that is a problem that needs to be addressed, and police on accountability, though that is a problem. The issue is much, much deeper, and this population is being bypassed by wave after wave of non-European immigrant, who are also people of color. And so, the disconnect between what I read from the usual suspects at these websites, and on these op-ed pages, and the tragic reality of reproducing in the 21st century -- you think this the government's fault? You think this is because they didn't pass a program? I mean, come on, that requires a defense that I have yet to see effectively made, but thank you for allowing me to say all of that.

MCWHORTON: No. I understand, I agree with everything that you're saying, but it's just what do you make of it? I, too, have read all of the op-eds about Baltimore, where basically trots out their William Julius Wilson, and says that that explains what's going on, and therefore, the rioting must be understood, and I see it as a kind of soggy utopianism, because what that really means is that until we somehow recreate the conditions that poor black Americans had access to from roughly 1920 to 1960, then all we can expect is more of what we've got. I find that ridiculously unimaginative. I frankly find it intellectually flabby.

It's really essentially just sentimental. The reason that our Baltimore is the way it is, is partly racism, mostly racism in the past, but then you have a kind of a mouse trap, Rube Goldberg series of events, a lot of which I think involved the widening of welfare benefits in the late '60s, so that it was very easy to get on it, and nobody cared whether you got off it, or got a job. I think that really busted black communities apart, and I wrote about this in a piece in *The Daily Beast*, which I say was widely read, and commented on, because I said, that just to attribute all of this to racism is lazy thinking, but Glenn, here is somewhere that we've often wound up before. The question is what can we do about this? And the simple fact is -- and this gets back to that Manhattan Institute conference, where I think my main point was, and I think it was rather unwelcome to some of them -- if you stand up at a pulpit, or on TV, or anywhere else and tell people, stop this, stop raising children without a man, stop running away from your women and children, stop being violent boys, nothing's going to happen, and you might ask, well, how do you know nothing's going to happen. I would say, because we've been doing that for 50 years, and nothing happens, you know. Heather Mac Donald was very well-intentioned, but Heather Mac Donald writing that black communities are

going to have to clean themselves up -- she might as well be writing that weather is going to have to stop raining --

LOURY: But Barack Obama writing that, or you know Michelle Obama writing that --

MCWHORTON: -- And I'd still say that would have just as little affect -- and so my point being, what can be changed? And it seems to be that what can be changed, and what is in more of a position to change is the cops. The people who are in the inner cities doing the things that their doing. It's like somebody who's in Japan speaking Japanese, and you tell them, stop being Japanese, but they never knew any other language. It has to be something from the outside, and you know, if the cops could be pulled away, if there would be fewer opportunities for the cops and these black men to meet, the black men would for one thing feel less like they live in an alien world. A lot of why they feel as if they're pinned into their own communities is because most of the white people they meet are cops, and you know my whole spiel about the drug war and how many people that puts in prison -- if there were no drug war, fewer people in prison, more two-parent families. All of those are things that I think we could say, hey, let's change this. You can't tell some guy who's 22 years old, and packing heat, and fixing to settle some score by

going and shooting somebody, hey, look [Daquan?], stop it. Frankly, he's not interested. We can't save that. We have to change the community from the outside.

LOURY: Well, who are we, I think, needs to be asked here. I agree that the government, you know, the politicians, the legislature cannot change that. I think, though, that educational institutions can play a certain role.

MCWHORTON: What leads you to think that?

LOURY: Well, I mean, for example, we think sex education and the people who abdicate it -- there are people who don't want sex education, but they are a distinct minority, can affect the way, you know by giving kids information, but also by modeling values. I think people think that anti-racist, anti-homophobic, and other kinds of interventions can, you know -- I mean, but I don't want to pick a bone with you. I mean, I --

MCWHORTON: Social change takes time.

