Panel Two

Natasha Williams

Good afternoon, everyone. I hope you all enjoyed lunch provided by our fabulous caterers. If we can give them a little hand. If there is one thing I can say about an Annenberg event is that you will never go hungry. For those of you here who don't know me, my name is Natasha Williams. I am a third-year joint doctoral student here at Annenberg, as well as affiliated with Penn's political science department, and my research broadly focuses on the intersections of digital culture with issues of international relations, specifically focused on mediations of war, conflict and crisis online. I am also a steering committee member here with the Center for Media at Risk. And I'm also a doctoral fellow with the Center for Advanced Research in Global Communication.

And so it is my pleasure to bring us all once more into conversation this afternoon for our second panel of the day, titled *Precarity and Power*. In panel one this morning, we discussed sociohistorical forces that shape and situate academic norms and praxis both online and offline. And in the panel this afternoon, we will focus on the present and exploring tensions that academics navigate on social media today. We will discuss the potentials and perils of academic visibility online and interrogate how social media and academic freedom mutually influence one another. Following this morning's format, each of our panelists here will speak on these topics for 15 minutes, and then we will open up to an audience Q&A for the latter half. Our first panelist this afternoon is Dr Brooke Erin Duffy.

Dr Duffy is an Associate Professor in the Department of Communication at Cornell University, where she holds appointments in Feminist, Gender and Sexuality Studies and Media Studies. She is the author or co-author of three books, including *Not Getting Paid to Do What You Love: Gender and Aspirational Labor in the Social Media Economy*, which *Wired* named as one of the top tech books of 2017. Dr Duffy's work has also been published in such top journals as the *Journal of Communication*, *New Media and Society* and the *International Journal of Communication*, among many others. In addition to her academic publications, Dr Duffy has disseminated her research to a broader audience through popular writing in *The Atlantic*, *Business Insider* and *Wired*, among others. Doctor Duffy's latest book project, titled *The Visibility Bind: Work and Resistance in the Creator Economy,* is under contract with the University of Chicago Press.

Our second panelist this afternoon will be Dr Rachel Kuo. Dr Kuo's research focuses on race, social movements technology. She is currently an Assistant Professor of Gender and Women's Studies and Asian American Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Her writing and commentary on feminist politics and activism have been published in journals such as *Social Media and Society* and *Political Communication*, and featured in outlets such as *The Washington Post*, *The New Yorker* and *The New York Times*. She is a founding member, a member and current affiliate of the Center for Critical Race and Digital Studies, a co-founder of the Asian American Feminist Collective, and was a 2021 to 2023 Fellow at the Center for Democracy and Technology.

She is co-editor of the anthology *Black and Asian Feminist Solidarities* and two special issues on Asian American abolition feminisms with *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*.

Dr Kuo's current book manuscript, *Movement Media in Pursuit of Solidarity*, demonstrates how technologies enhance and foreclose possibilities for political organization across uneven racial and class difference, and she is working on a new project on disinformation and Asian diasporic politics, with support from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Our third panelist this afternoon will be Dr Julia Sonnevend. Dr Sonnevend is an interdisciplinary scholar, a public intellectual and an Associate Professor in the Sociology Department at The New School. Her work foregrounds features of social and public life that are hard to define, yet they come to define us, such as events, charm and courage. She has been profiled in *The New Yorker*, and her ideas have been featured in a wide variety of news outlets such as *The Atlantic* and *Time Magazine*. Dr Sonnevend's new monograph, *Charm: How Magnetic Personality Shape Global Politics*, focuses on the power of personal magnetism in contemporary politics, and was named to *The New Yorker*'s "The Best Books We've Read in 2024 so far" list. In her previous book, *Stories Without Borders: The Berlin Wall and the making of a Global Iconic Event*, Dr Sonnevend explained how storytellers create global, iconic events that international audiences remember and recycle over time. Dr Sonnevend holds a PhD from Columbia and a Masters of Law degree from Yale, and she grew up in Budapest, Hungary.

And so, I think these rich bios are an indicator of what will surely be fruitful discussions to come. So please join me in welcoming our panelists today.

Brooke Erin Duffy

Thank you so much for the invitation to be here today. As some of you may or may not know, I did my PhD here, and I have counted that four of my former professors are in this very room. No pressure at all. And so, I have attended many of the symposia in this very room. And my appreciation for this community runs very deep. And so, it's a little weird to be issuing what is perhaps not a surprising critique of academia within an institution that I have such allegiances to. And so I do want to just acknowledge the fact that we are having these conversations is a testament to the uniqueness of this very school. So again, thank you for opening up this space for the dialogue.

My talk today is perhaps a bit different, especially from the first where I'm going to be talking not about academics well, a little bit, but more about creators. And so I want to begin by situating my work and think about how the lessons from the creator community bring to bear on academics.

So, for those of you who don't know much about my work, very quick bio. I'm a scholar of media and cultural production, and I'm primarily interested in the platformization of the media and culture industries. A central line of my research has been focused on questions of work and labor. And so, about a decade ago, I was working on a book called *Not Getting Paid to Do What You Love*, where I was studying the work and labor of women

who were trying to make it in the social media economy, and I was struck by the parallels between their experiences and mine as an academic at the time, on the tenure track or going up for tenure.

This is an image from the book and the reflection I provided in the epilogue where I reflected on the similarities between influencer culture and academia. I wrote in this epilogue that as academics, we are guided by this logic of branding. A research specialty is our niche. The academic elevator pitch that we have honed with vigilance is our slogan. This pitch shapes our introductory interactions at academic conferences such as this one, post lecture receptions and informal gatherings, such events like creative industry meetups, and other forms of compulsory sociality which are a peculiar hybrid of labor and leisure.

These activities are rationalized as investments in this future self, but they may or may not pay off. They may or may not be paid for either. Given the diminishing budgets that have forced many universities to suspend travel funding. So again, I wrote that about ten years ago. Fast forward, and I spent the past few years working on a book project on social media creators, influencers and streamers.

The project began with two separate studies I was doing with my graduate students, one where I was interviewing marginalized creators about their experiences with platform governance. The other was a study where we had been interviewing social media influencers about the logic of putting yourself out there and how that entailed particular kinds of vulnerability. And so I've kind of brought these two projects together and since then done about 60 additional interviews with creators, influencers and streamers where I've been centering the experiences of marginalized creators.

