

Strange Bedfellows: Are Individual Freedoms Compatible with Group Rights? By Dr. Grant Havers (Philosophy)

Liberal democracies in principle uphold the rights of the individual to freedom of speech, worship, and conscience. All individual persons, who are equally protected under the law, ideally enjoy these rights. The religious basis for these individual rights is Christianity, the first religion to recognize human equality, or the dignity of all human beings. Since the 1960s, however, a revolutionary transformation of the meaning of these rights has taken place. “Group Rights,” or rights which are awarded according to group identity, challenge the hegemony of individual rights. The rise of group rights has been fuelled by the well-meaning attempt to redress longstanding patterns of discrimination which have been inflicted upon historically oppressed groups. In the process of legally implementing these rights, however, the mass democratic state has taken on the task of infringing upon individual rights in the name of enhancing “tolerance” and “diversity.” The upshot of this rights revolution is the decline of individual freedom, the rise of the big state, and fierce competition between oppressed groups for power and prestige. The reconciliation of individual rights with group rights is one of the most serious challenges facing liberal democracy.

Liberal Democracy and Group Rights

Let’s start with a definition of terms here. Individual freedoms (or rights) belong to individuals. In practical terms, this means that all rational adults within a liberal democracy (the only regime which grants these rights) have the same rights. This corresponds with another great principle, equality before the law. All of us have the same rights to free speech, worship, association, and conscience under the law. We do not have the right to violate the rights of others nor do these others have the right to violate our freedoms. Group rights are a different kettle of fish, since these rights belong to groups. It is my membership within a particular group which determines my rights. It also means that different groups, depending on different criteria, can possess rights which the other groups do not. Group rights, then, enshrine unequal treatment before the law, since not all groups possess the same rights. This rights revolution poses great implications for the survival of freedom of speech in our time.

Christian Origins of Individual Freedom

Let's start with a historical-theological survey of the origins of individual freedoms, which begin with Christianity. What does Christianity have to do with individual freedom? After all, this term never appears in Scripture. Yet the Bible commands all of us to love our neighbors (and even our enemies) as we would want to be loved. What does this love have to do with politics? The Enlightenment philosopher Benedict Spinoza answered: everything. In his magisterial work, *The Theologico-Political Treatise* (published anonymously in 1670 in Holland), Spinoza insists that one cannot practice Christian love unless one respects the freedom of others. If I want freedom for myself but not for others, then I am a hypocrite. The GR also applies to those who rule: their job is to regulate actions rather than ideas. "The right of the highest powers concerning sacred as well as profane matters is only related to actions; otherwise let it be granted to each both to think what he wants and to say what he thinks." (Spinoza, *Theologico-Political Treatise*, chapter 20)

Christian love is necessary for liberal democracy to function. In Spinoza's view, then, the Bible is the true foundation of democracy, since the golden rule calls on all human beings to treat the other as they would want to be treated. If no one wants to be a slave, then no one can enslave another. As Abraham Lincoln famously put it: "Those who deny freedom to others, deserve it not for themselves; and, under a just God, cannot long retain it."

There is a powerful individualism which is subtly revealed in the Bible. Spinoza well understood that we have to treat each other as individuals in order to fulfill the imperative of Christian love. After all, God judges all of us as individuals, according to what we do or fail to do. God's sacrifice in love bridged the gulf between the world and the transcendent and made it possible for men to face each his indissoluble identity and accept its responsibilities. Only the person can be the earthly pole of the discharge between the transcendent and the immanent. The sanctity is drained out of all institutions of an earthly nature. For no community, no state, no association—only persons, individual human beings—can receive the beatific vision or be redeemed by the divine sacrifice of love. (Frank S. Meyer, *In Defense of Freedom*, 1962, p. 93)

Freedom is not license; we are not allowed to do whatever we want to do. "God's sacrifice in love" demands that we love all human beings regardless of their attachments to caste, nation, or creed. To say the least, this is a demanding truth, since human beings are all too naturally inclined to love their own kind more than anyone who is a stranger or an enemy. What the Bible commands is that we put aside the natural instinct to love only our tribe and group and instead love those whom we do not want to love.

Immanuel Kant, another great Enlightenment philosopher, well understood the political application of the golden rule: freedom for all.

