

Abolishing the FBI and Why Don't Some Men Work?

What Happens Next – 09.17.2022

Larry Bernstein:

Welcome to What Happens Next. My name is Larry Bernstein.

What Happens Next is a podcast which covers economics, finance, history, politics, the arts and current events.

Today's session will be Abolish the FBI and Why Don't Some Men Work?

Our first speaker will be Harvey Silverglate who is one of America's top defense lawyers. Harvey has represented criminal defendants in some of the most famous cases. He has taught at Harvard Law School and has been the Chairman of the Board of the ACLU's Massachusetts Affiliate. Harvey is an expert on the FBI and he feels that the ghost of J. Edgar Hoover haunts the FBI, and as a result, the FBI needs to be shut down, the staff fired, and a new national police force needs to be created to handle national crimes. This will be a provocative discussion. Our second speaker is Nick Eberstadt who is the American Enterprise Institute Henry Wendt Chair in Political Economy. Nick is the author of the book *Men Without Work*, and the second edition of the book will be released tomorrow.

Nick is going to discuss the steady increase in the number of men who are 25 to 54 who do not work and are not looking for work. We are going to find out who these men are, what they do all day, and whether they are happy. And finally, we are going to hear about what public policies may have exacerbated this problem and what we can do about it.

Buckle up.

What Happens Next uses a team of interns to make this program and I have job openings. Interns improve the podcast by selecting topics of discussion, editing, and production. If you're interested, please let me know.

I make this podcast to learn and I offer this program free of charge to anyone that is interested. Please tell your friends about it and have them sign-up to receive our weekly emails about upcoming shows. If you enjoy today's podcast, please subscribe so that you can continue to enjoy this content.

Let's begin with Harvey Silverglate's opening remarks.

Harvey Silverglate:

I've been a lawyer since 1967. I have done criminal and civil liberties law and students' rights law. I've had a tremendous amount of experience with the FBI. And my conclusion is that J. Edgar Hoover may be dead, but his ghost hovers over the Bureau. In this age when confederate statutes are being torn down, names taken off buildings in Washington, DC, we still have the

John Edgar Hoover Federal FBI building. And that's because in a very real sense, he is still the director.

I've been a long time member of the ACLU, although it's more progressive now than civil libertarian. I was on the Board of the Massachusetts affiliate. I was President of the Board. I advise people, do not under any circumstances talk to the FBI. Why? Because they will not allow a lawyer for an interviewee or to record the interview. Believe it or not. They have two agents at every interview. One of them asks the questions and the other one takes notes. The one who takes notes goes back to the office afterwards and types up a summary of the interview. It's called a form 302.

I have never seen a 302 form that was accurate. It was what the agent hoped to hear from the interviewee rather than what the interview actually said.

I was meeting with a group of FBI agents and Mueller. Mueller walks in with two agents. I just want to start by telling you that criticism of the Bureau is a non-starter. I said, Bob, the whole purpose of the meeting was to complain about the phony forensics and the phony interview techniques used by the Bureau. And he got up and walked out. That is how irrational the Bureau's approach toward any criticism is.

Any lawyer worth his or her soul will never ever accept the reports of FBI forensic agents, you have to hire a specialist. The agents tell the forensic people what result they want, that's what they get.

Larry Bernstein:

I have no personal experience with the FBI. I assume that the FBI is competent and world-class at what it does. Is that true?

Harvey Silverglate:

I represented a fellow named the Wolfgang Vogel. This was during the cold war and Vogel was known as the spy trader. He made his reputation by trading Soviet and East German spies for spies that were captured by the Soviets. Vogel had been arrested at Logan airport because he was alleged to have helped the East Germans understand the importance of certain physics documents that had been stolen by other East German Stasi agents. I had to meet with Vogel, and we're sitting in the dining room of the Parker House Hotel, talking about the case and about how he arranged the spy trade and Vogel looks to his right. And he says to me, "Let's get outta here." I say "why?" He said, "see those two guys in the table next to us?" I said, "yeah," he said, "they're FBI agents." I say, "how do you know they're FBI agents?" He says "the trench coats, they all wear the same trench coats. Trust me." I said, "really?" He says, "guess what? They're the same trench coats worn by the Stasi. Let's get outta here." They're so incompetent that when they're acting in a undercover capacity they identify themselves with the trench coat. So not only they have no regard for civil liberties, but they're not particularly smart.

Larry Bernstein:

Do you think the FBI can be reformed?

