Molly Wood: Hey everyone, I'm Molly Wood. Welcome back to Make Me Smart, the podcast where none of us is as smart as all of us.

Kai Ryssdal: Somebody has definitely been in my studio and turned the volume on my headphones. I do not approve. Hey everybody, I'm Kai Ryssdal. Tuesday today, single topic deep dive, y'all who've been with us for a while know the drill. Today, it's reproductive rights as an economic policy issue. Reproductive rights as economic rights.

Molly Wood: Yeah. And we kind of teased this topic last week. And I'm actually, I actually had a conversation over the weekend with a friend who said, what is the, she goes, there must be a money angle to these abortion bills, right? Like, what is the reasoning for this? And I said, well, on the one hand, it's, it's, you know, religiously motivated. But yes, on the other hand, you know, not having access to birth control and not having control over when and if you give birth is fundamentally an economic issue for women, like think about what happens to a 17-year-old with an unplanned pregnancy. And so we had already had this conversation about exploring this idea of reproductive rights as economic rights and as a matter of equality. It isn't something that is usually discussed in economics, but frankly, it should be and there is a growing body of research that shows there is a profound connection between access to abortion and the economic mobility and financial security of women.

Kai Ryssdal: So we have gotten Caitlin Myers on the phone. She is a professor of economics at Middlebury, where she researches, among many other things, I'm sure, the effects of reproductive policies, how that plays out in the land of actual economic policy. We should say here, professor, you come with a point of view that is to say you favor reproductive rights. But I, I guess, first of all, first of all, welcome to the program, it's good to have you on.

Caitlin Myers: Thank you.

Kai Ryssdal: I guess I want the big picture question first, which is make that connection with you. For those who might not sort of in the instant get it, make the connection between reproductive rights and economic rights.

Caitlin Myers: I'm happy to. I think I'll start with making the connection between reproductive rights and social science perhaps, because while I do come with a point of view, I also come primarily as a scientist, and as a scientist, my job is to measure the causal effects of reproductive access and reproductive policy on people's lives. And economists do this all the
time and part of our job as measuring the causal effects of regulations, and particularly in the abortion world, the causal effects of abortion regulations. And so there’s quite a large literature in economics that looks at that and teases out those causal effects.

**Molly Wood:** Tell us more. What, what did, what, what are the effects? What do you find?

**Caitlin Myers:** Well, so this literature starts back in the era of Roe when most people are familiar with Roe v. Wade, which had the effect of legalizing abortion nationwide in 1973. But in fact, before Roe was even decided, five states that we often call repeal states had largely legalized abortion in advance of Roe. And so this afforded economists what we call a natural experiment, this opportunity to look at what happened to people's lives in the states where abortion became legal, compared to the rest of the country where it hadn't yet become legal. And then a few years later, when Roe is decided, we kind of have the second experiment where we see abortion become legal in the rest of the country. And we can compare what happens relative to the states where it had already been legal. And what we found is that the legalization of abortion had profound effects on young women's motherhood, the ages at which they became mothers. So the legalization of abortion reduced the fraction of women who became mothers as teenagers by about a third. And it reduced the fraction of women who married as teenagers by about a fifth, primarily through preventing what, what were then and sometimes now called shotgun marriages that were resulting from unplanned pregnancies. And then those really large first order effects kind of reverberated through the affected women's lives and we have evidence that for women who delayed becoming mothers because they had access to abortion, those women were much more likely to attend college, to graduate college, to obtain occupations that are kind of professional in nature, and they had higher wages by as much as about 10%. And they were about half as likely to live in poverty as adults.

**Molly Wood:** Let me show you bright line.

**Kai Ryssdal:** Yeah, it is a pretty bright line. I want to make sure at the outset of this conversation that we make sure people understand when we say reproductive rights, it's more than just abortion, right? Reproductive rights is, is healthcare writ large and that whole spectrum of things.