A constitution allowing the greatest possible human freedom in accordance with laws by which the freedom of each is made to be consistent with that of all others [Critique of Pure Reason, 1787, B 373]

Kant is recognizing the true (Christian) understanding of freedom. The real test of freedom of speech is to protect and tolerate freedom of speech for those with whom you disagree.

What does the Christian understanding of individual freedoms or rights mean for us today? As Michael Ignatieff explains in *The Rights Revolution*, ‘the basic intuition of rights talk is that each of us is an end in ourselves, not a means to an end.’ Although Ignatieff does not mention the religious foundation of this idea, he is implicitly acknowledging the Christian premise that all human beings have dignity and are not to be treated as mere means to an end. We are not simply objects to be used by others, without regard for our inherent dignity. For this reason, rights are necessary so that the law can protect us from violations to our dignity by the state, the majority, or powerful interests in society. By ‘violation,’ I mean either physical harm or the threat of physical harm. Once again, in accord with the golden rule, these are rights which belong to all human beings.

How does this liberal tradition deal with conflicting views? How do we balance individual freedoms with the safety and well-being of society? It is important to recognize that this tradition does not allow the state to regulate the private realm of conscience. That means that I have a right to freedom of speech unless I employ it in a violent, threatening, or mischievous way. As J. S. Mill once observed, I cannot yell “Fire” in a crowded theatre. If we disagree with each other on ideas, we must do so peaceably. In accord with the golden rule, we must respect each other’s right to disagree.

What about conflicts between individual and group rights? I fully concede that there are exceptional circumstances in which group rights must prevail over individual rights. Group rights are an important legal mechanism in righting the wrongs which have been suffered by historically oppressed or marginalized peoples, especially minority populations. Quebec has passed laws to protect the French language in la belle provence. Provinces such as BC have embraced the devolution of power over land and resources to several first nations.

Note that this traditional liberal approach to rights does not allow the government to dictate what the truth is. Rights are about mediating conflicts

between citizens in a peaceable way, rather than imposing a metaphysical concept of the good on people. As John Rawls argues in *Political Liberalism* [1993], it is not the purpose of a liberal democracy to impose “comprehensive doctrines” of the good [whether religious or secular] on its citizens. The political realm must not be used to settle longstanding philosophical questions. Its purpose is to ensure that citizens respect each other’s rights, including the right to disagree in an agreeable manner. A true ‘overlapping consensus,’ whereby individuals will agree on certain liberal principles because these principles are supported by their own particular “comprehensive doctrines,” must allow disagreement beyond the public square. Citizens, not the state, must settle their disagreements privately. To apply the principles of toleration to philosophy itself is to leave to citizens themselves to settle the questions of religion, philosophy, and morals in accordance with views they freely affirm. (*Political Liberalism*, 154)

Rawls goes on to claim that this ideal is not based on relativism but Kant’s idea of “reasonable faith” (172). I would call this the political application of the golden rule: if everyone wants their views to be tolerated, they must tolerate the views of others with whom they disagree.

A year after the war ended, Winston Churchill could still praise the “flame of Christian ethics” as “still our best guide” for striking a balance between individual freedoms and the common good of society. “Only on this basis can we reconcile the rights of an individual with the demands of a society which alone can bring happiness and peace to humanity.” In short, Churchill insisted that Christian ethics was essential for liberal democracy, a regime which had almost been destroyed in the fires and bloodshed of WW 2.

The Cultural Marxist attack on Freedom of Speech

My main focus tonight, however, is on the current assault on the individual right to free speech, in order to protect marginalized groups from being offended. This attack on the freedom to speak, read, and think as one chooses is a new and disturbing chapter in the history of rights. Within the academic community, once considered the last bastion of free speech, there is tremendous pressure on individuals with ‘politically incorrect’ views to conform to the prevailing winds of ideological fashion. If anything demonstrates the old adage “ideas have consequences,” it is this story.

This attack is a relatively recent and gradual phenomenon. It was only in the 1940s, in the wake of WW2 and the Holocaust, that the relation between Christianity and individual freedom was severely questioned. In the

remainder of my talk, I intend to answer the question: Where did all the kids go? That is to say, where did all those 60s protesters go? The answer is: many of them ended up redefining the culture of the West.