LOURY: -- I take your point that just so your repeating, you know -- we're not going back to the 1950s that's for sure, and just sort of repeating that you shouldn't have kids out of wedlock, or that boys need fathers in order to be properly socialized and disciplined and whatnot is not going to change very much, but I can't accept the idea that I should abandon saying -- I mean, first of all, there's

the interpretive question, what has actually happened? So, we need to give an accurate account of what has happened. I mean, we need to have a narrative that is consistent with the actual dynamics of the social evolution, and not selective, and it's sees the economic depressive, sees discriminatory, and the racist, but it doesn't see the behavioral elements and the cultural -- I say that with trepidation, but I say it nonetheless -- cultural attitudinal value aspects. I mean, for example, I really want to know the good, the bad, and the ugly on what goes on in a riot. I want to know who the people are. I want to know what happens to those TV sets, and those boxes of potato chips, when they get -- I want a reporter to go inside a housing project, and then tell me who the quote thugs close quote, actually are and how they live. I mean, I want the real story about what's going on.

MCWHORTON: We know the story. That person is somebody whose horizons are about 50 feet in a circle, he lives in his community, he had poor schooling, he doesn't know much of anything, he lives an oral life, he doesn't live on the page, he has never had much of a sense of what kind of career he was going to have, he probably has sold some drugs on the street, he probably has three or four kids and it's probably by at least a couple of women, he has his

life kind of going on, but he has nothing to look forward to. His life is not an upper trajectory. He can only think of work not a career. So, when everything goes up in flames, he figures I'm going to get me a little, because this is the most I'm ever going to get.

LOURY: That's one story, excuse me for interrupting -- you know, that's one story, but it's not the only story. I mean, there are some bible believing Christian folks that go to a store front Church in there, and there's some thuggish, whatever, whatever, and everything in between, and there's some people who wanted to tell the truth from the very start. They were intimidated and afraid to say what they saw, and I'm talking about perjury. I'm talking -- in the Ferguson context, and we know this. We know that there people who wanted anonymity, or didn't speak out, or who were threatened. I want the full detail on that. I mean, I want the community to be taken seriously not just to be a prop in somebody's ideological crusade --

MCWHORTON: But Glenn what's the point if you found the bad apple? Let's say that they found somebody with the bag of potato chips and the TV back in his crummy apartment, and, you know, he's living with some other people in there, and it turns out that he's a trifling shithead, who stole a TV, and there's the camera, and you interview him, and he

doesn't really have much to say about himself, and he's also not much of a speaker, and it turns out it's what you're kind of implying, because of course, there are going to be people like that. The sort of people who are sometimes called chuckleheads by their fam. What's the point?

LOURY: I'm just saying. It's not a cartoon. Its thick description is real life. That's not the whole story there. There are a dozen stories. Some of them are going to be more flattering, and some less.

MCWHORTON: But where do we get by revealing that man in all of his glory? I mean he would just look like exactly what he is, and I'm not sure what that would do.

LOURY: If you're going to make reference to the alienation and the pain and whatnot of the community, don't let it be -- I don't mean this personally to you -- I mean just to all of us who would be engaged in that discussion -- don't let it be based on caricature and invention --

MCWHORTON: You mean, the noble freedom fighter -- that caricature, you mean?

LOURY: -- I mean, I could translate my point into any reportage. This could be about what the Farc in the Colombian jungle are actually about. They're not all pure Marxists Leninists walking around. Some of them are drug

dealers. Some of them are just shmucks, who are looking for a line of work that's, you know, whatever --

MCWHORTON: Probably half of them.

LOURY: -- Whatever. I mean, you know, maybe we should move on to something else.

MCWHORTON: No, no, no -- not just yet, because this is a very interesting point. I agree with you about those guys. I would say most of the rioters are not these Stokely Carmichael stand-ins that everybody says, but the truth is they're speaking the only language they ever knew. I really don't think you could expect anything better of somebody who grew up in that world that they grew up in, where they've grown up. I mean, it's the certain kind of norms. That person is caught up in socio-historical currents, beyond his control. No, he didn't have to steal that TV set, but I'm not sure what we gain from looking that person in the eye, because he can't do anything about himself, and his community can't change him, which is why I'm thinking how do we just avoid his --