And so, what I want to do in the next few minutes is consider some of the parallel trajectories between the creator economy and academia. And we can think about this through the lens of what one of my collaborators, Sophie Bishop, is writing about in the context of "influencer creep," which is a very apt term to think about this. And as I talk, I wonder about the extent to which the expressions and interview excerpts I'm going to share allow us to kind of hold up a mirror to our own activities. These are a few images from various social media platforms, and it's perhaps not surprising, given the neoliberal logics that animate so many spheres of cultural life that we are all compelled to put ourselves out there. We are emboldened to take risks, right? The trade-off can be profoundly rewarding. And so, I think it's quite telling that social media companies that once courted us as users are now courting us as aspiring creators.

And so *YouTube* was, of course, a front runner in this space. But now *Meta Snapchat*, *Instagram*, which is of course owned by *Meta, X*, are all trying to get in there on the creator game. And so *Meta* right now has an entire feature telling creators that they too can get paid to do what you love. But we hear this in academia too, right? This notion of putting yourself out there. And so my first week at Cornell, I attended a seminar on how to best tweet. We know from the research, that that was a quite interesting one, especially because it was that was pre-Musk, to be clear. We know about the

connections between *Twitter* and citations, as we see in this research. Academic journals, books all ask us about our metrics, our citation counts, our following. And so, this logic of putting yourself out there is quite resonant in academia. And to Nick's point earlier, thinking about our complacency, our compliance in this, our being complicit, I talk to my graduate students all the time about self-branding, and so acknowledging the kind of laboring subjectivity that compels.

So why do we do it? Well, in the creator economy, of course, it provides dazzling rewards. You get to be your own boss, you get to do what you love. If you're Mr. Beast, you're making, you know, millions of dollars. In the U.S. tenure system, paying off is getting tenure, right? But we know that these experiences are rooted in heavily lopsided structures. When we think about who pays off in the creator economy, who gets rewarded as well as in Academia, we know these are bound up with existing social inequalities.

And so, I've been thinking about some of the risk intensive conditions that creators experience, and academics too, as a visibility bind. Drawing upon Sarah Banet-Weiser's work, a kind of visibility economy, thinking about these two risk intensive conditions that creators often find themselves trapped in.

And so I'm going to talk briefly about these. And then this allows a little bit of mental gymnastics to show how it applies to academia. The first is of course, invisibility. The system of the creator economy is fraught with exploitation. I've heard considerable accounts over the years of not getting paid in compensation, but this is always deferred via the promise of exposure, right. And so this entails a lot of labor and you hope that you will accrue the rewards. Of course, there's also profound accounts of idea theft, of cultural appropriation, especially of Black creators. Creators are reckoning with the volatility of the platform landscape. I mean, think of what's going on with with *TikTok*, the fact that your entire livelihood could be taken away without notice, without recourse.

This injects an incredible amount of instability into creators' livelihoods. And then finally, the kind of looming fear of shadow bans and algorithmic punishments. And shadow bans are essentially what scholar Carolina Are calls "soft punishment" or "soft censorship," where you're not violating a community guideline for a platform, but all of a sudden you see your numbers go down, and so you have the sense that you are being soft censored by not having your content seen.

And so these are the risks of invisibility in the creator economy. Just to show you how this impacts the lived experiences of creator, this is a quote from Nina who talked about "every time I speak about how *TikTok's* algorithm is different for people of color, especially Black creators, I always, always, always get hit with a content violation or my following videos will be shadow banned." And so there is this pervasive sense that for marginalized creators, if I post anything identity based, I'm going to be punished.

Certainly there are many accounts of idea theft - I've heard this from so many creators - where they'll have a dance or an idea. And just like in the traditional media industries, their ideas and experiences become appropriated by a White creator who gets credibility for this. Okay. So how

does this apply to academia? This came up in the last panel, the invisible labor that goes into self-promotion. I remember when I was going up for tenure, I asked my chair, I said, should I be doing my work or promoting my work? And I was kind of serious because there's so many ways that you need to think about circulating it, and especially in the space that I work and people are constantly churning things out, I'm getting notifications on Twitter and Academia.edu and LinkedIn, and so we're all told to kind of put our content out there.

But this requires time, forms of privilege, other resources. If you are an adjunct professor making $3,500 per course, do you have time to participate in this system? Absolutely not. There's also the very real risk that it may not pay off. Tenure and promotion are not guaranteed. This came up in the last panel again, thinking about the citation politics of this and how much of this economy is predicated on how visible you are, how many metrics you have.

Visibility, we know, begets visibility. And so thinking about how various inequalities are structured into this through invisibility. But what about the other side of the bind - hyper visibility? From my creators I have heard accounts of burnout, targeted hate and harassment, forms of surveillance that prod them to self-censor. So let me give you a few examples. Burnout, of course, is endemic. One of the TikTok creators I interviewed talked about constantly performing for the algorithm, trying to condense everything into 2 or 3 minute soundbites. She said: “It's a weird psychological state to always be in, to always be trying to go viral.” And as I was thinking about this, I was trying to condense everything into an 8000 word journal article. Like these structures that are here but also the platform fatigue. Right?

I too have joined Blue Sky and I'm really excited about it. But it's another platform. It's another place where I need to think about the kind of content I'm putting out there, and the labor that goes into that. Platforms fail. I have heard from so many creators who are dealing with hate and harassment, who are experiencing these forms of identity-based antagonism, that they don't feel protected. So Heather said, you know, there's filters that the platform gives me, but they don't do a good job of filtering out racist comments, you have to go through individually. Norah said something that I've heard so many times, which is “I've tried to get someone on the phone for help. Nobody will respond.” And so because these creators are independent contractors, they don't have the same mechanisms of legal support.

Thinking about hypervisibility in the creator economy. Time and time again, we hear about the accounts of women and faculty of color dealing with hate and harassment that is normalized as part of the job. And I think Rebekah’s comment about occupational hazard is so important because again, it just comes with the territory.

How many of you have heard about the the woman from Cambridge who just posted about her PhD and was like taken down. If you haven't, look up this story. She's been getting rape threats, all because she posted about her PhD in English Literature. And so, for putting yourself out there, you are dealing with risks to your safety. And so if

hate and harassment is one concern of excessive visibility, what about surveillance and weaponized surveillance, where we have students recording faculty in the classroom and then weaponizing it, where we have listeners all around that are trying to catch Faculty, thinking about not just the culture of surveillance, but what one of my students and I called “imagined surveillance”, where there's this pervasive fear of “what could I say or what should I not say?”

