Guest: Steve Hsu

WOODS: Can you start off by telling us about your background, where you're from, how you got into academia, all that?

HSU: I grew up in Ames, Iowa, home of Iowa State University, where my dad was an engineering professor, and went off to Caltech. My hero was Richard Fineman, did a PhD in theoretical physics at Berkeley, became a professor of theoretical physics. Got interested in things like genomics, computational genomics, AI applied to genomics about ten years ago, so I've been sort of splitting my research time between theoretical physics and some more applied work in computational genomics. Until recently, for about eight years, I was the Vice President for Research at Michigan State University.

WOODS: Okay, now, while you had that position, were you also doing classroom work?

HSU: No, when you get to be a senior administrator, generally you don't have time to teach classes, so although I was able to keep up a research effort, I was not teaching during those eight years.

WOODS: All right, well, given the field you're in where a lot of the work that you do would be over the heads of most people, it demands explanation that you would turn out to be a controversial figure. Now, had you ever been the source of controversy before, let's say, the last however many months?

HSU: So there's a complicated history of what has been happening in computational genomics. So as the cost to sequence DNA has gone down, we've accumulated very large data sets, and we can then do sort of AI or machine learning analysis on these huge data sets. We're talking about hundreds of thousands of people at a time can be examined. And so a bunch of somewhat controversial things have arisen from that kind of analysis.

Like about ten years ago, believe it or not, there was a big controversy about whether you could look at someone's DNA and determine their ancestry. And the people in the sort of far left felt that this was undermining their long-held position that race was entirely a social construct. And so even the idea that I could look at the DNA of an individual and say, hey, this person is probably about half Nigerian and half French, hat seems totally mundane now, and in fact, millions of people have done this kind of analysis, have paid money to 23andme and Ancestry for this kind of analysis, and it's totally established science now. Ten years ago, it was pretty controversial, and there were honestly I would just say leftist attacks on the scientists who were studying just this kind of data analysis.

And I was only peripherally involved in that, I wasn't actually a researcher in that area, but I was just getting involved in computational genomics at that time. And I wrote some blog posts, just trying to understand what is the data analysis involved in this kind of classification of people by ancestry, and so I was attacked for just writing this blog post.

WOODS: Wow. Well, now that you mention it, I understand why this would challenge some people's ideological preconceptions. It wouldn't have occurred to me until you pointed it out. But instantly while we're on the subject, do you mean to say, then, that if I go ahead and use 23andme that, I mean, I know you don't work for them, but can you vouch for the kind of results I'm likely to get? Is it absolutely legit?

HSU: Yes, the basic technology and science is super well established, and it's used every day in medical genetics. So if we're analyzing a bunch of genomes for possible signals for diabetes risk, we first segment the study population by their ancestry so that there isn't some confound, so that we're not mistakenly picking up some signal that's due to ethnicity or ancestry as being causative for the disease. And so this is very standard stuff, and just any kind of even crude statistical analysis of two genomes can tell you roughly where the person's ancestry comes from.

WOODS: Okay, well, I've got the kits sitting here. I just haven't gotten around to doing it, but all right, well, now I feel even more confirmed in my determination to do it. All right, so now let's fast forward to this year, 2020, which is just a disaster on every possible front this year, this blankety-blank year that we're enduring. And something happened that took you from the realm of an administrator at Michigan State University to a national figure and a lightning rod. What was that?

HSU: Well, actually, I think the trigger event had to do with George Floyd. So in the wake of the George Floyd tragedy, there was a some kind of effort called Shutdown STEM, which was supposed to be a day when we didn't do any science. SEM stands for science, technology, engineering and medicine typically, or sometimes M means mathematics. But so there was a movement that said, hey, we should shut down all science and STEM research for a day in memory of Black Lives Matter and George Floyd. And on that day, there was some sort of a Twitter mob that attacked me personally and released a bunch of really, actually very false and misleading tweets about me and tried to get me fired from my job as the Vice President of Research.

Now, the main triggering event for them I think — I'm not sure because I don't have access to their internal mental states — was that one of the researchers on our campus, a very prominent psychologist who's actually editor of a prominent journal, had published a few years ago and also more recently results on police shootings. So he studied both the statistics of how often they happen and to whom they happen, and also studied the behavior of individual police officers in a simulator environment. So as a psychologist, he was interested in how they make decisions under stress, what are they focused on when they decide to draw their gun or shoot their gun, and are their eyes focused on the glove compartment of a car, or do they really care what the race of the person is? Are they just trying to see if there's a weapon visible?