**Caitlin Myers:** Absolutely. But I think, you know, one of the, one of the features of this debate right now that's just become so salient and you see it a lot in the litigation around abortion right now is that there are folks who are arguing that abortion access essentially is no longer relevant to people's lives, that we've had such advances in contraceptive technology and contraceptive access, for instance, with the Affordable Care Act and Medicaid expansions, the argument goes, that even if abortion was once salient to people's lives, it no longer is. And so I would really kind of carve out although, yes, reproductive rights is about all of that, I carve out in these analyses and say, let's look at the effects of abortion access right now. We know that abortion access mattered a lot in the 70s. Now that all of these subsequent changes have taken place, does it still matter? And what we see is yes, like even in the age of the diffusion of more access to long-acting reversible contraceptives, like IUDs, even in the age of Medicaid expansion and
increasing rates of insurance, although we fall far short of universal health care coverage, when people have diminished access to abortion, it still dramatically affects their lives, it makes the people who are experiencing an unintended pregnancy more likely to experience an unintended birth and the subsequent consequences for them personally on their lives.

**Molly Wood:** Why do you think, I, anybody who follows me on Twitter or even on this podcast will know that I have a bit of an obsession with framing, right, with the way that we talk about issues. Why do you think we don't talk about abortion and reproductive rights more in this context of economic justice and as an economic issue?

**Caitlin Myers:** I think that is a fantastic question. It's one that I asked myself a lot as an economist studying reproductive rights and reproductive policies. And I think the answers are complex. I think, frankly, that one of them harkens back to eugenics movements and concerns that connecting reproductive autonomy and reproductive freedom to economic outcomes in some ways has these kind of echoes of a former very problematic era. And I think that's one reason people steer clear of it. I also think it's very difficult to be a scientist working in such an emotional and politically contentious space. You know, it's hard to work in an arena where you're trying to prevent objective evidence, when people are gonna feel so strongly about the results. And so I think to some extent, it was just an understudied area for a while, but there has, at this point, then, you know, increasing economic attention to it. And it's been linked to the fact that there's increasing economic attention or attention among economists, to the fact that if you look at gender gaps in economic outcomes, particularly in the labor market, they are very closely tied to the motherhood penalty, the penalties that women incur in the labor market when they become mothers look very different than what happens to men. And that has caused us to start to pay more attention to connections to reproductive rights.

**Kai Ryssdal:** So what's the best way to fix that issue of not being able to talk about this? Well, we can we just don't, right, of not talking about this issue in in, in economic policy terms, right, because the the evidence seems to be Stark. I wonder how you you get traction, then what do you do?

**Caitlin Myers:** Well, it's interesting, I think that we're starting to get more traction and more attention now. And I think that the fact that that's occurring has to do with current litigation around abortion regulations. You may be aware that there's a case coming before the Supreme Court this term in Dobbs v. Jackson, women's health, which concerns an abortion ban, not in Texas, but in Mississippi. And in that case, the state of Mississippi has asked the Supreme Court to overturn Roe and one of the pillars of Mississippi's argument about overturning Roe and about overcoming starry decis, overcoming precedent, is to say to the Supreme Court there's no good reason to believe that abortion ever was or is relevant to people's lives. And that's a moment when economists like me, who might otherwise tend to stay out of like, the political fray, who see themselves as Be aware that this passionate scientist, and we're going to deliver the objective evidence to the policymakers, and they will receive it and we will all carry on. Like, we kind of sit up and take notice and say, that is completely out of keeping with the entire economics literature on how people interact in the labor market. It's out of keeping with
the economics literature on gender and family and reproductive policy. And so it's a moment for our economists, when I think that we have recognized that there's a place for us to speak up and talk about the relevance of reproductive policy and reproductive access to people's economic lives and to make those connections because the evidence is there, the literature is there. And there's very good reason to believe that it matters however you might feel ethically about abortion.

Molly Wood: It's interesting, because it, the way that you've described this sense that your abortion isn't as important as it was in the 70s, or that there is this argument that it doesn't matter as much to people's lives, reminds me a bit of the overturning by the Supreme Court of the Voting Rights Act, that that sort of suggested that, you know, preclearance in terms of voting restrictions didn't matter anymore because there was not, in fact, racial discrimination built into our election system. And it feels like, yeah, there's a preponderance of data in both of these cases.