And so, again, I don't know that it requires too much in the terms of mental gymnastics, now that I've laid this out, to think about the visibility of kind of Academia. And of course, the consequences and conditions are amplified for historically marginalized communities. But from the point last night that Todd and Rebekah said, like, how do we get away from just talking about problems? What are the solutions?

And so I want to close by thinking about what we might learn from creators about not just contesting visibility regimes but in the context of labor.

And so just a few conclusions I want to draw. One is that there are marked parallels between platforms and Academia, and there's some really interesting and some scary convergences when we think about for-profit sites like *Research Gate* and *Academia.edu*, or the fact that universities are enlisting students as unpaid campus brand ambassadors.

Another scary parallel is the fact that institutions may fail to provide recourse and may amplify harms. And so, I've heard from many creators who say they have this similar narrative about the algorithm, it rewards hate and antagonism. And we know this from the literature on emotional contagion. So thinking about what universities do may amplify harms, but also let's think about the important forms of creator solidarity and resistance that may provide something of a blueprint and a more hopeful direction. And so, I will leave it there. Thank you again. I look forward to the discussion.

Rachel Kuo

Well, thank you so much for having me and also for everybody who's organized this event. I'm really excited to be part of this conversation and it's been so fruitful so far. And so I think in approaching this conversation, I will probably enter into the space really thinking about the perspective right, of movement organizing and thinking about that relationship between like Academic knowledge production and organizing work, which I think is in line with some of the conversations that we've been having. I enter into this space as a scholar of social movements and digital activism, thinking about social media as somebody who's less and less visible on social media platforms over the years. So I was very active, very immersed, and now more and more have become less visible and more hidden.

And so I think where I'll begin with my remarks, just to kind of orient folks who might not be as familiar with some of the ways that I think, with some highly visible online projects that I've been part of, and some of the lessons learned. Then I’ll really focus a lot of my time on thinking about a short, adapted, adapted excerpt from my book on media and social movements as some provocations for how we think about precarity and risk in our

digital landscape, which has always been hostile and carceral.

So what does it mean that we're doing this work on an always already repressive space? So some of the projects that I've done in terms of cultural production and public education have been most often in collectives. And then while the projects themselves have gained a lot of visibility and traction,. I actually have not been that visible as an individual through them. One of them, more recently, was a public report around Asian Americans - and I put in air quotes - disinformation, as people have talked about. It's a very ambiguous, murky term that activates a lot of different kinds of politics.

But actually, the report as it came out, the moment that it gained visibility, it was covered by NBC. And we talk in this report about men's rights, about casteism and Hindu Nationalism, about the notion of Black on Asian crime tropes as they exist. The minute that this came into visibility was the moment that the people that we talked about in the reports were like, “oh, we're coming after all of the authors of this.”

And so, the kind of ways that racism and misogyny permeate on the internet that the moment of visibility was actually when the moment of harassment also emerged. Similarly, I think there was a zine created at the start of the pandemic with the Asian American Feminist Collective. It gained visibility in specifically Asian American digital cultural spaces and feminist online spaces that produce really fruitful connections, such as work that we did with Black women radicals. But then at the same time, the minute that that partnership was more public, we received a lot of intense harassment from members of our own community. To say, like, for black women radicals, like, why are you focused on Asian issues? In the kind of language of “you’re race traitors,” all of that internal community strife and harassment also emerged. The third example I'm thinking about when we also think about precarity and risk are the moments when projects come into visibility, the different lives they take beyond the original intention. One of these was the work of abolitionist discourse in the summer of 2020.

While a lot of attention came as “what are abolitionist politics?” How are we thinking about a world without prisons, police, military? Right? But as it came into the public, for the way that it became keyworded among funders, around the institutions, became then this capture. So I just want to offer these as like some examples of the terrain of visibility and what's been happening. So I share some of these because again, when I started in academia, that was in that 2014 - 2016 juncture. That's like a different kind of era-ish. Ten years ago on social media, there were little spaces, as many people have identified, that were spaces for dissent, protest, collective expressions of grief, of joy. And at that time, I think what's also important to pull out is, when we talk about that 2014 -2016 moment and the kind of public attention on Black Lives Matter, right? And questions of solidarity, that was also a moment of the transnational connections that were being forged between BLM, the US and also Palestine, as this global critique of war and policing at that moment.

You also had the protest against the Dakota Access Pipeline and this kind of

mobilization, right? of what's happening in terms of the environment is wrought by settler colonialism and capitalism. And so you have this moment, right? When people are talking about digital activism, these are the issues that are coming to the fore.

And at that same time, as people have also already mentioned, that repression and surveillance and that criminalization is always already there. I know Guobin talked about this like also in the 60s. Right. The kind of moment of heightened repression. And as resistance is also happening, and so you have, activists and organizers in these movements that were being targeted, Black Lives Matter activists being surveyed as identity extremists, as criminals. And then also as terrorists for the connections that they're building and these kinds of disruptions to routine institutional violence.

Right. You also had laws that were being passed in different states that were charging people with felonies for trespassing on, “critical infrastructure” to target indigenous protesters against pipeline projects. That drew off of 9-11 counterterror laws to protect physical infrastructures. And how this was also emerging last September with Atlanta protesters for Stop Cop City being indicted.

And so you always have these kinds of moments where insurgent demands for liberation, for decolonization, for abolition are always repressed and punished. And so, what I've been thinking a lot about is how the U.S. export of freedom of speech and expression has long twined together imperial violence and freedom, and securing liberal democracy by managing the terms and conditions in which these freedoms are accessed and administered. And so the right to expression has always been unevenly lived. And so I think this functions as a parallel for how we might understand the promises and perils of academic freedom, especially in an industry that is predicated on institutional power relations and hierarchy.

And that's also then coupled with associated dynamics of race and power. As the state or institution seeks to contain threats, it also targets political participation and expression deemed threatening to its own legitimacy. Coming into this conversation, what is first and foremost on my mind - and I think on many people's minds - is Palestine and the intense repression that both academics and activists continue to face. I think many of us in this room have had friends, colleagues, mentors, students be brutalized, arrested, disciplined, doxxed.