So he's done a bunch of really in-depth studies on this, and I had interviewed him I and a colleague had interviewed him on a podcast that we do, and that was a trigger event because his results suggest — and there are many other results like his published in leading journals — which is just that the bias is not as strong as what the media or activists would like you to believe. Another major study in this area was done by a professor at Harvard named Roland Fryer, which came to the same conclusion. So the activists don't like this conclusion. To come to this conclusion is considered racist. To promote the science or the discussion of the science is considered racist. And that was I think the main precipitating thing that caused them to attack me.

WOODS: So on the one hand, we have people who say we have to follow the science, but on the other hand, they already know how the science is supposed to come out, so if it doesn't come out that way, then it's ipso facto not science. I mean, is that more or less the way they're looking at it?

HSU: It's unfortunate that most people who are activists have typically an emotional or psychological state, that they want a certain conclusion to be justified. And they're not the kind of rational Spock-like scientists who can step back and just weigh everything equally. Just to be completely fair, if you have very strong libertarian commitments, there might be some scientific papers, economics papers that you really don't like the conclusions of. It's

tough for anybody to be fully rational and balanced, but in this case, with all the emotions running high with BLM, George Floyd, it was a particularly bad moment.

WOODS: Right. And believe me, being a libertarian means that so much of what you come across in academia is a challenge to you, and the sorts of speakers who come to campus and all that sort of thing. But you learn to be mature about it. You learn that, well, it's a wide world with a lot of people who look at things differently from the way I do, and I'll hear them out, I'll see maybe if there's a flaw in their paper. Maybe their paper requires me to adjust my outlook on the world. I will say, speaking for myself and the people I know, that it has the effect of making us even more careful, even better scholars precisely because we so often deal with opposition. But I think —

HSU: Yeah —

WOODS: I beg your pardon. Go ahead.

HSU: I was just going to agree with you. I'm sorry to interrupt. I think the best environment for students to learn for their future careers, how to make decisions based on data and evidence, is to be confronted with opposite views of things that they strongly believe in, so they have to really confront the opposite case, the strongest case against their cherished beliefs. And that process used to be what college was about. And unfortunately, that's all being I think suppressed in the current environment.

WOODS: Well, I've said numerous times just from my undergraduate experience that what would happen is we would get all kinds of speakers coming to campus, and I would say the great majority of them were more or less opposed to my views. But I went and listened to a good many of them. And every once in a while, we'd get one or two who were exactly like me, who thought exactly the way I did. And those would be, if not shouted down, disrupted in one way or another, people would be screaming about them, there'd be protests that the people had even been there. And I thought if these people ever got in power, if they're that impatient with just one dissident voice, my gosh, these would be dangerous people to be close to the levers of power.

And that seems to be happening in your case. Everybody is saying the same thing in the wake of the George Floyd tragedy. I mean, basically everybody, every corporate CEO, every media spokesman, everybody in academia. So the idea that there'd be one or maybe two studies that say, *Well, wait a minute, hold on, the situation may be a little bit more complicated,* it seems like you ought to be able to cope with that.

HSU: Yeah, I don't want to claim to be an expert on what happened to George Floyd, and that wasn't a shooting, and certainly it was tragic. And so I think it's right for people to get somewhat exercised about it. The broader issue of how biased are police on average in the US, what can be done to improve their decision making process, how do they make their decisions, these are all obviously among the most critical things that need to be studied scientifically today. And to suppress the study of those subjects because the conclusions might not agree with what some activists want to be true, I think is just completely wrong. And my situation was that I was forced to resign as the Vice President for Research.

WOODS: Right, yeah, we're going to get to that. Yes, yes. So let me ask, first of all, can you just clarify how it is that somebody in your field came to be involved in this particular question, which is so far outside your field?

HSU: Yeah, I'd like to clarify this. So the involvement that I have personally with Joe Cesario's research is very minimal. So a few years ago, he came to my office. My office has a small budget just to support certain promising areas of faculty research, and he came to me and said, I have just gotten access to a major city police force. The chief of police — this is a few years ago, so post BLM and Ferguson, but well before George Floyd. He came to me and he said, I'm studying this area, and I've gotten access through the police chief of a major metropolitan force to his officers, to records, to infield documents, all kinds of things that

will help the study of this important subject. Can you give me a little bit of money to help make more realistic simulator videos?