Harvey Silverglate:

I think the Bureau is beyond reform no matter who is in the Department of Justice, no matter who the attorney general or the president is, the Bureau has a culture of its own and is deeply, deeply embedded. And as agents retire, the ones replacing them get trained by the ones leaving. It's a self-perpetuating organization. What we have to do is fire every single one of them. Start a new organization with a different name. You cannot name it Federal Bureau of Investigation because it's got Hoover written all over it.

I'm generally not in favor of tearing down statues of Confederate soldiers and Robert E. Lee. I think it's an attempt to rewrite history, but in this one instance, I would change the name of the building in order to wipe out the postmortem leadership of John Edgar Hoover and call it something else. All new agents, new director, different name and start over. That's the only chance we have at reform.

Larry Bernstein:

Why is the name J Edgar Hoover on the front of the FBI building so important to you?

Harvey Silverglate:

It's like Hamlet, the FBI is infected by a ghost hovering around. Unless his name is extricated, it's going to be hard to really change the agency.

I think the problem is the culture. I also would have the equivalent of a civilian review board because I think there should be some civilian oversight of this agency.

Larry Bernstein:

In your opening remarks, you questioned the professionalism of the FBI forensic department. I thought forensics was one of the crown jewels of the FBI.

Harvey Silverglate:

Forensic examiners ask the agents why it is they're asking for a forensic exam, and that immediately biases the forensic examiner. I would give the forensic examiners samples, and I would not give them any idea what the agents are hoping they find so that you always have that kind of separation between the forensic people and the investigatory people.

Larry Bernstein:

Why do you condemn the FBI's raid of Trump's Mar-a-Lago home?

Harvey Silverglate:

I think it's highly likely that it was suggested by the FBI. Merrick Garland is a very careful methodical professional guy. He would've made a very good Supreme Court Justice. I think this whole heroics was engineered by the Bureau. That raid will turn out to be a huge historical blunder.

The problem of Trump improperly having retained records that should have been turned over to the government, could have been solved by having Mar-a-Lago surrounded by Federal agents, and then go to a Federal judge and ask the Federal Judge how in a civilized fashion, they can find out what documents were inside. They could have agreed on a special master. The special master could have gone in and methodically gone through all the documents that arguably belonged to the government. And then those documents would have been subject to a court proceeding where a judge would decide which documents remain with Trump and which go to the federal government. The heroics of this thing is classic FBI, the headlines classic FBI.

Larry Bernstein:

Garland said that he couldn't tell the public what the FBI found in the raid, and the next day there were leaks to the NY Times and Washington Post. Who is leaking and is this legal?

Harvey Silverglate:

The leaks didn't come from Garland. It's possible they came from an Assistant US Attorney. I think it is more likely they came from the FBI because the FBI likes to cultivate its relationships with the news media, because they like to get good coverage.

Larry Bernstein:

Is this a crime to leak that to the press?

Harvey Silverglate:

Of course, but guess who would investigate the crime if there was a criminal investigation, can you guess, three letters?

Larry Bernstein:

I assume that when you suggest that the FBI should be disbanded, it is meant to be provocative but not sincere.

Harvey Silverglate:

No, I am absolutely serious because I don't see any way for reform. I really think that the name has to be changed. The name of the building has to be changed. The personnel should all be fired. A new director should be in charge of a newly named organization. I think culture is everything and I am not trying to be provocative. I'm being very serious.

Larry Bernstein:

Why did you co-found FIRE, the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression? Your co-founder Alan Kors is a retired history professor from Penn who spoke previously on What Happens Next about free speech on college campuses.

Harvey Silverglate:

Alan Kors and I wrote a book *The Shadow University: the Betrayal of Liberty in America's Campuses*. Our thesis was that campuses were being taken over by a huge army of deans who were promulgating regulations governing what students could say, punishing students for mere speech, all things that are totally inconsistent with notions of academic freedom. We got thousands of requests from students and faculty members who were subject of these kangaroo courts.

Larry Bernstein:

Crime is not always local. It is national and global. We need a national professional police force that can stop criminals and terrorists. What should we do?

Harvey Silverglate:

I have not adopted the progressive line of abolishing the FBI. There are progressives who want to abolish police departments, until of course they get robbed on the street at three o'clock in the morning. People are endlessly hypocritical. I would limit its jurisdiction to cases that have peculiarly federal interest.