And so this kind of moment where people's intellectual analysis of state violence, of colonialism, of racial apartheid, of nationalism become marked as hate speech or as, pro-terrorist activity in efforts to suppress, silence or punish. Like any forms of speech marked as pro-Palestinian. And so I think in these kinds of moments when we think about present crises of democratic freedoms, it is really indicative of the always existing fissures, breaks and erosions of liberal freedoms that have been built on racial and colonial violences that have made such freedom possible.

And so it's always dependent on these uneven relations of power. And so I think if we start thinking about this moment in continuity with the long trajectory of liberalism that has always secured freedom

through empire and corresponding technologies of race and racialization. I think it also points us to how the kind of conceptual and practical limitations of dominant understandings of academic freedom, which are often very underpinned by assumptions of freedom and agency that underwrite liberal individualism, democracy that evolved from this kind of universalization of secular European history, politics and culture and so like liberal democratic freedoms as being made possible on the grounds of racial and colonial violence, continue to legitimate said violences to secure freedom through liberal violence.

Academics, like organizers, have to wrestle, as we think about the digital landscape or media landscape writ large, as one that is already very carceral even in its inauguration and its existence. And so this is it's not my usual slide, this is just for the people who care about policy. And it's a very incomplete genealogy. There were some of the measures of when we think about the internet as we have it today, the measures from the Clinton-Gore administration that transpose policing practices to digital technologies as part of their crime reform and anti-immigration policies.

The kind of digital landscapes that we currently work on are always coupled with the contradiction that these very same tools not only introduce frictions, but are used for counterinsurgent tactics of punishment and repression.

And so these ties between big tech state violence and racism have always become ever more obvious, right from the uses of platforms to promote ethno-nationalisms. Like the kind of blocking and censuring of social media activity, online banking activities and all of that.

I think in this kind of genealogy, alongside Clinton crime reform, what was happening with the digital telephony act, the kind of Antiterrorism and Death Penalty Act, and how we might trace it, to what was happening with the Patriot Act, that a lot of scholars around what was happening with the war on terror have talked a lot about, and this networked surveillance system as is threading through this current moment into what's happening in the House in terms of suspending nonprofit status.

At the same time, though, I'm very wary of the kinds of projects that also seek to reform technology or democracy without any explicit analysis or commitment to understanding race, power and violence. In the absence of a deliberate politics, these kinds of reforms often tend to facilitate ongoing, legally sanctioned violence.

This is an old memo from the Third World Women's Alliance that during their moments of being surveyed by the FBI, where they wrote, “we are always in the presence of the enemy at a stage where you can be incriminated for wanting to be free.” And so I point this out, because I think it speaks to the kind of conditions that we have always been in. But at the same time, going back to that slide on policy. What happened was the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act was passed as a measure to reform government surveillance. So they were like, “oh, that was illegal.” And so then they passed FISA. So what Jimmy Carter then said was, for the first time, a prior judicial warrant for all electronic surveillance would be needed.

And so this basically inaugurates warranted surveillance. So you have what has been legal policing versus illegal policing and so this legacy of FISA then begins to offer this reminder that liberal reform will always reproduce legally sanctioned violence, because in 2008, 30 years after FISA was passed, you have section 702 under the FISA Amendments Act that authorized warrantless spying on foreign persons outside of the U.S. who may potentially possess intelligence and intelligence information as part of this national security measure. Post 9-11, section 702 is what sweeps up all the emails, texts, calls by anybody who is in contact with a targeted individual. And so people were running searches on victims and witnesses of what was happening with police violence on protesters during the 2020 uprisings.

And so I think a lot of the contemporary debates on social media surveillance and privacy often talk about warrantless spying. I think they begin to push us like, okay, so what then? Does government oversight actually do what is warranted? What does it mean to legalize forms of policing, versus thinking about policing as a system of violence that can't be technologically or democratically managed?

I think many people are making the calls for, how do we think about collective action and organizing? I think continuing to reflect, sharpen and grow our analyses and theories of race, power and violence as not only politically instructive, but also necessary to the broader academic project of how we can theorize a new humanity, freedom and democracy away from the ravages of imperialism, capitalism and racism.

And as we seek to create safer conditions for knowledge production, we are always enacting this within a hostile and repressive technological terrain. And we're always working under compromised conditions. But I think in the midst of this, we must also keep working within the contradictions to reflect, grow and transform. And I think that's key and core to this kind of project of academic study.

Julia Sonnevend

Thank you for coming to the post-lunch panel. That's always the hardest. I'm very honored to be here today. It was actually two days ago that I received an email from my dear mentors, Guobin and Barbie, asking me to be on this panel, and I usually say no to last minute requests because I'm old school. I overprepare, I overworry, I overpractice. But Barbie knows me and she knew I would say yes for two reasons. One is that I love Annenberg and so many of you here, that it's also a way to catch up and see you all. And the other reason is that they asked me to connect Charm, my book, with Academia. Well, it's a stretch. Okay. Let's leave it there. There are a lot of words that would come to my mind when it comes to Academia. Charm is not in the top hundred. Academics are awkward. We are obsessive. I'm Eastern European, so I use words that we are idiotic. I drive my Midwestern husband crazy with saying these words. But charming? Occasionally, a few of them.

Okay. So bear with me as I'm trying to connect the two. I do need to speak a little bit about the book so that it's clear how I

define charm, or how I think of charm. So part of this book is the realization that we pay more attention to personalities than to institutions, values, or facts. And if that's the case, then we simply have to better understand how these personalities are constructed in mediated environments. And then the starting point for looking at charisma and charm is still Max Weber, the German sociologist from the early 20th century who moved charisma out of the religious realm, namely the Catholic Church, to the secular realm and defined it in a way that we could apply it in social and political settings.

And in fact, he thought that charisma was a key feature of political leadership. But note that Weber wrote this theory before the invention of television, and certainly before the rise of Adolf Hitler. It was a very different political and media environment. So I thought that some update is needed, and I spent a lot of time thinking about the difference between charisma and charm. And I think the heart of the difference is distance and proximity.

Okay, so charisma relies on distance to political citizens. Think of exceptional performances by Martin Luther King or Winston Churchill. Far away from the audience. Limited set of media platforms. In contrast to that, charm is based on proximity. So what? Politicians try to sell you that they are just like you. The illusion that you could have a beer with them. They could be here, we could have coffee and so on. And of course, these representations spread in a wide variety of media platforms. And here comes the central paradox in it. And we know this in academia very well. The performance of authenticity. Right. So when I asked people at airports or daycare drop offs is, you know, do you think the media is real authentic? No, no, no, it's fake. It's constructed. It's manufactured everything. But then if you ask the second question, do you want your politician to be real, to be authentic, then they would say yes, right? So we demand kind of a constant, steady performance of authenticity in a fundamentally fake environment.