So he wanted to hire black and white actors to play roles where they would do exactly the same thing functionally, but one person was black and the person was white. They would be seen reaching into their glove compartment in a jerky way during a traffic stop, and the real officers would be monitored in the simulator to see how they react to this. And I thought, this is just phenomenally good science. He's got get-up-and-go because he was able to get a police chief to make his force available for the study. So I said okay, a few tens of thousands of dollars from my office to create these videos seems like a good investment for Michigan State and for the country. So that was my only involvement with Joe Cesario, the professor in question.

Now, after he completed his studies, my colleague is a guy called Corey Washington, who by the way has two PhDs, one in philosophy and one in neuroscience, and he is also very interested in this question of police shootings and decision making. He invited Joe to be on our podcast. Corey and I, who have been friends for 30 years and happened to do this podcast together, he wanted to interview Joe Cesario, so we invited Joe. And it was that interview that I think set off the activists. So sorry for that convoluted story, but I really don't have much actual connection to his research. And I'm not defending his research, because I'm not an expert, but we did spend a full hour interviewing him about the results and it seemed like he's a serious guy and he should have the right to publish his research. The research is published in the top journals, like *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.

WOODS: So I'm sure they're also angry at him, but it's interesting that you as an interviewer — is the complaint that you are "platforming" him, and since he's guilty of wrongthink, no right-thinking person would do that?

HSU: Yes, I am promoting racist wrongthink by having him on our podcast. And even though mainly the role I played in that particular podcast, Corey and I split it up, so if he's the guy who's more interested and expert in that area, he leads the question and I'm just the audience ombudsman. I just ask clarifying questions to make it more understandable to the layperson. And so on that podcast, Corey was the lead interviewer; I was just the audience ombudsman. Corey's African American, so nobody accused him of being racist over this, but somehow I, a Chinese American, am racist for interviewing Joe Cesario.

WOODS: So let's talk about, then, when this podcast episode was released and then the time lapse between that and the Twitter mob. And what did the Twitter mob look like? Just paint the whole picture for us.

HSU: The Twitter mob was primarily graduate students and people who, if you look at their Twitter feeds, they have a history of — I don't want to make any political judgments on anyone, but they are sort of strongly left-of-center activists and talk openly about canceling people who think the wrong things or say the wrong things. It's sort of that type of population of people.

What really irritated me was that their accusations against me were so easily debunkable. Like they would say Steve is a racist for XYZ, and they would link to a blog post I made ten years ago. And then if you read the blog post, you would see me actually denouncing racism in the blog post and pointing out that I'm talking about some published scientific papers saying these results should be interpreted very carefully, etc., etc. And so I think reasonable people who looked at the these attacks on me realized this was just nonsense. And that's why a group of faculty that was defending me was able to get, in just a few days, almost 2,000 signatures on a petition, including many top scientists, many letters sent directly to the president, public letters, people like Steve Pinker at Harvard —

WOODS: I read his letter. His letter was terrific.

HSU: Yeah, so it just seems like — I hate to say this for Michigan State, but in the fullness of time, if people really want to examine this incident, it will really look like irrational mob stupidity causing a hasty action by the administration. But in the fullness of time, it will be seen as a terrible example of how universities should conduct themselves.

WOODS: Yeah, it is astonishing how university administrations will leave their faculty — it's not just that they leave them hanging out to dry; it's they join the other side in attacking their own faculty member, because they think that's the best way to defend themselves.

HSU: Yeah, let me relate to you what happened to Joe. So I actually don't feel like I should take center stage here, because I'm just some administrator. It's not a big deal. I can go back to being a physics professor or find my quality of life actually goes up. But the guy who's really being under threat here is a researcher like Joe. And let me tell you what happened to him, because it's almost like out of Orwell.

So when this was all happening, *The Wall Street Journal* had run an article, which reference Roland Fryer's research and also referenced Joe's research. And in response to that, the communications people at Michigan State had published a little thing and their newsletter saying, *Oh, isn't this great? This nice research by Professor Cesario has been cited in this Wall Street Journal* article. Then when this whole incident happened, which engulfed me as well, they actually issued an apology to the campus community for mentioning that Joe's work had been cited in the *Wall Street Journal* article. So it was a 100% reversal of their position of A) being proud of him for his work, to suddenly apologizing for calling attention to his work. Now, if you just leave me out of this whole discussion, what kind of message does that send to serious scientists on our campus about where the administration is vis-a-vis defending anything they do that might be controversial?

WOODS: And of course, nothing had changed about the facts of the matter between the moment of their being proud and the moment of their apologizing. Nothing had changed other than they'd gotten an earful from activists who obviously do want to intimidate people into silence. What other intent could there be behind this?