Larry Bernstein:

Your book *Three Felonies a Day* suggests that every day, each of us commits crimes that can be prosecuted. Are we all criminals?

Harvey Silverglate:

The thesis of *Three Felonies a Day* is that federal statutes are incredibly vague and broad. And the reason is that in order to have areas of daily life covered by Federal Law. Federal law is supposed to have very limited jurisdiction. And yet you get FBI agents prosecuting theft, how do they do that? Well, if you use any facility of interstate communication or commerce to commit a crime that becomes a Federal crime under a longstanding Supreme Court precedent. So for example, you can commit a quintessentially state crime, a fraud, and if you use the telephone or you use the mail in connection with that, it becomes a Federal crime. Well, of course, that isn't what the founders intended. There is no Federal interest in a local swindle. Those are for the state district attorneys and police to deal with, but the Feds have jurisdiction over this interview, we are using the facilities of interstate communication.

Larry Bernstein:

You're in Boston, I'm in New York.

Harvey Silverglate:

I would like to have either a Supreme Court ruling or a congressional statute that says that if the sole link to establish a Federal interest is because of communication or the use of the mails or interstate commerce that should not suffice. There should be a quintessentially Federal interest. If you bomb a post office, if you commit espionage.

Larry Bernstein:

The former head of the KGB Beria said "show me the man, I will show you the crime."

Harvey Silverglate:

Said that to Stalin. Don't leave that out.

Larry Bernstein:

Does the KGB's aphorism apply equally to the FBI?

Harvey Silverglate:

I think it has influenced secret services in every country in the world, Beria has had an enormous influence, almost as influential as Stalin. It doesn't matter whether you have Nixon, Biden, Trump, it doesn't matter. The FBI stays the same. It has its own culture. It is impervious to elections. It's impervious to who the leadership is.

Larry Bernstein:

Do you believe that the FBI could find you, Harvey Silverglate, to have broken the law?

Harvey Silverglate:

Correct. Everybody unknowingly commits three felonies a day, and all you have to do is target someone. And then you look into their daily life and you can find some crime. Find me the man, I'll find you the crime.

Larry Bernstein:

In your recent article you suggest that the Department of Justice and various State District Attorneys have decided to get Donald Trump. Will they find a crime and indict him?

Harvey Silverglate:

They're never gonna convict him. They probably will indict him in New York, in Georgia, in Washington DC. You can try him in Massachusetts, the blue state, I guarantee you, there would be one juror who would hold out and you would never convict Trump.

Convicting him smacks of trying to disable him from running for president again. I think it would be a mistake of historic dimensions to indict this man.

Larry Bernstein:

In your book *Three Felonies a Day*, you mentioned that Federal prosecutors seek to prevent distasteful felonious politicians from running again. You describe a plea bargain where the

Speaker of the Massachusetts State Legislature agreed not run for office for five years. Do you think prosecutors should demand pleas that prevent individuals from running for public office?

Harvey Silverglate:

That's exactly what they want to do. And if I were a judge, I wouldn't approve of any plea bargain where a public official agrees not to run. Guess what? We're a democracy. We have these little twerps that are called voters, that's us. And, it's up to us to decide who gets to run and who wins elections. It's unconstitutional.

Larry Bernstein:

I end each episode on a note of optimism, Harvey what are you optimistic about?

Harvey Silverglate:

I am actually optimistic despite it all. And that's because I am 80 years old, I have lived to see trends that seem to be forever, turnaround. I was born during the McCarthy era, and I was very active representing students protesting the Vietnam War. I have seen enough to realize that nothing is forever. Tomorrow will be different from today. Could be worse but also could be better.

We have a lot of problems, but what we don't have is static situations, things change. We are more than any other country in the world, we're fluid.

Nicholas Eberstadt:

The latest monthly job numbers underscore a troubling paradox about the state of work in our country. Employment levels are finally back above pre-pandemic highs and unemployment rates continue to skirt 50-year lows, but that's only part of the picture. An extraordinary flight from work is also underway. Inadvertently exacerbated by the largesse of the COVID 19 emergency measures, we now face an unprecedented peacetime labor shortage with employers, practically begging for workers while vast numbers of grown men and women are stubbornly sitting on the sidelines of the economy, even though job applicants have more bargaining power today in the current great recession than at any time in recent memory. Never before has work been so readily available in modern America. Never before have so many been uninterested in taking it. Unfilled non-farm positions have averaged over 11 million a month. For every unemployed man and woman in the US today, there are nearly two open jobs.