Right. And that's the challenge of contemporary politics and in many ways, academia too. But we will talk more about it. So I speak about a lot of techniques in how politicians build up this idea that they are just like us. One is restaging: so moving politics out from its regular settings, such as Congress or press conferences, into, let's say, the kitchen of Kamala Harris. This is the video when she's cracking the egg, you know, with one hand. That famous one.

But of course, that has little to do with who is a good president, right? The president is in boring meetings, delegates tasks. There are a lot of, you know, tools and qualities you need as a president that are not really viral, that don't work well in these kind of videos. And of course, it's very important to realize and this is, of course, a tool that is used also by the global right wing. This is not a left or liberal or centrist tool to appear as one of us.

To me, this was one of the most interesting sentences of the Trump campaign. I don't know whether you remember it. At some point he visited a barber shop in the Bronx, and then he said to the overworked, underpaid workers, “you guys are the same as me.” Based on what metric? Right. Like, what was the assessment here? That's

the message. And this is something that is used internationally as well. I have a chapter on Viktor Orban and how he presents his family regularly as sort of celebrities to the audience on *Facebook*, how he visits food carts and orders various meals that are considered quintessentially Hungarian. Don't tell them that they are not actually Hungarian. But anyway, and then he indirectly draws the boundaries of the nation. He doesn't necessarily have to directly communicate it each time. But there is a message there.

You know, he helps with the stroller - it's always white heterosexual families with multiple children. And then he is diapering his grandkid. This is a post on *Facebook* where he's the most popular, politician. He has more than 1 million followers in a country of 10 million. And he says, don't worry, I will give you back to your mom. Right? So the message is pretty clear. I will take care of the kid momentarily. It's the woman's role otherwise. So indirectly, you get the message.

And then I asked the question in the book, what are the cases when we have authenticity without these tools of being one of us? And then my case study is Angela Merkel, who was chancellor of Germany for 16 years. Incredibly powerful position. And this is her Instagram. Okay. That's my favorite slide, by the way. So here's Angela Merkel, right. The team tried to turn her into an Instagram celebrity for a brief period of time. Didn't work. Okay. It's a disaster. So they quickly changed course. So basically you have Angela Merkel presenting facts. The color of the jacket is changing, right? But she's herself. She's authentic. So charm oscillates on a spectrum of seduction and deception. What do I mean by that? So if it works, you fuse with the performer. Think performance theory. You experience the best form of seduction. And I do argue in this book that we have to face it. You know, it's hard to do that. That seduction is important, right? It's easy to say, “oh, I don't want to have anything to do with seduction”, which people often say, but let's be honest, who doesn't want to be seduced, right?

So there is that element. But then there is also the dark side, the deception aspect. It's connected to psychopathology, fraudsters and obviously also to authoritarian and fascist leadership.

So Academia okay, let's face it, who is a charming academic. Let's think about that. I think then the question is who is an authentic academic. And I can think of a few in life. I think you know that when you meet them. So, let's say you go to ICA and everybody is doing their performative nonsense, you know. And then you meet the authentic academic who is the real mensch. Right. Sort of different. I can also say from my own journey as a PhD student, Jeffrey Alexander, telling me, come every Friday for 90 minutes to New Haven and let's work on your dissertation. And I'm not at Yale. I'm at Columbia. He's doing that. Why is he doing that? I don't know. He has this kind of dedication. Or Elihu Katz driving me every Tuesday to the university. He was 88 at that time in Jerusalem. And crazy traffic. I was fearing, you know, for my life as he was driving.

But he said, let me explain to you, Julia, the history of communication studies. You know, he just did that. And then there is Barbie, who helps me with a charm book, even though, I’m a former student. She doesn't have to do that. And she does it. So

these are the moments when you realize it's not the performance, but somebody cares for a variety of reasons, and it's hard to do, hard to remain authentic.

So I want to give you a little bit of an example of, you know, as you know, my book got picked up by the media. Who knows why. But it also created this situation that I was forced to do a lot of promotion. So I got this image, for instance, from the publisher when *Charm* got published in Hungarian to share this on Instagram. And I don't like the coffee mug. I don't like the chair or the whole thing, but you know, you still have to kind of share it. There is a Twitter banner you have to put on your X and Twitter account. There are all these endless events in which you worry that you don't repeat yourself or say something stupid because there are just so many of them. And then the media articles start to come and apply charm to various contexts. And you have little control over it in terms of which contexts and how and, and so on.

It starts to circulate and then you start to write your own things. I usually write the op-eds from 5pm to 6am because I have a little kid who then wakes up, and then I teach and by noon we edit. It comes out in the afternoon. This is my final take on the VP debate. You know, it's there forever, but it was written within an hour in the morning. So the tension between the two, right? And all the slowness we discussed with Nick and so on is gone. The hesitation, the the complexity, the nuance.

So let's get more back to charm in academia. And I wanted to show you a unique example of a charming academic. Okay. And it's a unique example because it's a university president. And I think we are used to kind of dehumanizing university presidents, particularly the whole culture of that. And I think, let's be honest, it's not only the right, we sometimes do it too. It's easy to speak of university administrators in a way that you don't consider that they are human beings, too. And it's really difficult to be a university president, particularly. So we have a wonderful new president at the new school who has spent 20 years as a faculty member beforehand. And speaking of charm, he does say that every time you meet him, he says, I spent 20 years here as a faculty member. I happen to be the president, you know.

So there is that kind of game of “I'm like you,” “the same as you,” “I happen to be the president.” I'm on the Faculty Senate. Don't ask me why. I'm on the Faculty Senate. And he comes and speaks in such a way. He speaks about Thomas Kuhn and mentions, you know, theories and books he has read and so on. And he meets faculty members and goes to various events. And he recently opened my book event with this sentence. So I called him charming in *The Atlantic*. But I thought it was such a classic example of charm that he came to the event. He spent ten minutes analyzing the book, which was, you know, not a standard university president way of doing it. And I thought there was a certain charm in the kind of hesitation and playing around, you know, we interact a whole lot. So the question that I have for you is the ultimate question, who are the authentic academics at this gathering?