LOURY: Let me try the argument in a different way. OK. I see what you're saying, and I accept and agree. Caught up is very well put in socio-historic currents being beyond his control, and you know, focusing on him, and why did he do this, or why didn't he do something different, may not

take us very far. I accept that, but still. I want to call these things what they actually are. So, I'm not saying you would do it, but the word uprising infused with respect to civil unrest in the context, but I'm deeply offended by it. I'm intellectually offended by it. I'm politically offended by it. As a social scientist -- uprising, so what is it? It's a slogan. It's a banner. I'm on the right side of history. I called it an uprising, because the people have finally spoken. What kind of idiotic politics is it that you associate it's socio-historical change with the unruly behavior of a few people in a particular situation, which is hooked to no movement, which has no grass root, which has no theory or framework that reaches beyond itself. You're so desperate that there should be such a movement, and so lazy about actually creating the foundation for one that you cease upon apparat events and think that dressing up the words -- where's George Orwell, when we need him -- you can make a politics that doesn't exist. I'm tired of people -- and we could name Michael Eric Dyson -- sitting in their parlors inventing a politics that doesn't exist with fancy words on the pages of cooperative and intellectually flabby organs of the dissemination of ideas like *The New York Times*. I'm tired of it. Uprising? I mean, will you please give me a

break. History is moving on. OK. The United States of America invented in a global system, the action is elsewhere. Fix the schools -- whatever it takes -- OK -- for a starter, and don't condone, defend, make excuses for the inexcusable. So, the murder rate on most African Americans is astronomical. The fact that there's not a single, prominent, intellectual figure or politician in the pantheon of leaders, who's prepared to make that his or her issue is a disgrace.

MCWHORTON: No, it isn't, Glenn. It's a shame, because it's an indication of a certain element of self-hate at the core of the black American soul. These people that you're talking about in a way are not sure that we're good enough not to do those things, and you know, I don't think it's a surprise --

LOURY: These people being black people.

MCWHORTON: Yeah.

LOURY: These people being prominent spokespersons, intellectuals, and writers commenting on these affairs of today. My God, you'd think they don't really have enough confidence in our people --

MCWHORTON: They think that they are so superior to say, I know, but I firmly believe that this is what it is -- they think that black people are so beaten down, and they've

been taught not only by white people, but in a way, by black people, that we are so weak, that they figure all of this murder is because they don't know better. Society doesn't love them. What can be expected?

LOURY: Do you remember when the two police officers in Ferguson got shot during some demonstration? Two guys got wounded. One near the eye socket, and the [Foxytons?] were trying to make a big deal of it, and of course the protests were subject to possibly being discredited. This was after the assassination of those two police officers in New York City -- possibly being discredited by association with the violent element around the fringe. I'm watching the TV -- CNN or something one day, had a prominent -- I don't remember who it was, so I don't want to say -- but a prominent person says, in defense of the protest against the charge that they have turned violent, those people weren't really aiming at the cops, they were aiming at other protesters. They had a beef with other protesters, and that's what that was about. They weren't really firing on the cops. So, no, the protestors and those fringe elements are not attacking the cops. The cops that were accidentally hit by bullets intended for other protestors.

MCWHORTON: Right. I never heard that particular explanation.

LOURY: Well, I fell from my chair, John, because I thought, oh, I see. If it's one of these guys in the back firing at another black person, and missing, and accidentally hitting a police officer, well that ratchets it down from a serious offense, where it'll be attack on police to a mundane day-to-day, well the guys just had a beef.

MCWHORTON: It has to be understood. Right.

LOURY: You know. So, when the *Fox News* people report on OK, in the greater St. Louis area, there have been so many murders, or in the greater Baltimore area, there have been so many murders of black people that have occurred while we're prot-- and we don't know the names of any of the black people who were actually killed, because nobody has bothered to put 120 words in their newspaper on page 17 about it. It's a federal case if the white police officer kills a black person. It's just another day at the office, if that -- well, come on now, the moral implications of that are appalling to me.

MCWHORTON: Yeah, and you know --

LOURY: I mean, what does black lives matter mean, if all the black lives don't matter all the time?

MCWHORTON: It's partly a sense that we're not up to doing any better, and you know what else it also is? It's like Japanese again. It's all they've all they've ever known.