Caitlin Myers: Yeah, I really look forward to the day when we live in our, you know, post racial utopia, post discrimination utopia, and, and similarly, I look forward to the day when women can effortlessly balance career and motherhood. It's not to say that many of us don't manage to with great effort balance it, but when you look at right now in this country who is that, that is seeking abortions, women from all walks of life do seek abortions, but there is kind of a modal person who's seeking abortions. And that modal person is already a mother, has already had a child, is low income, about 75% of people who seek abortions are low income within about 200% of the poverty line, half of them are poor below the poverty line. And about 60% of them are experiencing some disruptive life circumstance, like the loss of a job, threat of an eviction, breaking up with a partner. The people who are seeking abortions, it's not, it's not some random event, they're doing so because of some particular life, difficult life circumstance. And you look at that, you look at the fact that it's still the case that about nearly half of all pregnancies are unintended, that for any given woman in the United States, there's about a 6% risk--in a given year, sorry, she's of childbearing age--for any given woman of childbearing age in the US, but a 6% chance in a given year that she'll experience an unintended pregnancy. About 1% of women of childbearing age, every year, seek an abortion. And overwhelmingly, the women who are seeking abortions are doing so because they are in a tough spot where they don't feel that they're able to parent a child. And when you look at the economic evidence on kind of what happens next, if they encounter substantial obstacles to obtaining that abortion, we have evidence, for instance, that they are much more likely to face bankruptcy proceedings, to have their credit go down, we see this evidence of financial distress. And similarly, we see evidence of downstream effects on their education, labor market outcomes.

Kai Ryssdal: Yeah, it's, you don't, it's not a factor in your life much like voting until you actually want to exercise the right to, you know, get that healthcare procedure or actually cast the ballot. So look, look, not to put too fine a point on it, but if you're, you are a social scientist and in an incredibly emotional debate, right, which has become politicized to the nth degree. And you now in this amicus brief, you're filing as I understand it, in, on the, on the firm's side in the Mississippi
case, you have to convince six people on the Supreme Court, well, you only have to convince five but you know what I mean, you have to convince the conservative majority on the court to interject sound, economic thought into an incredibly emotional, legal debate. How do you do that?

**Caitlin Myers:** I still very much want to believe in rational evidence based policy wherever the policymakers are, wherever the policymaking is occurring. I don't believe it's the role of economists to answer every question about abortion, for instance. We, most of us, at least, are not experts in constitutional law. But there's this one very key element of the argument that is coming to the Supreme Court that economists are expert in, and what I see our role as economists as being in this case is to come forward and say, this still matters. It's not as easy as simply casting aside the precedent of Roe because you conclude that abortion is simply no longer relevant to people's lives. That clearly is completely out of keeping with all of the literature from this, like very large and credible economics literature. I think that's the role for us. Like that's what we as economists can say to the court. And I suppose all I can do is, is hope that Justices of, you know, any political persuasion are open to hearing what the scientific evidence on the question is.

**Molly Wood:** Yeah, I mean, I had to continue to put a finer and finer point on it. It sounds like what you're saying is, according to your research and according to available data, that overturning Roe vs. Wade would not, in fact, be a rational, evidence based legal decision.

**Caitlin Myers:** I certainly don't think one could abandon precedent on the basis of assuming that it doesn't matter. It would definitely matter, all available evidence is, is that if Roe is overturned, that many women across a wide swath of the South and Midwest are likely to experience really substantial reductions in abortion access as the providers near them close, and they're facing very long travel distances to other states. Based on economic research, we estimate that about a third of those women who want abortions won't be able to get to the states where they're still available, and that the majority of those women who can't get there will give birth as a result, and then have subsequent effects on their economic outcomes. In other words, it's gonna matter.

**Kai Ryssdal:** Yeah, well, so let's play that out a little bit, right, just as a last question, assuming, as seems likely, that Roe is overturned by the court and, and let's just work with that as a premise, you know, you're accepting my premise, doesn't mean that you think that's what's going to happen, but accepting that premise, what happens to women in this country?

**Caitlin Myers:** It's really going to depend on where the women live. You know, I'm from the deep south originally, I'm from the Georgia Alabama border. Women from where I am from are going to experience enormous reductions in access to abortion. And women there who experienced unintended pregnancies, a large fraction of them are going to be unable to obtain abortions they want. And I think what we're going to see is more low income families in financial distress, disruptive circumstances facing some really substantial economic challenges. Women where I live now, which is rural Vermont, are not likely to experience large changes and
access to abortions is likely to remain available here. So if wrote, If I accept your premise that Roe is overturned, and let's also add the premise that then greater power to regulate abortion is returned to the states, then what happens to women next? Again, it's just going to depend on where those women live.