Right. And I don't expect an answer, you know, from everyone you can email me or and I can give you my list next time you

invite me to Annenberg. Just do it earlier, okay? Thank you.

Natasha Williams

Thank you all so much for those incredibly generative and thought-provoking presentations. You've each individually brought to the fore and to our attention myriad issues and ways in which the logics of social media and public-facing scholarship problematizes the nature of scholarship today through visibility regimes, this sense of an always already existing precarity imbued by the nature of colonialism and neoliberalism, and finally toward the tensions brought on between performances of charm and authenticity amongst academics.

So now we will turn to our audience and bring you all into discussion with our panelists. We invite questions from you all. Please look out for our mic runners. Raise your hand if you have a question and please introduce yourself before asking your questions. Thank you.

Jessa Lingel

My name is Jessa. I'm a faculty member here and I just wanted to thank you all for those talks. It was really engaging. I want to return us to the question of resistance and what that looks like, and to think about what collective resistance looks like in the academy. I think we've heard great articulations of the problem, but I'm still struggling to grapple with what the resistance in place looks like.

You know, here at the University of Pennsylvania it is a private university. We're not allowed to form a bargaining union. I mean, we have an advocacy chapter, and I'm very involved in that. I mean, you realize the limits of that kind of organization, even as I'm still willing to put in the time to build that collective power. And I do have hope for it. I've served on Faculty Senate committees. I mean, I don't have a lot of hope for those I've served at, you know? So where are the structures that you've seen, the models that we can look to, to really build the collective power that we need to address the problems you're raising?

Brooke Erin Duffy

Jessa started with the easy question. So one of the ways I do want to call attention to what we talked about some of the discussions from yesterday. There are no easy answers. But thinking about the ways that we can use our existing tools. And so I mentioned that autonomous communication article. And one of the reasons I like it is because it's arguing who is better prepared to discuss issues with the media than media professionals within the context of labor.

And so, what are the unique tools that we have? Within this particular, you know, within the various constraints? Well, we can write, we can conduct research, we can amplify each other. And so one of the things that I have tried to replicate, that I see creators doing, it's a way to challenge some of this, is the creators do what's called “signal boosting,” which plays to the visibility logics of the platform economies by saying, you know, “so and so wrote this.” And so how can we replicate this in citational politics? And so, I think that's an easy way that unless we can fully get outside the system, which I don't see happening, what are ways we can band together to push back in the ways that

play to the strengths of academia and the strengths of communication?

Rachel Kuo

I think one of my answers to that question, too, it's probably an unsatisfying answer, but one of them is thinking about this notion of “how do we do collective study and analysis, right?” I think oftentimes in jumping towards solutions, there's always that turn to quick fixes, whether that's policy, technological, and then actually without that adequate analysis of - where are we actually in alignment, how do we understand power - the kind of horizons that we're trying to go to. That's where in those moments of like short term crisis, you actually see then the longitudinal harms that happen. And I do think academics, we are good at thinking, and that's like actually a kind of shared space that I often am like “it's okay to slow down, right?” I think that's one piece that I'm thinking through. I am actually thinking about a lot what Todd shared yesterday about how do we organize across sectors in the Academy?

And one example of this was in that 2017 moment at the university I was at, we did a lot around campus sanctuary and so actually built from faculty in relation with staff, but then also with student organizers and then local community, to kind of think through, what does campus sanctuary look like? Obviously, the university was not going to make the campus a sanctuary, right? But then what were the kinds of tools at the time? We had a lot of folks at the law school that worked with community organizations to do asylum clinics and then like those are also short term, you're not fixing this larger deportation regime. But I think there's these kinds of moments of, how do you think about what is at your disposal at that moment to think, those are quick answers. And I do think the question of failure, people talk a lot about, and I think that is also okay, I think to not have the prescriptive answer right away and to think through these contradictions that often emerge at that level of theory and practice and to work through and across those.

Julia Sonnevend

I only have a very brief answer to that. My next book is on courage. And so I do think of this question a lot. And one answer I would give is - what is a strategic intervention? Like what is a meaningful way of doing it. And because at the university, you deal with a structure that norms institutional limitations and so on. So to me, it is always the question of how to do it in a strategic way that it actually makes a difference instead of just being performative, because that's very easy to do.

Audience Member

I think my question is for all of you, but it was Brooke Erin Duffy’s presentation that got me thinking about visibility and invisibility. Right? And this idea that if we're not on social media, we're invisible. Almost. I'm shortcutting your presentation, but are we? Who are we visible to when we are on these social media? Right. There's a lot of entropy going on there. There's a lot of noise. I remember getting rid of Twitter in, I think, 2020. In lockdown, I just could not handle all the entropy, let me say. And then if I think what did I miss? Did I become invisible? Probably. Who cares, right? But what did I miss was mainly seeing what my peers

were up to. Right. But where was my visibility in sort of pre-social media? I spent a lot of time going to talk to civil society organizations. I would go and talk to the Socialist Women, and then the next day to the Atheist Group and then to other people. Those civil society organizations are still out there, still hoping that we will come and talk to them. And I think you really talked. I sound like an old woman, but I am. That's fine actually, right? I love digital media, by the way. Right. That's not the issue. But I do think we get sort of blinded by, even if we get quoted in the *New York Times*, you'll add a thousand followers or these interesting people - but are they really listening to what you're saying? So right. What kind of visibility and to whom and with what purpose? That's my question.

Brooke Erin Duffy

I think the first part was especially compelling in terms of, you know, what does it mean to be invisible and to whom? Because there is a notion of these being vanity metrics, like, does it really matter if you're not having any sort of civic engaged dialogue? You know, because the whole idea, the kind of town square, public square notion is: I have these Twitter followers and I am engaging in this, or I am a publicly engaged scholar, and I am doing this work because it is going to shape some sense of the mainstream public agenda, and that doesn't necessarily happen. I think it's worrying to me how much these commercial logics have infiltrated the academic system in terms of the fact that, in my tenure materials, there was a discussion about, I put the discussion in there because someone suggested you know, your citations and what courses you've taught at all of this, like showing your evidence of impact. But it doesn't seem that far of a stretch to me to say I have this many followers on *Twitter*, because in book contracts they do ask that.