It's at the point, where whoever that commentator was probably 38, and so as far -- and during their entire lives, what they know is that particularly, black men in certain parts of the country are always killing each other, and that's just the way it is, and so they shape their sense of reality around that, and why would occur to them that that is not the only way that oppressed people deal with oppression. As far as they're concerned, that's just something that black people do. A standup comedian might even make jokes about it, and honestly, I think a lot of people don't think about it a whole lot, beyond that, and that would include some journalists. We've got to get passed that situation, no doubt, but then also, Glenn, quickly, another thing that I've said is, you're asking the black community -- I'm going to use that word abjure again -- abjure its own. And so, are we really thinking that black people are going to say, no more thugs, when the thug is your next door neighbor, your son, and your nephew, and the person you're sleeping with. I don't know of any community could possibly do that, and so of course the thug is human, whereas Darren Wilson is the enemy. Is this a good state of affairs? No. But that's not going to change. The black community is not going to reject all of its thugs in any real way. So, we need to work around it,

to bring it back to what I was originally saying.

LOURY: Yeah. Well, I guess I invited this language of the thugs and so forth like that. I don't want to have such a [manakian?] view. I don't want it to just be black and white, and you know, people are good or bad -- the evil people amongst us and so forth and so on. Of course, it's complicated, and yes, people are staggering as it were across that line, between, as it were, good and evil within a common life -- a single person all the time, especially when money's hard to get, and when the surroundings are you know, not very healthy, and you know, there are dangers at every hand. Of course, it's complicated, and you know, a novelist could help us understand this just as --

MCWHORTON: Richard Price --

LOURY: -- well as a social scientist can --

MCWHORTON: -- would do it well.

LOURY: -- you have to get inside the minds of the, you know, and the hearts and the hopelessness. I agree. I'm fine on that, but I still don't want to abjure. I still don't want to surrender on questions of principle about which way is up. What direction aren't we least striving in? What does it mean to make progress? And somebody has to hold up that banner. Not reflexively, and unreflectively, and kind of ritualistically, and moralistically, practically, and

rooted in the history, and knowledgeable about all of the complexities, but nevertheless say, work is better than idleness. Responsibility to your children is the first order of concern. Don't waste your life. There are some activities that are beneath you -- that are beneath your dignity. You cannot expect people to respect you, if you don't respect yourself, and so on. These may sound like nostrums. They're actually the cornerstone of civilization. I'm sorry for the way that sounds, but that's what I think.

MCWHORTON: It sounds fine, but Glenn, you know what the response is, and I just had a piece on this --

LOURY: You have a piece on everything.

MCWHORTON: -- Today or yesterday? Yesterday, Washington Post, actually on respectability politics. Glenn, you are doing respectability politics, and that has to be said with a sneer with the idea being that conditions for descendants of African slaves in America are such that it is an insult to speak to us of behavioral issues and anything but the most parenthetical of terms. I'm quoting myself, and I'm not sure how we peaked our intelligence out of that mode of thinking for respectability politics.

LOURY: I hear you on the respectability politics. I've got to read your piece. It's such an interesting topic,

because that's exactly what people have accused me of. I didn't like Mike Brown, because he's not a poster boy, because he's not Rosa Parks, because he's not squeaky clean --

MCWHORTON: I got some of that, too.

LOURY: -- kind of thing, like that. Oh, so we got to be, respectable according to you know squeaky clean, white people standards before we have rights? No, I'm not saying anything like that. However, I'm saying this -- OK -- and I'm not backing off of this. You cannot logically, consistently complain about implicit bias, and racial profiling, and not attend to the reputation of your people as it's affected by the behavior of people who belong to the group. You can't complain that everybody -- the woman walks across the street, and clutches her purse, just because I'm a black man, walking by, and that offends you, and not be concerned that there are black people snatching purses, that make women afraid of black people, who might snatch their purse.

MCWHORTON: There are white criminals, too. Now, what do you answer to that, when somebody says that?