Molly Wood: Professor Caitlin Myers teaches economics at Middlebury College. Thanks so much for the time today.

Caitlin Myers: Thanks very much for having me.

Kai Ryssdal: Yeah, it's the whole idea of trying to inject sound economic policy into this incredibly emotional debate is, it just must be daunting, right? It's got to be.

Molly Wood: I mean, I guess all credit to her. I think it's, I mean, it's when you have, you know, a side of this incredibly emotional debate that is like, attacking doctors and bombing clinics and calling people murderers, like it's, it's a, it's an asymmetrical debate, let's say. The other thing I want to point out is that when we talk about women's health writ large which is already, you know, underfunded, underrepresented, I think was under-researched, yeah, under researched, exactly, the women were even included in studies because it was like, you're just smaller guys, right? When we talk about states where abortion will not be accessible, what we also mean is that women's health will not be accessible because clinics that, you know, are not necessarily one stop shops like when Planned Parenthood closes and that's where women go for pap smears and birth control and checkups and all of the, you know, breast cancer screenings, like all of the things that go into women's health, you have this entire halo of health care and health services that disappear along with access to abortion. And it is, it is just, it is proof. soundly impactful on the lives and, as we just heard, the economic outcomes of women, and frankly, I think this whole conversation argues for why businesses who need healthy economies and, and a preponderance of workers should maybe have something to say here. All right, we're gonna take a break because, as I said earlier, when we did, when we decided we probably were out of questions, I'm only gonna keep getting madder. So this is a topic, as we know, that is hard and it's frustrating to talk about and if you want to share your thoughts with us, we're ready. We'd love to hear from you.

Kai Ryssdal: That, by the way, was from the slack that Molly and I had going during the interview. You good? Wait, gotta ask this.


Kai Ryssdal: Alright, send us a voice memo if you'd like, your thoughts, or an email, makemesmart@marketplace.org, or you can call us and leave us a voice message the old fashioned way. Our number is 508-827-6278, 508-UB-SMART. We're coming right back.

Molly Wood: And we are. We did, we came right back and it's time for the news fix.
Kai Ryssdal: I've got three but really only it's like 1.2 or something, it's not really three. It's not really three, I want to point out, just because a lot of--so first of all, this is the week of September 11. There's Afghanistan has happened, a lot of those coverages are getting rolled in together. But what is happening over in Afghanistan is that the Taliban is trying to set up a government. And today, they actually did set up their government. And for those who have been looking to the Taliban, and I don't know what three people have you out there who are and saying, oh, they've definitely changed and it's going to be different, that's not what they've done so far. Because in this new government that they announced today, there are no women, there are no moderates. There are people who, who are wanted by the FBI, there are people with $5 million bounties on their heads for terrorist activity. So that frames this next thing that I'm going to point out, which is my real story, which is a piece I saw in Foreign Policy this weekend, pointing out that the economic system is on the verge of collapse, banks are basically shuttered and can barely function, and there is a black-market economy there that is thriving and going and may be the very future of the Afghan economy. And if you think it's bad now for everybody who's there, right, and it is terrible for women, imagine what happens when the economy actually collapses, when the price of bread goes up 4,000% in a day and a half. Those kinds of things are what's going to happen. So I think the Afghan economy is a story that in my professional life, I'm gonna keep more of an eye on, so, so I just want to point out those two things. Piece in the Wall Street Journal about the new government and then this piece in Foreign Policy about the Afghan banking system and specifically currency exchange, really interesting. The other thing that if we didn't make me smile on Tuesdays, this would be it, but I'd be smiling because I was crying if that makes any sense. So today is the day that in El Salvador, Bitcoin becomes an official legal currency. Okay. And one of the ways they're managing this thing is that there's a big government pool of Bitcoin that retailers who are being obliged to accept Bitcoin and use Bitcoin can trade in and out of if they want to get the hell out of the Bitcoin market, which is really volatile. Well, today, the president of El Salvador tweeted as the price of bitcoin falls, “President Nayib Bukele says we’re buying the dip, 150 new coins added,” and I'm just telling you, that's no way to run monetary policy. That's no way to run monetary policy. Just don't do that. Don't do that. Don't do me Don't do that.