Major sectors of the economy are now wide open to applicants without any great skills, apart from the skills of showing up to work regularly and on-time, drug free. Why the bizarre imbalance between the demand for work and the supply of it? One critical piece of the puzzle was the policy response to the pandemic in 2020 and 2021. Washington pulled out all the monetary-fiscal stops to avoid an economic collapse. Those heroic and extraordinary interventions may indeed have avoided a worldwide depression, but they also disincentivized

work in America as never before, padded by transfer payments, disposable income in America spiked in 2020 and 2021 reaching previously unattained heights despite the economic crisis. And after the initial temporary plunge in consumer spending from the COVID shock, the stimulus funded rebound pushed consumer demand well above its pre-COVID trend line.

Savings rates doubled in 2020 and 2021, a windfall of over two and a half trillion dollars in extra savings was bestowed by Washington on private households through borrowed public funds. As my study *Men Without Work* details, work rates for men of prime working age 25 to 54 had already collapsed to late depression levels driven mainly by a half century long flight from work. For each jobless prime age man looking for work, another four were neither working nor looking by 2019. The current manpower shortage highlights the new face of the flight from work in modern America with pre COVID rates of workforce participation, almost 3 million more men and women would be in our labor force today. Half of the gap is due to men and women 55 and older, no longer working. Strangely, workforce participation rates for the 55 plus group remain lower now than in the summer of 2020 before the advent of the COVID mRNA vaccines.

Why premature retirement? Thanks in part to pandemic policy wealth effects. COVID era interventions transformed the financial profile of America, nearly doubling the net worth of the bottom half of American households. 64 million homes reaped an average of about \$25,000 from this COVID policy lottery. Before COVID, 9 million homes headed by men and women, 55 to 69 years of age, over one in five, had less than \$25,000 in life savings. COVID era windfalls generated by the pandemic policies have played a role in the withdrawal of many older men and women from the workforce. The question is, will we witness a gradual return to earlier patterns of work or have longer term work norms and attitudes been affected by the pandemic too?

Self-reported time-use surveys paints a grim portrait of nonworking prime age men checked out from civil society, largely disengaged from family care and housework, sitting before screens, increasing the risk of death and despair. Men aged 55 to 64 who are neither working nor looking for work were kings of the screen, clocking in 2,400 hours during 2020, possibly a new record in the inactivity Olympics. The signs that growing numbers of citizens are ambivalent about working should not be ignored. Success through work, no matter one's station, is key to self-esteem, independence and belonging. A can-do work ethos has served our nation well. America's future will depend in no small part, on how, and whether people choose to work.

Larry Bernstein:

Thanks, Nick. Unemployment is defined to be individuals who are looking for work who can't find employment. The unemployment rate is at record lows. Those individuals who are not working and not looking for work is at all-time highs. What does the non-working man look like and what are his goals and objectives?

Nicholas Eberstadt:

There are over 7 million prime age guys today who are neither working nor looking for work. African Americans are overrepresented. Latinos are underrepresented, Asian Americans are underrepresented. The Anglo versus people of color differential isn't very big at all. People overrepresented have less education, only high school or high school dropouts, but about a fifth of the dropout population has a college degree and over 40% has at least some college. Native born American guys are way overrepresented. Married guys with children are way underrepresented.

There's a lot of self-reported illness. Some of that illness is physical. I think that some of that illness is more metaphysical, but it's also true that over half of these men report taking pain medication of some sort every day. So you've got a picture of people who are disconnected from their community, surprisingly disconnected from family. They're obviously disconnected from work. And, they present as if they think that they are in pain. There's a lot of misery in this pool.

Larry Bernstein:

Let's talk about pain. I don't get it. Work has become much less physical over the last 50 and 100 years, why are so many people now in pain?

Nicholas Eberstadt:

It's a paradox, isn't it? Larry? We see job mortality rates for workers in America, steadily, dramatically going down. And yet at the same time, we see more and more working age men and to some degree women applying for disability. The two fastest growing qualifications for disability benefits over the past half century have been musculoskeletal problems and psychological problems. If you or I go to a doctor, the doctor can tell whether we have tuberculosis. The doctor can tell whether we have a broken leg. A doctor cannot tell whether someone has back pain. And a doctor can't tell if you or I are having sad feelings. So there's this gray area out there where more and more of the disability archipelago seems to be located.

Larry Bernstein:

What does the trend line look like for the men who do not work in the prime of life?