LOURY: Yeah, and that answer is ultimately resting upon what I think is the false premise that these people are fears are without any legitimate basis and fact. They see the

black criminal. They don't see the white criminal. No, no, no, no. These people are living in these cities, who are reading newspapers, and have their television sets turned on, and have friends, and whatnot, are aware of the association between race and crime. We can give a gazillion reasons why, but I don't think the statistics are complicated with that respect, so this is an objective fact. There again are reasons for it. OK. I'm not casting aspersions. I'm not pointing a finger. I'm just trying to be realistic about what the facts are. So, now, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith might be an organization concerned about maintenance of the collective reputation of the Jewish people. The comparable Italian defamation doesn't want everybody to think that the Italians are in the mafia, and so forth and so on. These activities require not only the admonition to the public at large, don't buy the stereotype, we are not all according to the stereotype, they also -- don't they -- have to attend within the group itself, to sanctioning those who might lend credence to these undesirable judgments about the group, and they can't be friendly and winking at the mafia and at the same time telling people don't think that Italians are all Mafioso. See, so people have been spoiled, and I'll stop. I know I'm talking too much, but

people have been pampered. People have been patronized. OK. They have been playing the race card in this particular kind of logically inconsistent way for so long, and getting the sympathetic nods from the Nicholas Kristofs of the world. God love him, but has been licensed, in this, and my sense of the matter is, whereas the intellectual classes may all conspire to not embarrass somebody on the op-ed pages, but we're writing nonsense op-ed pages in *The New York Times*. The median voter in western Pennsylvania is not going to be much moved by it.

MCWHORTER: No. They never will, and all of the things you're talking about so that there is a kind of dog chasing his tail aspect to the logic here -- for everything you say, the certain kind of person we both know and both read, who has responses, and what it all comes down to is that black people are blameless. That if any of us do anything wrong, we should have our hands slapped behind closed doors, but that really society is such that there is nothing a black person is doing that is truly wrong, all of it must be understood as the result of the operation of outside forces, and we also come down to this, where I think I'm not sure how we can cut through that by talking to the intellegencia and the people who read *The New Yorker*. Yeah, it's interesting. I had a very interesting

interaction in this city, probably about 10 years ago, where if there were video of it, I'm sure that there would be people taking snapshots of it, and throwing darts at me -- it was -- there was a white woman of a certain age, and I was on a street, here in the city, in a neighborhood where there are a lot of young, black men, who are, you know, kind of loud, and some of them probably have records, and it was nighttime, and I was walking up behind her, we were both going to the same place, and I was walking kind of quickly, and there was nobody else on the street, and she turned around, and she looked at me, very closely. This was a woman I'll bet she reads the *Times* and *The New Yorker*, but she also -- I got to know her a little bit later, she's kind of outspoken, and very honest, and she said, I'm sorry, but you never know, and I knew what she meant, you know. You're a black man, and I was younger than, and you know what, Glenn. I was OK with it. I said, yes, I understand, please it's OK, and we walked into the door together. I know that I was not supposed to understand that. I was supposed to think of that, as this women viewing me as an animal and wondering why that woman thinks of all black men as violent. I didn't think it. I agreed completely with what you're saying to the point that I could have encounter with that woman and not feel like I

had run up against racism. I ran up against the real world.

LOURY: Well, they're going to be throwing darts at you, John, for a long time. I mean, one of the subtext I'm taking from the story that you're just telling me, now, is how about a little generosity? How about a little forbearance? I mean on the tip of the heart to those of us that belong to stigmatized groups and discriminated groups. How about letting the chip down off her shoulder just a little bit? How about giving the benefit of the doubt? How about a little generosity? You know.

MCWHORTON: Now, you're going to get the darts thrown at you.

LOURY: I know.

MCWHORTON: Well, before we end.

LOURY: Yeah, we should, because we've going on --

MCWHORTON: What do you have to say about the 10,000 words that Georgetown professor of sociology, Michael Eric Dyson, wrote about what a horrible human being Cornel West is? What do you think of that?

LOURY: Well, it's worth than the time that we have here. I have a three o'clock thing, and that's only 20 minutes from now. What I think, though, briefly is on so many levels, first of all the *New Republic* -- OK -- so they gave over 10,000 words to this kind of classroom.

MCWHORTON: You wouldn't have been in there even six months ago.