In order to redefine culture, you have to redefine language. Think of how different the present age is, in sharp contrast to the old liberal age I have just described. New, strange terms have entered our vocabulary: zero tolerance for ‘hate speech’; inclusivity; diversity; tolerance; speech codes; micro-aggression; trigger-warnings. All of these ideas have been conceived with one purpose in mind: to restrict the free speech of some in order to enhance the group rights of others. In the process, a new group right has emerged: the right not to be offended. This right gives enormous power to our already powerful Leviathan state.

It is impossible to understand the attack on individual rights without looking at a phenomenon known as “Cultural Marxism.” The origin of CM, which is alternately dubbed ‘critical theory’ by friends and ‘political correctness’ by foes, lies in the Frankfurt School, otherwise known as the Institute of Social Research, which fled from Nazi Germany to the USA in the 1930s. Eventually they set up shop at the New School for Social Research in NY as well as other prestigious US schools and gained enormous influence in American academe after WW2.

In order to understand CM, one must understand the failure of traditional Marxism. One of the most important purposes of CM was to explain why the communist revolution predicted by Karl Marx and his heirs had failed to materialize in the twentieth century, even under conditions of economic depression and political turmoil after WW One. Actual Marxian regimes such as the Soviet Union and Communist China had also failed to deliver any economic prosperity or political freedom. Worst of all, traditional Marxism, which had focused on economic forces alone to explain the movement of history, had failed to take into account ‘cultural’ institutions such as the state, the church, schools, and media which succeeded in persuading large elements of the working class to reject socialism and embrace fascism. It was the job of CM, then, to reinvent these institutions in order to uncover and demolish the ‘prejudices’ which had prevented socialism from emerging up to this point. Nothing less than a “transvaluation of values” was needed.

It is no wonder that CM’s most influential members (Theodor Adorno, Erich Fromm, Jürgen Habermas) saw fit to synthesize Marxism with Sigmund Freud’s depth psychology. Many CM theorists were refugees from Nazi Germany, and were understandably traumatized by the shocking rise of Hitler in an enlightened nation. The carnage of WW 2 and the

Holocaust had convinced them that fascist prejudices had to be uprooted before they could infect people. Ultimately, it was up to the state and other culture-shaping institutions to cure the mass neuroses of American society, a veritable hothouse of psychic disorders. The FS fitted well into the politics of the early Cold War era which was often just as obsessed with preventing a resurgence of fascism as it was with pushing back Soviet communism. The FS at the same time helped to create the therapeutic state, which diagnoses all prejudices [of Christians in particular] as signs of mental illness. Using psychological language is a very effective way to shut down debate by smearing your opponent as disordered!

One of the most important works in this ideological war against the Christian West was *The Authoritarian Personality* (1950), a study which Adorno and several co-authors wrote in order to press the point that white conservative middle-class and working class Christians living in the United States were unconsciously fascist. This study, which is based on scores of interviews of Americans during the 1940s, reveals the determination of Adorno to identify bourgeois Christianity with a far right politics. In this often ponderous indictment of 'bourgeois Christian' society, traditional bourgeois values are made to seem 'pathological' and 'pre-fascist.' A test known as the 'F scale' measured the fascist personality traits of each person interviewed. This scale was applied to anyone who happened not to share Adorno's socialistic politics. A parole officer who in an interview had doubts about the wisdom of socialized medicine was diagnosed as having fascist sympathies. For Adorno, any conservative views were signs of mental illness. "Conventional" Christians were childish, insecure, and uncritical." [AP 218] By contrast, only 'fully conscious, very articulate Christians' were 'likely to be free of ethnocentrism.' [743] The CM were guilty of what Leo Strauss called the "reduction ad Hitlerum": if they could associate any belief with fascism, it would become a fascist prejudice automatically. For example, if Hitler liked patriotism, for example, then this must be a fascist prejudice.

Despite the apparently scientific and objective flavor of *The Authoritarian Personality*, Adorno's team of researchers reshaped the questions and answers of their interviewees in such a way that conservative beliefs in the traditional family, sexual mores, and patriotic love of country were magically transformed into the credos of a star-spangled fascism. It would be tempting to say that Adorno and his team were merely reacting to the excesses of anti-communism and McCarthyist paranoia during this period, but Adorno was not content with simply attacking anti-communism. Christianity, not mere opposition to communism, was the neurosis that

afflicted American democracy. Adorno's dislike of Christianity, masquerading as social science, had a lasting influence on distinguished American historians like Richard Hofstadter and Seymour Martin Lipset, who carried on the ideological war against American Protestantism that Adorno initiated. Around the same time, the psychoanalyst Erich Fromm, who was also a member of the FS, blamed Calvinist Protestantism for paving the way towards fascism.