Molly Wood: What I think is so interesting about these two stories back-to-back is that they are both stories about decentralized finance. Like, this story about Afghanistan is money exchangers, right, being our economy's best hope, it's this informal network of money exchangers. The reason that Bitcoin people believe that Bitcoin will succeed and maybe even save the world, and whatever it is, that Jack Dorsey tweeted is because of exactly this, like Bitcoin can potentially do what central banks cannot. Volatility is a part of that game. And that's real dangerous when you're talking about country sized economies. And yet, all of the exact same potential is still there, like relying on an informal network of money exchangers to keep Afghanistan's economy afloat, is also risky. Right. It's pretty, it's pretty risky. But I think we're on our like, kind of messy way to a different way in the world. And this is definitely part of this. I don't know like, I actually think it's way too soon to say whether or not this Bitcoin experiment in particular is gonna turn out.
Kai Ryssdal: I think it's way too early to pass judgment, even though I just did on what else avid was doing, but. but here's the deal. I think it's too early in the evolution of Bitcoin and crypto in and of itself for an entire country to put its economy on Bitcoin, right? I think that's, that's the questionable move.

Molly Wood: It might be, it's like it's like a, it's a cart and horse thing, right? Like it's where Bitcoin isn't going to evolve to the place that people think it can get without a country putting its entire economy on Bitcoin. So maybe El Salvador is like the canary in the coal mine or the, the push or the, there's a bunch of metaphors that are swirling around in my head now because of coffee. So I'm just interested, we live in interesting times. Related to the Texas abortion law, and to be clear I've actually been like refreshing Twitter all during the show, sorry, mainly because Texas Governor Greg Abbott just now as we were starting to record, signed the overhaul, the elections overhaul, the one that the democrats walked out over, I meant to stop calling it the elections overhaul, signed the voting restriction bill that has gotten so much press but has not yet, at least as we're recording this, signed the abortion law in to law, it's not yet officially a law, which I think is kind of interesting. However, that has not stopped people from trying to collect the personal information of doctors and pastors and whoever else and women who are seeking information about or actual abortions. So for the second time in a week, prolifewhistleblower.com, which lets users submit anonymous, HIPAA violating tips about people that they think may have tried to receive what is constitutionally protected health care in every other state, has been shut down. Thank goodness, GoDaddy booted it last week, which we talked about. And then the Washington Post reported that their new web provider, which was described, I think, over the weekend on Twitter as like, sort of a far right web host called Epic, also took it down. Because, again, the tip line violates almost everybody's Terms of Service because it gathers private information about third parties. So look, if the thing that brings this idiocy down is the fact that you can't just like, share people's private information on the internet, that'll be something at least, that'll be something. I heard a very frustrating interview this morning on this very topic, which is what brought it up. So as we're having this conversation about potential booster shots for adults in the United States, we still, just as a reminder, don't have vaccines available, approved vaccines for children under 12. And the pressure is only increasing and the pressure is not from like randos on Twitter, right? It's from pediatricians, and pediatricians groups and public health groups, and of course, all these parents of kids under 12 who are going to school and are increasingly going to be stuck inside because windows can't be open because winter is coming. And I heard a really unsatisfying answer from Dr. Fauci on NPR today about this topic. And I think it is fair to say and especially like doctors aren't, nobody wants the FDA to rush the process, right? But doctors now are starting to be like, yeah, you actually do, you know, need to be efficient in this process, and, and if we're spending a ton of time and research and money trying to figure out if we can give healthy 20 somethings or 40 somethings like myself third shots, I would actually prefer, personally, that you give the third shot to my immunocompromised mom, and then quickly with some haste figure out whether my eight year old niece can get her first shot. Like prioritize that. Yep. Come on. Yep. Yeah, that's it. Okay. Okay. All right. That's it for the news fix. Let's do the mailbag. Yep.
Kai Ryssdal: Alright, so we talked about IKEA last week getting into the resale game, reselling its slightly used furniture, here's Christian in Ohio, called us to share his favorite IKEA furniture hack.