Nicholas Eberstadt:

When we look at the not in labor force proportion of the prime age male, civilian non-institutional population, it's all a straight line from 1965 to today. You can't tell when recessions took place in the United States, you can't tell when China entered the World Trade Organization, you can't tell when we started playing with iPhones, and you can't see the opioid epidemic. It's a straight line.

Larry Bernstein:

Did COVID change the line?

Nicholas Eberstadt:

Not at all, it's the same line.

Larry Bernstein:

In 1960, work was different than 2022. Is there something peculiar about today's work that so many men cannot adapt to the current job requirements?

Nicholas Eberstadt:

I'd say that's the received wisdom about the problem is that we're undergoing an enormous amount of economic and structural change. The shifting demand for less skilled labor with the decline of manufacturing with the global outsourcing, China entering the WTO that's the regular storyline on this. Remember Larry, what I was saying about that straight line, you wouldn't have a straight line if this was an economic shock, demand side dominated problem the way we've had it.

When I came out with the first edition of *Men Without Work*, a number of people said the problem is that there're isn't any work out there.

I mean, that was an argument that some people made back then, but September, 2022, it's kind of hard to make that argument, since we've got north of 11 million unfilled jobs. And almost twice as many openings as unemployed persons in the country. We've got a peace time labor shortage. And at the moment there are millions of jobs in which the skill requirements are fairly modest throughout big sectors of the economy. There are an awful lot of jobs available out there for people who are willing to show up, get paid, go there, and be regular and sober.

Larry Bernstein:

Let's imagine that you don't have those job characteristics. You're not regular. You're rarely on time. And in fact, you are not drug free.

Does that mean that the poor performer could find work 50 years ago but can't work now? Is there something about our economy that requires those particular attributes?

Nicholas Eberstadt:

Well, we've got three and a half times as high, a proportion of prime male workforce dropouts today as we had in 1965. And that may tell you something about the supply of what you might call nonconformance, but it may also tell you something about the difference in the demand in 1965 versus today. I mean, remember back in 65, African American men had higher work rates than their white counterparts have today. It's a pretty different world. Overwhelmingly prime aged men were married and in families with kids, most of them had served in the military. A lot of them had been in World War II in Korea. The welfare state was still Lyndon Johnson's dream, drug use was punished pretty harshly. All of this is to say that there were some pretty different guardrails in society back then, and pretty different ways of socializing people. So I'm not sure at all that we should assume that we refer to as the attributes of some people who are difficult to fit into our workforce today are fixed and immutable characteristics.

Larry Bernstein:

Daniel Altman is the Chief Economist at Instawork and he spoke on What Happens Next a few months ago. His firm has an app that facilitates employers and employees to find each other for short-term employment. Do you think that there are technological solutions to reduce transaction costs for finding employment for these out of work individuals? And do you think short-term assignments might be the best way to get them back into the workforce?

Nicholas Eberstadt:

It's a tremendous innovative idea. One of the pools of manpower that might benefit from this tremendously is the ex-con population. The US government has no interest in estimating the number of adults in this country who have a felony conviction in their background. It's not trivial. *Men Without Work*, I'd ballpark estimate maybe one in seven adult men at this point have a felony conviction in their past. For every person who's behind bars with a felony conviction, there are 10 people in society who had a felony conviction at one point. They're invisible, we've got 20 plus million invisible ex-cons in our society.

And we don't have any employment data on them, but I bet you that their employment levels are through the bottom of the floor. And if helping rehabilitated ex-cons who weren't recidivist, reintegrating into society and especially into the labor force, the reputational repair of their job CVs could be really facilitated by something like this. And there could be possibly millions of additional potential members of the labor force drawn in with the help of this sort of technology.

Larry Bernstein:

Are the men who are not working mentally or physically disabled?

Nicholas Eberstadt:

The golden era of the mid-1960s, there's still a fair number of guys who are neither working nor looking for work, maybe three and a half percent of the prime age, civilian non-institutional male population between 25 and 54. And there were always mental health problems. There were always physical health problems. My impression is that there were more physical health problems than mental health problems, but that's only impressionistic. Whether we have more mental health challenges, or better at diagnosing it or less afraid to talk about this, I can't tell you. But it has always been a part of real life for people.