And so these become proxies for how valuable you are. I mean, I have been in meetings where we talk about someone's Google Scholar citations, and I don't think that's unique. And so there's kind of a slippage. But I think your question about the audience also brings me to the fact that having this public audience can again give you the wrong audience. And so creators talk about being on the wrong side of TikTok or the wrong side of Twitter, and that essentially means that you are visible to antagonistic audiences. And this is what we're seeing all the time in the political landscape where you know, the discussions of woke liberals being served to the wrong audiences, and how that can amplify it. And so do what? What control do we even have in this context to siphon off our audience and say, these are the people I'm speaking to? And I don't have an answer, but I think it's important to keep framing that as “what audience” when we're talking about these visibility metrics.

Niels Mede

Niels Mede, University of Zurich, Switzerland. My question was also prompted by one of your slides, Brooke which was entitled “The Risk of Invisibility.” And I wondered whether there's also a risk of visibility or, let's say, a threat to scientific progress and that sense that and I know that's deeply Habermasian the loudest voice, the most authentic voice, the most charming voice wins and not, the smartest argument, the best evidence and so on. So doesn't that

really kind of harm scientific progress, equitable production of knowledge? And I wonder what your thoughts about this are and whether this might also be kind of a risk to scientific inquiry in a broader sense.

Brooke Erin Duffy

Thank you. I keep coming to this quote that haunts me, this is an interview I did probably about a decade ago with an aspiring influencer. And she said, “you know what? You don't have to be the best. You have to be good enough and well marketed.” And that sticks with me because, I mean, I think you're absolutely right. It is impossible to be able to do the good, thoughtful work. And the comment from the the previous panel from Jayson, it was about the politics of temporality and pushing for this slowness. The social media economy does not reward this. Politics do not reward this. And so what are the risks? It is this constant pace of constant updates.

There's all kinds of problems with being an academic 50 years ago. Let me acknowledge that. But to not get these constant email alerts and using our email signatures to see what everyone is publishing and everything becomes a space for branding. What if we were able to opt out of that? And so, you know, the one risk is that it's rerouting our energies towards this.

But then what I get caught on is, isn't our part of our job as academics to inform the public, to share our research beyond the ivory tower? And I do a lot of public scholarship, in part because I otherwise there is the fear that the discussions about social media creation and influencers are not taken seriously, not well theorized, or given over to the tech industry to control that narrative. But, I mean, it is essentially a trap because if you are devoting your time and energies to this promotion, it detracts from the kind of larger project.

LaCharles Ward

LaCharles Ward. I used to be here at Anennberg. I'm now at the Smithsonian. And I've been thinking about the precarity and power and the conversation and thinking about actually, to connect your notion of, well, not necessarily charm, but maybe the idea of seduction and the ruse of seduction, which we can also then think of the ruse of power in relationship to early diversity, equity and inclusion initiatives.

The ways in which we in the university really fought for the recognition and the visibility of folks, people of color, women, queer folks, trans folks to be included. Then the ways in which that got then taken up by corporate America and where they created diversity, equity and inclusion initiatives. For most people, they were seduced by this move to actually create a moment where there is an entire department committed to actually thinking about inclusion and what that would look like in organizations, both university and non-university settings. And thinking about that idea with the notion of the most precarious of subjects.

So thinking about the folks who work at our university dining halls. Right. Folks outside of this room cleaning up after we just had lunch. Right. Like thinking about how even in this charm of diversity, equity and inclusion, we still have the most vulnerable workers not receiving the same kinds of care. Right?

And then connecting that to our current moment where those very things that we were so charmed by are now completely being dismantled and eviscerated. Right.

The point in that which is not a question. It's a point to build on. The conversation is that we all, in many ways got seduced. Whether you're a grad student, you have to write a diversity statement, right? That is a way in which we perform this commitment to diversity and inclusion.

Yet we're now dealing with the impact of giving in to that kind of response to the conditions that create our labor and our everyday experiences, right? While holding, at the same time, to those initiatives also brought about really important people into these positions to enact some form of change, right, who also have then been pushed out. Right, because they've also been outspoken. And really there is no like question there, but just a way to locate this moment that we're in. There are so many ways in which we do get seduced and charmed by people and power, right, to give the things that we want, and that it's always hard to navigate our way out.

And I think of this even in terms of labor and organizing. At Northwestern, I remember we were fighting for graduate wages and we were pitted against STEM folks, right? We were. And then all of a sudden we all got a universal 20% raise in graduate stipend. But that was because they wanted us to stop the organizing, right? So they gave us money, but they also said, “hey, we have seduced you into believing that that was all you really wanted.”

And so I just wanted to add that to the discussion, because I do think it is related to what we do. And it's been really torn apart in the mainstream media. And you could respond to that.

Rachel Kuo

I'll quickly respond. Just really briefly what you're speaking to. It’s like always that lure of reform. And there's so many kinds of different parallels with what happened, right? With radical movements that became NGOs. And they're like, “here, like, you're welcome.” Like formalization and institutionalization that always become precarious. We’re in this moment where people are like “we need to save science.” And you're like, what? Science was also really racist and what do we do with that? So yeah, that's kind of short response.

Julia Sonnevend

Short response from me too, that I just wanted to thank you for mentioning the dining hall workers. I think there's the other element of dehumanization. An academic is sitting in her office writing 10 million statements on how progressive and super we are for the working class, but never stops to say hello to the security guard, or a conversation with the person who just cleaned this room. I think that's nonsense. I think that's performance. My book is about performance, but this is the form of performance that I have little respect for. But the actual way how you presented it, where the human being is, there is a meaningful way of activism.

Audience Member

I want to follow up with LaCharles on your point, because this was a great panel,

lots to think about. I've been thinking about the sort of key terms or key logics maybe that I saw from each of you. So, Brooke. Visibility. Rachel. Surveillance. Julia. Authenticity. And thinking about those three as part of this idea of how academics inhabit particular spaces or not. And to your point, LaCharles, about seduction.

It seems clear to me that we are seduced by visibility. We are all seduced by visibility. And Adrian's really interesting question at the end of the last panel has also got me thinking about things like metrics and visibility. And, Brooke, it makes perfect sense for you to put the number of Twitter followers on your tenure dossier, if that's what we are rewarding. And so I'm wondering if you could speak to different logics of visibility.

W created the feedback of visibility on social media platforms. We could create something different. We could create a different goal for visibility. Moya Bailey, Sarah Jackson and Brooke Foucault-Welles have written a whole book about a different goal for visibility on social media platforms and what that means for community and solidarity. And so your comments about seduction really made me think, what we're seduced by is a certain kind of visibility, not just visibility, but a particular logic of visibility. And I'm wondering if you had thoughts on other logics?