HSU: Yes, to make such strong accusations, not, *Oh, we think Joe made the wrong statistical adjustment here*, or *We think his videos were not very realistic* — there are all kinds of reasoned criticisms one can make up any professor's research. That was not what was happening. What was happening was *This was racist research. This is scientific racism. Let's fire Steve Hsu over this*. That was literally what happened, and that is literally what caused the 180-degree shift in position by the Michigan State University communications people and the upper administration.

WOODS: So what's the timeframe over which this has happened? Is it a couple of weeks? I mean, from the moment people attack you —

HSU: No, it was days.

WOODS: Days?

HSU: Days. It's days, yes.

WOODS: So you're Vice President for Research in the early part of the week, and by the end of the week, you're out? That kind of thing?

HSU: To be totally precise, the tweets appeared, I believe on a Wednesday, by Friday and the weekend, I was having concerned discussions with the president. During that period of time, I think is when the reversal on the communications strategy or hiring Joe Cesario happened, and then I was asked for my resignation the following Friday. So it was basically ten days in total.

WOODS: Okay, so obviously you have tenure. It’s impossible for you not to, right?

HSU: Yes, correct.

WOODS: Okay, otherwise we wouldn't even be having this conversation.

HSU: Right.

WOODS: So the very fact that faculty members like you have to operate in an atmosphere of fear such that the only way they can speak comfortably is if their job is absolutely guaranteed also says something. But I'm not looking for you to badmouth anybody. I'm not looking for drama. I just want the facts. And I guess if you were in talks with the president, on some level, if I were the president, I just can't imagine not saying to my faculty member or administrator, privately:

Look, I realize that what's happening here — I know you well. We wouldn't have hired you if we thought that you were the way they're describing you. Of course, we know that you're not this person. But you've got to understand, the administration is in an impossible position.

I could see somebody saying that. I mean, I wouldn't support that, but at least I understand the motivation. I guess you can't reveal what was said behind closed doors, but at least publicly what were they saying about you? *He's a terrible person, but we have we're stuck with him*? I mean, what were they saying?

HSU: There was one intermediate set of quotes given out before I was asked my resignation, in which they apologized for the harm that my actions might have caused. And I assume they were referring to the podcast? I am not sure exactly what are they referring to. I will say this on the record. I don't want to say anything about private conversations. I think, you know —

WOODS: Of course. Right, right.

HSU: But there was never any fact investigation. There was never any — we have thousands of very accomplished faculty on this campus. They could have set up a committee and said, "Wow, these are very serious charges. Can we examine them?" And I had, of course, posted on my blog my rejoinder to all these accusations. The president had access to that. The communications people had access to that. There was never any process meant to establish the facts of the matter before the decision was made.

And I want to contrast this to something that happened at University of Chicago, basically contemporaneously. There was an economist at Chicago, who tweeted — and this guy is a BLM supporter, but he had tweeted out that he thought it was a political mistake for them to take the defund-the-police position, that he felt just on a political level this was not going to help them. He was attacked. Now, two things happened to him. One, I believe his consulting position or research position at the Fed, at the Chicago Fed was terminated quickly, so that was analogous to what happened to me. But the University of Chicago itself set up a committee to quickly investigate whether this man was a racist because he was trying to suggest a better strategy to BLM, or if that was kind of completely ridiculous charge. And they concluded the latter, and that was the end of it, although he did lose I believe his position with the Fed. So that's a better model, isn't it, for the university, which should be dedicated to truth, to try to figure out what is actually the situation here and then we'll make a reaction, as opposed to purely reacting at a political level.

WOODS: I don't know if this is fair or not, but when I look at the Bolshevik Revolution and after that occurs, what happens to the Mensheviks? What happens to the social revolutionaries? It doesn't matter if you agree with us 90%, because that 10% makes you a traitor, and we're going to hit you hard. Now, there are a lot of people — what was it? Willie Brown used to be the mayor of San Francisco? He came out, and he's black, and he came out and said "Defund the Police" has to be the single stupidest slogan to run on I have ever heard. Because there is no constituency in America for getting rid of the police. And even if that's not what you mean by it, that's how they're going to take it. This has to be the most politically tone-deaf thing in the world. Now, nobody dares go after Willie Brown, so they just pretended he didn't exist. But by and large, even if you have a strategic difference — you

agree with them on the substance — even that alone is enough for the boot to come onto your neck.