One of the ironies stemming from the influence of CM in America is that they were targeting an ultra-conservative Christianity at a time when American Christianity was becoming more liberal, and therefore more receptive, to the message of CM. CM fit well into the psychology of Christian guilt; many Christians felt this guilt over the Holocaust. In the postwar period, mainline Protestant denominations were already preaching a message of pluralism which did not challenge the ideological message of CM. Many of these Christians had failed to note what pluralism actually meant. The idea that all individuals are entitled to the same rights has never been widely accepted. It is ironic that Horace Kallen, who also taught at the New School for Social Research which was a centre of CM, popularized the term 'cultural pluralism' in a manner which was not tolerant of all ideas. Pluralism for him meant the toleration only of ideas which advanced progress. Christianity in its most orthodox forms was simply beyond the pale.

The Christian embrace of progressivism laid the foundation for CM. In fact, one complemented the other. The popular Canadian historian Pierre Berton in *The Comfortable Pew* (1965) urged his fellow Anglicans to embrace the lessons of *The Authoritarian Personality* by abandoning prejudices which were more reflective of social conformity than the Gospel of Christ. Berton even quoted, with approval, Adorno's condemnation of the established churches in America: 'Belonging to or identifying oneself with a religious body in America today certainly does not mean that one thereby takes over the traditional Christian qualities of tolerance, brotherhood, and equality. On the contrary, it appears that these values are more firmly held by people who do not affiliate with any religious group.' (Berton, 69; AP, 219).

It is not hard to see why Berton, an Anglican Christian, was attracted to passages like these from the AP. How often have we Christians lamented the hypocritical gap between the official creed and the actual behavior (including our own behavior) of church members? For the record, I partly praise the FS for raising important questions about the power of mass institutions in a state capitalist society. Even if one can debate whether

‘tolerance’ is a ‘traditional Christian quality,’ it is all too evident that the church often falls short on practicing brotherhood or equality, a criticism which was advanced by Kierkegaard about a century before the AP. What Berton, along with many Christian admirers of CM fail to see, however, is that Adorno and other FS theorists insisted that the big state take on the task of re-educating the population by fighting ‘prejudices’ which hinder social progress. This legacy of the FS has grave implications for individual rights, especially freedom of speech. Anything which counts as ‘Christian’ in a traditional sense is viewed as fascist or proto-fascist, and must be uprooted. It is also noteworthy that Adorno, in *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, dismissed Christian love as just a cynical cover for anti-Semitism. At best, Christian love of thy neighbor fails to change the status quo; at worst it paves the way for fascism’s triumph.

I am not denying that valid questions can be raised about the temptation to conflate tradition with Christianity: they are not always the same thing. What I am questioning is whether the state or any political group has the right to suppress speech on the basis that it is ‘intolerant’ or ‘unprogressive’, terms whose meaning tend to be defined by powerful interests at the best of times. Herbert Marcuse, another famous member of the FS, essentially invented what are today called “anti-hate speech laws” to counter speech and ideas which were incompatible with progress, as he understood it. It is worth noting that Marcuse worked for the American government during WW 2 in part to undertake the planning of the postwar reconstruction of Germany. This work included the proposing of ‘far-reaching plans for curing the Germans of their aggressive political culture.’ Marcuse was an enthusiastic defender of ‘de-Nazification,’ the process of teaching Germans (especially the youth) to identify all traditional German values with Nazism. In practice, this required the postwar state in West Germany to suppress any anti-democratic dissent as potentially Nazi. 20 years after WW 2 ended, however, Marcuse believed that the United States, the victor in this war, was just as susceptible to the same fascist sympathies as its defeated foe Germany. America had become too tolerant or “repressively tolerant” of beliefs which promoted destructive (that is, conservative) views of politics. Marcuse thus advocated intolerance of any movement which was anti-left:

Tolerance would be restricted with respect to movements of a demonstrably aggressive or destructive character (destructive of the prospects for peace, justice, and freedom for all). Such discrimination would also be applied to movements opposing the extension of social legislation to the poor, weak, disabled. As against the virulent denunciations that

such a policy would do away with the sacred liberalistic principle of equality for 'the other side', I maintain that there are issues where either there is no 'other side' in any more than a formalistic sense, or where 'the other side' is demonstrably 'regressive' and impedes possible improvement of the human condition. To tolerate propaganda for inhumanity vitiates the goals not only of liberalism but of every progressive political philosophy.