Brooke Erin Duffy

I think the notion of visibility, as you well know, is quite fraught and used by different actors to widely different ends. Of course, now it's, it's often rooted through individual neoliberal commercial logics. Also part of the commercial logics is thinking about the market friendliness. So if you're a creator, you think about how to balance needs and not offend not just the platform companies, but the advertisers and the potential audiences.

But that's exactly the sort of thing people do when they are posting on online is not setting off the wrong audience. Appealing to other academics, but also within the university system, not offending donors. And so what a good model of visibility looks like for an individual may often conflict with the university. And so there's where we see those ruptures where, yes, X University wants their faculty to put themselves out there to respond. And we heard this from Rebekah to respond to media requests, to do the op-eds, but that's if they are engaging in a kind of brand-friendly message, something that is too politicized, that kind of walks too far into the territory, that could peel back any kind of funding.

That's not a good kind of visibility. And so thinking about what a good kind of visibility could look like, I mean, it it's one that challenges this culture of individualism, this culture of market logic, and upends how we've been thinking about visibility as one that is structured through the neoliberal market logics that have infiltrated all spaces.

And so even in that case, it was the signal boost. Yes, it's to help individuals, but it's coming from creators of color who are realizing this system and finding ways to push back or thinking about forms of salary transparency where faculty will post different initiatives. I mean, that's deploying invisibility to strategic ends. And so I think when the goal is not this

kind of individual progress, but one that is acknowledging the structural realities and advocating for more collective support, then that kind of gets us outside of this one.

Julia Sonnevend

I think that's the $1 million question, right? Because we are seduced by it, too. And that's leaving the hypocrisy behind. Yes, it's forced upon us. But there is also something really seductive in this kind of sharing and interaction, and occasionally it does lead to meaningful things.

We all have been invited to panels or co-wrote articles because we interacted on some social media platform and an idea came and then we did it and so on. I don't have a good answer. But I think in-person meetings like this one matter enormously. I had many times the experience that on a social media platform, I find somebody impossible. And I would think I have nothing in common with that person. And then we meet at an academic meeting, and actually, we share a lot of things. And, you know, the person is amazing. And that happens pretty often, right? So there is a difference between the authenticity performance there and in everyday interactions. And you know, the opposite can happen too obviously. But I do believe in these small settings on a focused topic, as a place of intervention.

Audience member

Thank you so much. This was a really lovely panel. I think my question really does tie with all three of the key concepts and terms that you brought in. So I don't even know where I wrote this. I think I wanted to talk about the idea of authenticity and performativity in digital activism.

I was thinking a lot about this idea. You were talking about charisma and charm and authenticity, and then also you were talking about visibility and invisibility and hypervisibility. And obviously Rachel, you were talking about digital activism specifically. And I was thinking about how online, I think there's a lot of focus on both creators and digital activists, on authenticity and specifically I see the validation or invalidation of digital activists based on the authenticity or their identity politics or maybe the purity of their politics online and how sometimes that can contribute to their invisibility.

If they're like, “oh, your purity politics aren't good enough.” And sometimes, they're hyper-visible, and then they're “canceled” for that. I don't know if you all have seen in digital activist spaces, the online joke is like, you know. And so specifically since we're talking about precarity and power how does that affect the precarity of digital activists, so all of this discourse around visibility, authenticity, How does that affect the effectiveness of different forms of resistance online?

Rachel Kuo

I can start off with this question because I think many people, in thinking about solidarity, are very consumed by this question of like, “what is performative solidarity versus authentic solidarity, right?” You hear that a lot from people in different spaces trying to grapple and be like, “I hope I'm not being performative. I'm showing up in this way.” And so I feel like that's this kind of interesting space. If

you're talking about digital activism in the form of social media platforms, that is all about text and visual signification, right? That like mediates a form of showing up. But I think that is often not the only form.

I was talking a little bit about the kind of banal, the drudgery of digital activism. With this question of authenticity, it's like, I think, a level of consistency in how people are engaging with contradictions and examples that I often give. You might have already heard me give that, but it's when I think about summer 2020. And there were so many, for example, Asian-American organizations that were like, "oh yes, we stand with black liberation, we are with racial justice." Then at the same time, as more and more visible incidents of anti-Asian violence emerge, they were like, but we need you to take hate seriously. We want police task forces and those kinds of moments. You see where on paper this desire to be like in visible solidarity then stands in direct contradiction with practice or with what's happening.

And I feel like that kind of fraughtness is something that people are often get to be like, am I being performative? Am I being authentic? Which comes up a lot.

Audience member

My question was inspired by Julia's talk, but feel free to chime in as time allows. I just love this notion of the authentic academic. So, I wanted to unpack that a little more. And I thought it was so telling that many of your examples or several of your examples of that were rooted in mentorship. So, I wonder, does that speak to the idea that maybe cultivating authenticity as an academic becomes yet another form of unpaid labor. Because mentorship is incredibly important, but that is often the form that it takes. So I'm wondering maybe are there ways or should institutions or departments support this cultivation?

Julia Sonnevend

It's a good question, like an authenticity award or something. It's a very good observation that I mentioned mentorship as example. But there are other ways in which we could be a little bit more authentic. So, for instance, faculty bios on university websites. You don't necessarily have to present yourself as the most important scholar in the world, right? Like it's not a requirement. We write these things. So it's very clear that, you say that he's a world renowned scholar of whatever with 255 articles, so these are the moments of intervention when I think we play into this kind of mindset instead of saying what I'm interested in, what motivates me, what what is meaningful to me in the world, we do exactly the thing that that is the opposite, this kind of quantified, narrow, egoistic thing on our own pages.

And it's obviously fostered and encouraged in many distinct ways. So I don't have like a clear answer to you of how that could be cultivated with one stop quick intervention. But I think acknowledging more mentorship is a crucial element. Not having necessarily the final answer on everything immediately, should be a requirement of being a good academic. I tell my students it's okay to say, "I don't know." So maybe I would say that I don't know the answer fully to this.

Natasha Williams

Okay. I think that wraps us up for now. Thank you all so much for your critical

questions and provocations. And most of all, thank you to our incredible panelists for this really generative discussion and for your thoughts and reflections today. We'll be back in this room at 2:45 for our last panel, where we will be thinking and imagining toward more optimistic futures for public facing scholarship. Thank you.