HSU: Right, I don't want to say that I'm a deep expert on what happened to this University of Chicago economist; I just know what I read online. But it seemed to me he was — I looked at his tweets. It seemed like he was very supportive of the movement and just was giving them strategic advice. It was misconstrued as him being a racist, and they attacked him over it. Anyway, it's not my story so I don't want to spend too much time on maybe something incorrect about what happened there.

WOODS: Right.

HSU: But my impression is at the university level, they handled this analogous matter much better than it was handled here.

WOODS: Yeah, I think Chicago has made clear where it stands on freedom of speech and academic freedom. In fact, I seem to recall they even issued a letter that incoming students would receive, explaining that in the course of your education at the University of Chicago, you may indeed be exposed to ideas and research that will make you uncomfortable, but if we didn't do that, we'd be doing you a disservice, because this is the part of your life where you have the best chance of really, authentically being exposed to a wide array of perspectives, and that's what we're going to be doing here. That used to be the consensus, I suppose, in a lot of places —

HSU: Well, sorry to interrupt —

WOODS: No, no, please.

HSU: Chicago is exemplary. That letter is exemplary, but it is rare. There are very, very few universities —and I say this is somebody who worked in higher ed administration for the last eight years. There are very few universities that either publicly or even privately support that level of conviction in the pursuit of truth and a full, well-rounded, diverse education for the undergraduates.

WOODS: Now, let me say this. As a libertarian, I don't feel completely at home on the left or the right, so I'm able to have a comfortable bird's-eye view of everything, not feeling like I'm part of either team. But what I think it's safe to say, however, is that of those two sides, there's one that is more engaged in intimidation of dissident voices than the other. I mean, if somebody can name me the last person who was shouted off campus by a right-wing group, it'll be the first one I've heard. So I don't think it's controversial to say that this kind of activity does seem to be concentrated on one side. And it does seem, likewise, that the sort of people who would be targeted by mobs like this are extremely scattered and demoralized right now and really don't know what to do other than keep their heads down and be quiet, which does not seem like a sustainable long-term strategy. Do you think there'll be a moment when people who genuinely think I ought to be able to say and think and write and research whatever I want will push back, or is it just going to continue to go the way we've seen?

HSU: I can give you two empirical data points to partially answer your question. One is that w the faculty on campus that were supporting me only ran this petition campaign for a few days. Just a few days before the president made his decision. So about 2,000 people ultimately signed the petition, and hundreds were professors from around the world. But we got many emails, or they got the emails and then show them to me, from people who were afraid, afraid to sign the petition. And some people actually signed it and then said, "Hey, I'm really sorry to do this, but I've got to take my name off, because I don't want the mob coming after me." We even had cases where people who hold endowed chairs at top universities didn't put their name on the list, just put the name of their chair because it's harder to search for them. They were worried that their name could be searchable on the list. So the level of fear cannot be understood very well by people who are off campus. This is the situation that we are dealing with.

Now, a second data point for you, which is empirical is I think it comes from Heterodox Academy, which studies this sort of left-of-center monoculture that's developing on campus. It used to be that the ratio of left-of-center to right-of-center faculty was about two to one, but it's evolved in the last 20, 30 years to be about five to one, according to their data. So there are about five times as many left-of-center faculty as right-of-center faculty. And so I don't think it's healthy, even though I am historically left of center. So if you look at my blog, I've been blogging since 2004. You can see me as one of the early Obama supporters when he first ran for the presidency, and I voted twice for Obama. I have pictures of myself with Obama on my blog. And so I'm actually, according to my voting pattern, left of center, a typical university professor. And yet I can be accused of racism for very flimsy reasons.

WOODS: Well, you seem pretty — well, let's say you have a very even constitution and temperament, because I can think of a lot of people who would not be taking what happened to them with quite the grace that you are. So first of all, I appreciate that about you. So what comes next for you at this point? Is this going to affect the way you operate? Is there any way you're going to be different as you pursue your academic work or even your podcasts in the future?

HSU: I am really looking forward to getting back to doing more research. These are really exciting times for the application of AI to many problems, for example, in genomics, which is an area that I work in, but also in physics. And so I'm actually looking forward to getting back to my main work. And one thing we didn't talk about is that I've been the founder or co-founder of four different Silicon Valley tech startups and two are still running, and so I'll have more time to be involved in those startups. So I have a lot of things to do. I feel very bad for serious researchers and scientists that are on campuses right now, because there is a climate of fear. Nobody can stand up to this mob, right? Even if you have reason and thousands of people around the world signing a petition for you, including a former dean of Harvard Medical School and chaired professors at MIT and places like this, you apparently can't survive if the mob comes for you. So I think faculty members have a good reason to be afraid in the current climate, and I think things are not going to get better for a while.