Out of this CM logic came the view that certain minorities needed the special protection of the state from these evil reactionary forces. Group rights, which is hardly a traditional Marxist concept, meant in part the right not to be offended by movements on the political Right. In short, GR institutionalize inequality; the rights of one group must trump the rights of another, unlike individual rights. Plus, this intolerance is practiced in the name of tolerance. To say the least, Marcuse was not particularly interested in finding a balance between individual freedoms for 'reactionaries' and what he conceived to be the good of society.

For this reason, I strongly question the prevalent notion that equality is somehow achieved via group rights. Conservative critics who worry about the struggle for equality as one that breaks down all differences between people are really beating a dead horse or perhaps a dead unicorn, an idea which has never existed on the CM Left. CM leftists instead are determined to use group rights in order to persecute anyone who stands for the traditional liberal understanding of rights. They are what the late great Canadian legal activist Alan Borovoy called the "new anti-liberals."

Mass Democracy vs. Liberal Democracy

We no longer have a robust liberal democracy. We have a mass democratic state which desires to transcend both individual freedom and its Christian foundation. The mass democratic state must also reinvent the very identities of nation-states so that the latter can become open to all human beings regardless of traditional attachments. This purpose may sound Christian, but it is not. Jürgen Habermas, a famous FS theorist, has urged the EU to embrace a 'postnational' constitutional patriotism which eschews the shared traditions and languages which make up distinctive European nation-states. Both Habermas and Charles Taylor, who recognize that there is such a thing as the Christian foundation of western civilization, has called on Christians to atone for their past sins while they embrace open immigration in the name of tolerance and diversity. Like other prominent defenders of liberal democracy, Habermas believes that biblical (especially Christian) morality is essential in undergirding the foundations of a new, more tolerant social contract. Yet this "salvific" moral content can somehow be preserved

even if it is separated from traditional Christian orthodox beliefs about God and salvation. Indeed, this separation *must* happen so that peoples who are non-Christian can embrace liberal democracy. Jürgen Habermas's version of Christianity requires that an enlightened Christian adopt a "reflexive position with respect to its own truth claim." If I understand Habermas correctly, he is insisting that Christians maintain their moral beliefs but not insist on their absolute truth. Any claim to absolutism would alienate peoples that do not herald from a Christian background, or, worst of all, have even been oppressed by historically Christian civilizations. Ideally, the "majority (Christian) culture no longer exercises the power to define the common political culture, but rather it submits and opens itself to an exchange, free of coercion, with the minority cultures." In short, Christians must give up trying to change the culture so that non-Christians can be more easily accommodated. Christians must support GR for non-Christians but not for themselves. There is no balance here. Anyone who claims that Christians are becoming a vulnerable minority would be dismissed as delusional or fascistic, or both.

In Canada, the political scientist Will Kymlicka has taken these Habermasian notions a step further by insisting that collective rights be rewarded to oppressed groups to serve the purpose of social peace and harmony. He solemnly writes: "If a culture is not generally respected, then the dignity and self-respect of its members will also be threatened" (1995: 89). But whenever Kymlicka identifies the English/Europeans by history and culture, it is scornfully as "colonizers," "racists", and "conquerors". As Ricardo Duchesne has argued, the only thing European Canadians are allowed to celebrate in Kymlicka's universe is multiculturalism. Not a single positive word can be found in Kymlicka's writings about the settlers who founded Canada. The words "pride," "cultural particularity," and "culturally meaningful lives" are reserved exclusively for ethnic immigrant groups. Kymlicka's celebration of group rights for non-Europeans has been attacked by the feminist Susan Moller Okin who argues that group rights can be just a cover for the private oppression of women:

Clearly, Kymlicka regards cultures that discriminate overtly and formally against women—by denying them education, or the right to vote or to hold office—as not deserving special rights. But sex discrimination is often far less overt. In many cultures in which women's basic civil rights and liberties are formally assured, discrimination practiced against women and girls within the household not only severely constrains their choices, but seriously threatens their well-being and even their lives. And such sex discrimination—whether severe or more mild—often has very powerful *cultural* roots. (Susan Moller Okin, "Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?")