Christian: If you have a cordless drill around, and two pliers, you can take the Allen wrench that's included in a piece of IKEA furniture and you can use this pliers to bend it and it will snap off so that you can have just a straight piece of that Allen wrench that you can then put them in a cordless drill. And you can use that to drill a screw in and out thing. And it may sound like a pain. But you only have to do this once. And if you keep that little straight piece of Allen wrench. You can use that to disassemble and reassemble furniture. So if you're moving this is a really nice thing to have never get risk cramps again. Thanks, guys. T

Kai Ryssdal: also blisters not just risk transferred blisters from those stupid blisters. It's

Molly Wood: It's really true. Also, though, I think like my little, I have like a little cordless screwdriver in addition to my drill, and it has an Allen wrench. Oh, elements bits. Yeah, you just put them on there. And yeah, I mean, I like, I like the happiness here. I like the DIY, because you already did, comes with one. It's probably the perfect size and whatever. But yes, there are lots of ways to automate this process. And also, I mean, I'm just gonna like, spoiler alert, our feedback is so amazing today. I love that. And I love this next voice memo, because I am a child, about the fart joke that I made last week.

Sophie: Hi, this is Sophie from Turners falls, Massachusetts. I really appreciated when Molly mentioned that she thought that Patty thing for me because I thought Patty said thanks for making me barf and I just was like, oh my god, I'm such a child. And now I don't feel like such a child anymore.

Molly Wood: I love our show. And I love our audience so much. And then you know who else I love even more? Patty, because Patty called back to clarify, Patty.

Patty: Patty calling from South Lake, Texas. And I really do appreciate you for making me smart. Yes. Smart. Not fart. Thank you.

Kai Ryssdal: That's the episode name on this podcast, this episode. Make me fart. Do a little SEO right there. Come on Tony Wagner or whoever's in charge of this now. I don't even know. We're doing a little reorg, making me fart.

Molly Wood: Oh, my goodness. I love you. I love our audience. I love you, Patty.

Kai Ryssdal: Alright, here we go. One more. Let's hit it.

Mike: Hi, my name is Mike from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. And I found your podcast about three years ago when I got cochlear implants and I needed to rehab and had all kinds of
podcasts sent to me. I’ve been listening ever since. And you’ve helped me recover my hearing. Thanks for helping me recover. And thanks for making me smart. Have a good day, guys.


Kai Ryssdal: Also super cool is that we now can do transcripts of these episodes to make this podcast more accessible for people like Mike and everybody who needs it. And you can find them on the show notes page. They’re posted the morning after we do the show, so, you know, a little lag while we do all the processing, but they’re there. And, and we hope you use them.

Molly Wood: Yeah, thank you, by the way, to everybody who emailed and tweeted us about that. Because yes, that's, that is like table stakes accessibility and we are sorry we didn't do it sooner. And we’re excited to do it now. So keep an eye out and tell your friends about it. Alright, and now we’re gonna leave you with the--and thank you to our team, by the way, and especially Tony Wagner for making that happen. We are now going to leave you with this week's answer to the make me smart question, which is what is something you thought you knew and you later found out you were wrong about. Today's answer comes from Dave in Washington.

Dave: One thing that I thought I knew that I later found out that I was wrong about is that the credits at the end of the podcast are for skipping. You guys actually have managed to make listening to a list of people's names and what they do for your podcast entertaining. And I, and most likely those people, very much appreciate it. Thank you.

Kai Ryssdal: That's cool.

Molly Wood: Oh, it's working. It's working because we couldn't do it without them and I just put in the slack to all of those people who are really tired of me already can we add to make me fart and make me barf? Cuz that's really, okay all right, I'm a child. You, if you have put off emailing or sending us a voice memo, clearly you now see the benefit of doing that. It both entertains, informs and delights us. Send us your answer to the make me smart make me fart question. Consider calling us and leave a voicemail. I'm sorry, I'm fired. 508-82-SMART, 508-UB-SMART. I won't do it again. That was one too many, just went to bed. No, it's, jokes get funnier the more often you repeat them. Okay. Yeah, it's a true story. Make Me Smart is produced and directed by the wonderful patient and extremely adult Marissa Cabrera. Tony Wagner writes our newsletter, and our intern, who's amazing, is Grace Rubin.

Kai Ryssdal: Grace did a bunch of stuff on the, on the transcripts too, so shout out there. Charlton Thorpe is across the studio glass for me, rather, mixing by Emma her brain, she's doing that later. Ben Tolliday and Daniel Ramirez, as all y'all know, composed our theme music. Bridget Bodnar is in charge. To turn you have is, is actually in charge.

Molly Wood: No matter what. It's true. We joke a lot but like you know don't mess with prejudice. Really good point. Really good point.