LOURY: Secondly, I think that Michael Eric Dyson -- OK, so he's a very [peaked?] person, you see him on the Sunday news shows, and on the page of *The New York Times*, and otherwise, he writes books, he's a professor at Georgetown, he's one of the leading leftist spokesman on behalf of racial justice in the country, and so on, and give him his respect and his props. I thought the piece was pretty well-written, frankly, and not all of Michael Eric Dyson's pieces have struck me that way. It was touching at a certain level, because of his personal relationship with Cornel West, and the fact that they've fallen out, because West has called him, you know, basically an apologist for Barack Obama, and so I thought he took the measure of Cornel West, whom he disappointed, because his early promise Cornel West, as an intellectual, as a scholar, as a philosopher of theologian was so great, and West hasn't lived up to it, and in doing so he, in a way, reiterated criticisms that we've heard from everybody from Leon Wieseltier, who attacked West on a similar -- you know, West not a serious mind --

MCWHORTON: About twenty years ago, now.

LOURY: -- yeah, from Lawrence Summers, when president of

Harvard University, who thought Cornel West wasn't spending enough time in the library --

MCWHORTON: And there have been certain things said on Bloggingheads.

LOURY: Yes.

MCWHORTON: We should be honest.

LOURY: -- and, you know, and I think we can criticize Cornel West about how he uses his time and whether he is fulfilled potential of his talents suggestions. There was also a political aspect to it, in which Dyson defended himself, and in doing so, also defended Melissa Harris-Perry, and defended Al Sharpton, in effect. We're not lackeys and we're not flacks of the Obama administration being used by him to the detriment of black people. We are loyal democrats, and loyal advocates of the interests of blacks who happen not to agree with you. Cornel West who we view to have a [smiley?] about, whatever, I guess that argument was more or less effectively made. Let me conclude. At the end of the day, I still thought, you're Michael Eric Dyson, and you cannot carry Cornel West's book bag. I mean, in the sense that, I know Cornel West. He's not a personal friend of mind, although he's an acquaintance, you know more than a casual acquaintance, and he has a great grasp of the western cannon. He is a deep and profound

thinker, and I don't think that Michael Eric Dyson is with respect to the -- however that comes off, it comes off. I mean, Michael Eric Dyson is Michael Eric Dyson. He's not Cornel West. So, I kind of thought, you know, it's shooting from the cheap seats or whatever, whatever, and I thought whether I agree with it or not, Cornel West's argument about President Obama deserves to be answered, OK. The argument is, Obama used white people to step into the White House, but he now behaves in a way that would have Martin Luther King, Jr., or W.E.B. Du Bois, turning in their grave. He is presiding over American empire -- American hegemony, American militarism. He is giving it legitimacy by marrying it to the noble struggles of freedom struggles of people of African descent in this country. Now, he may be right, Cornel, or wrong about that, but Michael Eric Dyson didn't even deign to address it, and I thought in that sense, to the extent that the piece was on [condensing?].

MCWHORTON: Well, I know you have a three o'clock, so I'll just say very briefly, we can talk more about that piece next time, which I would like to be sooner than --

LOURY: John, believe me you don't have to tell me twice. I heard you the first time. Will you be here for me next week, or something?

MCWHORTON: I can definitely do next week. I was moved by the simple fact that Dyson wrote an entire book about what a fraud and terrible person Bill Cosby was 10 years ago, and now a 10,000 word piece on Cornel West and the *New Republic*. I can't help thinking why this focus on tearing people down, who offend you -- writing pieces about that, when I would think that if it were me, I would only want to put that much energy into say, scholarship. There's a sandbox aspect to it that I find rather peculiar of somebody with Dyson's power. I kind of wonder who's he going to do in another ten years, but it's a funny way to spend one's time, but we can talk more about that.

LOURY: Well, let us do. I think your point's interesting, John. Thanks so much for coming on and I'm so glad you're back.

MCWHORTON: It was fun to be back, Glenn. Let's keep this going, and starting next week.

LOURY: OK. Take care, my friend.

MCWHORTON: Perfect. You, too.

LOURY: Bye.

END OF AUDIO FILE