One other practical application of what Kymlicka has in mind here took place at Wilfred Laurier University recently. A plan to erect statues of every prime minister in Canadian history was in part kiboshed when some political action groups demanded that the bronze statue of Sir John A. Macdonald should be removed. Why? Because our first PM was guilty of racism and genocide. Apparently, Canadians should not take pride in celebrating the achievements of Macdonald: building the national railroad, protecting Canada from the threat of American annexation, protecting the rights of French-speaking minorities in the new nation. Instead, the focus of the protesters was on Macdonald's racist views, which were all too current at the time. This is Marcuse's 'repressive tolerance' in action. Why should we tolerate any symbol or statue which is associated with a racist past? If we push this logic far enough, one would have to change the name of WLU as well, since Laurier espoused racist views very similar to those of Macdonald's. South of the border, several student groups in recent years have called for the end of 'free speech' for conservatives on campus, or anyone who happens to disagree with their brand of social justice.

For those who support laws which oppose hateful speech, it is worth noting that these laws or attitudes may no longer be exclusively applied to those who hold traditionalist views on equality. The group rights revolution may end up eating its own. At the University of Oregon recently, a student group demanded unsuccessfully that a quote from Martin Luther King inscribed on a campus building be removed. What was the offensive quote:

"I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character. I have a dream..."

Apparently, this great statement about human equality was not 'inclusive enough' because Dr. King neglected to mention other marginalized groups who are affected by forms of discrimination other than racism. The time may come when any official reference to Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood, will have to be expunged from the historical record. There is ample evidence that Sanger, who supported eugenics, hoped to limit the reproductive possibilities of the white working class, made up but not exclusively of ethnic Catholics. (As far as I can determine, Sanger would have been just as happy to keep Southern Baptist African-American sharecroppers from reproducing as she would have been to place ethnic Catholic factory workers on the road to extinction.) Other feminists may have to be reinvented as fascists. Eleanor Roosevelt and Frances Perkins would have emphatically opposed anti-discrimination legislation aimed at

encouraging women to enter the workforce. Progressives in the interwar years favored government support for a single-family wage, one that would allow men to provide for their families “in dignity” while wives stayed home and tended to their children. The statue of Canadian feminist Emily Murphy may share the same fate as Macdonald’s, given her views on non-white immigration and compulsory sterilization of the mentally challenged. (Lincoln is another example here.)

In conclusion, our last best hope may be to work for a revival of individual freedom. How that would happen I am not sure (philosophers are not in the solution business). As the defenders of traditional liberalism astutely recognized, there is nothing natural about ‘individuality.’ People are more likely to demand freedom for their tribe rather than for each other. Moreover, despite the condemnations of political correctness in our time, it remains a popular ideology which feeds the vices of our democracy. As if that were not bad enough, literacy is not what it used to be. Social media have taken the place of books as the dominant media of our age. If people no longer read seriously anymore, why would they fight for their intellectual freedom?

Not all is lost, however, because none of this is inevitable. Christians in particular have a tremendous opportunity to defend the individual freedoms which their faith brought into being. To undertake such a defence is not the same as excusing or white-washing past wrongs. It is rather the honest work of building on the spirit of the liberal tradition, its highest ideals, rather than rejecting this tradition altogether because of its tainted past (letter). In resisting the danger of Cultural Marxism, Christians must defend freedom for all human beings. If we are truly a liberal society, we must learn to listen to each other once again, instead of dismissing the other as delusional or fascist simply because we disagree. As Barack Obama once said:

“Being a good citizen, being an activist, involves hearing the other side. And I do worry if young people start getting trained to think that if somebody says something I don't like, if somebody says something that hurts my feelings, that my only recourse is to shut them up, avoid them, push them away, call on a higher power to protect me from that. We must use argument and reason and words in making our democracy work.”

-President Barack Obama [2015]

I agree. Thank you for listening.