WOODS: On a happier note, can you take a moment to tell us about your podcast?

HSU: So Cory and I — Corey, as I mentioned, is a very interesting character. He started at Amherst College when he was 15, and he has a PhD in philosophy from Stanford and a PhD in neuroscience from Columbia. He and I have been friends for 30 years. We met in the Bay Area when he was at Stanford and I was at Berkeley. And we do this podcast where we try to interview interesting writers, scientists. We interviewed Dan Gable. We interview billionaire hedge fund investors. And it's all about ideas and rigorous thinking. And we hope to continue the podcast. I don't know, it's a little bit in limbo after this whole crisis. I don't know if Corey can get back in the saddle and continue. I would like to continue, but we'll have to discuss that amongst ourselves. And podcasting is great. I mean, it's amazing that you can reach a broad audience and you can have serious discussions and there's no time restriction. It's a fantastic medium, and I think it's only going to grow.

WOODS: And it's called *Manifold*?

HSU: It's called *Manifold*. Yes, if you just type "Manifold" and my last name, you'll find it. We have interviews with — I interviewed Dan Gable, the famous University of Iowa wrestling coach, we've interviewed famous neuroscientists, genomicists, hedge fund managers, technologists, AI researchers, so I think people will find something interesting there.

WOODS: Okay, in fact, I'm on the site now, ManifoldLearning.com. I'll link to that on the show notes page. That's TomWoods.com/1685 for Episode 1685. And then also your blog, do you still blog on it? Do you still write?

HSU: Yes, I won't stop blogging. I mean, my blog goes back to 2004, and it covers topics like genomics and AI and physics, university issues, all kinds of stuff. Actually, Tom, I want to tell

you that I think I became aware of your podcast because you had some guests that talked about Spygate, the spying on the Trump campaign. And as somebody who used to work in information security, my two first startups were in information security in Silicon Valley, and one of them had the CIA venture fund as one of its investors. I've been following the ability of the NSA, National Security Agency, to monitor us person communications very aggressively. And so my intent was up when I heard these rumors that the Trump campaign had been spied on, and it's an amazing story that just hasn't been told, the level of, you know, that basically a sitting government investigated the opposition party during a close political campaign. And as I recall, you had some very good guests talking about this on your show.

WOODS: Thank you. On your blog, it's InfoProc.blogspot. com? Is that the best way to get there?

HSU: Yeah, so if you just type my name, Steve Hsu — although my name is hard to spell, it's HSU. But if you just type my name, you'll find the blog.

WOODS: Okay, and I'll also link to the blog at TomWoods.com/1685. Well, I'm glad to hear at the very least, as you say, that your quality of life will improve in your position as a professor. And in a way, it reminds me of a story. In the Southeastern part of the US, we have a small chain, like 170 restaurants, called Chicken Salad Chick. And it was started by a woman who at that time lived on my street, and she was making the most delicious chicken salad you'd ever eaten and selling it to people on the street.

She got a call one day from the health department saying, "Are you selling chicken salad out of your own kitchen?" Of course, this is the greatest atrocity in the history of mankind, so they shut her down. You can't do that. And it turns out it was a competitor who didn't like the fact that she had vastly superior chicken salad, who would ratted her out, and we're all desperate for her chicken salad. We're having withdrawal. So she decided: this is the thing I need to kick me in the rear end and start up my own restaurant, doggone it. Now she has 170 locations, multimillionaire, doing fantastically well. Even though what happened to her was not the ideal situation, after it was over, her life was happier. So maybe at least that is at least the silver lining in your case.

HSU: And anybody who does tech startups is probably just constitutionally on the optimistic side, and I definitely am. So for me, this is just a chance to do just take stock and just pursue other more interesting projects. Although I'm very proud of the record of my team in the Vice President's Office for Research here. We grew the annual research expenditures from about 500 million to 700 million per year. We were number-one in the Big 10 for rate of growth for that at Michigan State. So I'm proud of that. But I'm happy to go on to other things, and so just the main thing is I just fear for the serious faculty on campus that are having to live in this climate now.

WOODS: Right, right, well, no disagreement there. So show notes page, TomWoods.com/1685, we'll have links to the things we've talked about. And Steve, best of luck to you in the future. Thanks so much.

HSU: Thank you. It's been great to be on your show. Carry on.