Larry Bernstein:

Next topic is norms. Pre-COVID everyone used to go to work, and then immediately we had the zoom experience and everyone wanted to stay home. People adapt quickly to new routines. And so whether you lose your job because of a recession, whether you lose employment because of an injury, depression, and you get in this routine and it's not that bad. We think it's bad. They don't think it's bad. They're retired. I'm not rich, but I'm not destitute. So guess what I am not leaving the house today.

Nicholas Eberstadt:

Suboptimal habituation or whatever you wish to call it. I think there's a lot of that. The employment numbers suggest that there's a lot of mobility back and forth between people who are in jobs and people who are unemployed. There's not a lot of mobility between labor force dropouts and people who are in the workforce. There's a lot less of that. And that means that people who drop out from the workforce tend to be long timers. That may speak to this question of habituation or comfort, at least familiarity with a particular sort of routine.

Larry Bernstein:

John Maynard Keynes expected as we got wealthier that the wealthy would just no longer work. And what you mentioned in your book is that we've actually seen the opposite. Keynes got the sign wrong. The affluent are working more and the poor are working a lot less. We are much wealthier today than 50 years ago. Is it possible that a natural result of general wealth creation that there is a very large group of men who are happy to live without many material goods as long as it included an iPhone. What if we've increased the standard of living for our poorest men, and they voluntarily chose not to work?

Nicholas Eberstadt:

It's a wonderful essay that he wrote back in 1930, the economic possibilities for our children. And it was very bold in the depths of the depression to say that our children are going to be richer than us and our grandchildren going to be way richer than they are.

So what do we think about free time? People generally like more free time. Economists are trained to calling free time leisure, right? A leisure is a good, well, leisure actually has a very specific meaning, free time for higher purposes which enhance your being. There isn't a whole lot of learning Mandarin or studying Schopenhauer going on in the basement couches. In the earlier European Christian tradition would've been described as the sin of sloth, which is another way that free time can be allocated. I think we have to make the distinctions between what free time is used for, because it is certainly possible to fill up your free time, your non-working time with things which enhance the meaning of your own life and enhance the wellbeing of others that are uplifting. But it's also possible to do things which end up degrading yourself and demeaning yourself. And that's why we even have this discussion about the deaths of despair.

Larry Bernstein:

I end each episode on a note of optimism, Nick, what are you optimistic about?

Nicholas Eberstadt:

The most optimistic thing that I could suggest is that America is prone to great awakenings that will revitalize and provide meaning in people's lives that will help them get back into society, into families, into the workforce. We don't need Uncle Sam to help us with it. The most important thing we can do is to recognize the tremendous importance of work extends beyond the dollars and cents in the economy. Work is a service to others that helps complete you, and it connects you back to society. It helps you connect back to your family. We live in a time when

trust in institutions is maybe an all-time low in America. This is a way that we can deal with the trust crisis as well, because a lot of the trust crisis has to do with being withdrawn from the institutions of our society.

Larry Bernstein:
Thanks, Nick.

Nicholas Eberstadt:
Thank you, Larry.

Larry Bernstein:
Thanks to Harvey Silverglate and Nick Eberstadt for joining us today. That ends this session.

If you missed last week's podcast, check it out. The topic was about internships. Our speakers included Ross Perlin the author of Intern Nation who argued that unpaid internships are exploitive and create greater inequality. We were also joined by Jay Greene from the Heritage Foundation who discussed why internships are critical for job training and that we need more of them, even if unpaid.

Internships have become an important step in the process for students to get their first job or to transition to a new field. You will hear from 8 of my interns from What Happens Next podcast about why they picked this internship, what skills they learned, and how they plan to choose their next internship. The interns will also provide suggestions for employers on how to design the optimal internship program.

I would like to make a plug for next week's show.

The topic will be the controversy around Yeshiva education and whether NY State should coerce religious schools to have more secular education. Last weekend, the NYT published a 5-page indictment of the Yeshiva curriculum.

Our speaker will be Jason Bedrick who is the director of policy at EdChoice and a former policy analyst with the Cato Institute's Center for Education Freedom who will provide a defense for a religious based education.

You can find all of our previous episodes and transcripts on our website Whathappensnextin6minutes.com.

Please encourage your friends to join the What Happens Next community by signing up for our free weekly updates about upcoming podcasts. If you have a long of friends, send the list to me and I will enter the names for you.

If you enjoyed today's podcast, I would love for you to listen to more of them. All you need to do is subscribe, so please take a moment to do so on the website, or follow What Happens Next on Apple Podcasts or Spotify.

I would like to thank our audience for your continued engagement with these important issues, good-bye.