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## 📜 Full Podcast Transcript

Today on the Knowledge Bar, we're definitely in the Oscar spirit. We'll talk award show reactions and the buzz around AI in the "Best Actor" category. After that, Chris is worried about the demands for purity on the Supreme Court, and what does education going back to the states really mean for us? Hang out and talk with us. Welcome to the Knowledge Bar, where we're elevating conversations. I'm Alex. I'm Ethan. I'm Patrick. The non-Chris. We're pumped to have you for another episode of the Knowledge Bar. As always, we want to remind you to please subscribe, rate, drop us a 5-star review, leave a comment if you have anything to say. Remember that you can always find additional content at theknowledge.bar. If you ever have questions or topics you want us to discuss or want to let us know how we're doing, you can email us at podcast@theknowledge.bar. We're going to jump right into the discussion, guys. Let's do a quick round of "What's in Your Glass" and find out what everybody's drinking. Chris, what are you drinking? I'm drinking water. I'm pretty dehydrated. Speaking of things that are completely unlike others, I mean, Patrick, you're drinking tea, which is basically hot water with dirt in it. That's wild. I am enjoying Numi Green Tea. It is delicious. What brand is it? Numi. Like Numi? Like Numi? And now there's a new menu. Check out on Instagram where we post all our drinks. Yeah, we absolutely will. Ethan, what are you drinking? I have Kirkland 15-year-old aged rum with a little bit of pineapple juice. Nice, keeping it simple. And I'm having an Irish May cocktail that I mixed up today. It's Irish whiskey, simple syrup, lemon juice, and elderflower liqueur. And I must say, it's pretty tasty, really nice and crushable for sure. Alright, now that everyone has a cocktail in front of us, let's jump right into what's on your mind. Ethan, why don't you kick us off today? What's on your mind, man? What's been bothering me this week was having to sit through a three-hour and 40-minute ceremony this Sunday to watch what is basically the equivalent of the Super Bowl of Movies. Movies are very important to me, so this is a big night, and it was honestly one of the worst Oscars that I have ever had to endure. It was three hours and 40 minutes full of weird presentations. Hollywood, you're going 40 minutes over and you're so self-important that you do individual speeches for each category. Each person gets this fake, sugary, written by a publicist description. Oh, it's so cringy. And then they don't even show the movies. For categories like costume, hairstyling, and makeup, cinematography, we don't see the movies these are from. Don't you want to see clips? And then... Wait, what do you mean? I didn't watch the Oscars. What do you mean they didn't show clips? Normally, they usually show clips. They had people go out there and read terrible written descriptions about each nominee, and then they might show a little clip in the bottom corner. So what they did was the person would come out on stage, and five banners would drop down behind them with a picture for each movie. For costume design, it was like a picture of the artwork of the costumes. That's pretty cool, but I still want to see clips. But no. And then that person would go by each nominee and say things like, "Chris, you're a powerful artist, man. You're the most active viewer that sings so much to who we are. And if it's not for you, the movie industry simply does not exist." Whose idea was this? Why? What was wrong with the old format? Did anyone complain or ask for this? I don't know. An already overly long ceremony ends up being... Did more black people win awards in this format? No, that's a no. So what the heck? They just solved the wrong problem. I'd really have to go back and check the winners, but I think it was remarkably lacking diversity. Oscars are still so white. And then we get close to the end of the night, and Adrian Brody, who I was rooting for, gets up to do an acceptance speech. It was the most cringy, self-important acceptance speech I've ever heard. Did he win before? Yes, he won for "The Pianist." Did he win before? I can't remember if he has. They tried to play him off, and he kind of disregarded them and said, "I won't get gratuitous about this." And then proceeded to do just that. It wasn't even... I wrote it. It didn't have a thesis. It was just rambling nonsense. And again, it's fake flowery language, embarrassing. It's the longest acceptance speech in Oscars history. It was embarrassing how it was done, that he was allowed to do it. And I'm there and it just added to an already terrible ceremony. You don't think when he was going, Will Smith should have stopped him, dude? They should have kept him backstage. That's actually the new music. That's the new music. Is that when they go over, they start pointing at Will? Yeah, first, they play the music. But then eventually, it's like Sonic the Hedgehog, where if you're drowning, and then this is Will Smith walking out on stage. That was the thing that really upset me. Not going anywhere else on this. But did either of you guys watch this? No. The craziest part is that they turned the music on to play him off. And he bullied them into letting him stay on stage. He just kept talking and said vocally, "Turn it off. I've been here before. I'm going to keep talking." It's norm-violating, unnecessary. We don't need more of these norm violations. Like now, everyone's going to do that. If he was up there with a message and a well-written speech, maybe it would be different. But to get up there and ramble, he even threw his gum at his partner as he was coming on stage. And this is the same night where multiple groups won Oscars, and some didn't get a chance to speak and just left the stage with their notes when the music came on. It's surprising. I looked up viewership, and it had a five-year high for adults aged 18 to 49, even though it was really bad. For me, a three-and-a-half-hour show, I'd turn that off. Nothing holds my interest that long. It feels like the movies didn't justify the length this year. Wasn't that the year when Jamie Foxx played Ray? But Forest Whitaker won for "The Last King of Scotland." I have a stink about it. Forest Whitaker was amazing in that movie, but I thought Will Smith should have won for "Pursuit of Happiness." The eye in "The Last King of Scotland" was terrifying. Forest Whitaker's performance was so good that even if he wasn't ED, I wouldn't recognize him. That year had strong contenders like Jamie Foxx for Ray, Leo for "The Aviator," Don Cheadle for "Hotel Rwanda," Clint Eastwood for "Million Dollar Baby," and Johnny Depp for "Finding Neverland." Okay, Morgan, when? Yeah, "Wicked" won for sure. Yeah. Yeah, but that's like a year where that kind of length is justified. Oh, I'll stay on because one of the major categories is last, and I want to see who wins. We've been talking about it. But I mean, I know Adrian Brody was up for "The Brutalist," but who else was even nominated? I mean, I also think you had "Wicked" up for a lot of stuff. And we know that people were there for "Wicked." Like, we heard "Defying Gravity" 7,200 times throughout the Oscars. Like, I know you're wrong; I really love "Wicked," but it was a bit much. Ethan, do you have anything else on the Oscars? No, it sucked. It was pretty disappointing. You're normal one. It just catches right. I heard it. Nora. I did. It swept. I was happy about that. Mikey Madison won. Sean Baker won multiple Oscars. And then he was like the first person ever to win four Oscars for the same film. I wanted to go see it in theaters because Chelsea and I, on your recommendation, watched "The Florida Project," and we thought, "Oh, we should go see 'Nora.' It's the same director." But then I read that it was like, "Yeah, she is a stripper." So now I don't know a lot. Yeah. A lot. Yeah, I mean, she's a sex worker. So I get it. But also, Sean Baker goes for full authenticity to the extreme. I think it's just one of those things where Sean Baker just does what Sean Baker does, which is this really realistic view of how the world works. And that's part of it. Agreed. I was happy to see him and Mikey Madison win. I was happy to see that. Like, it was definitely probably my favorite movie of this year that was heavily nominated. So I was happy. Well, "Robot" I heard was up for best animated feature. Did that win? It lost; "Flow" won. But "Flow" is awesome. Have you seen "Flow"? Anybody seen "Flow" with me? I have not. No, I liked it. It is really cool though because it was made in an open-source program that's free called Blender. So like you could go download it right now and use it. Realize how inadequate I am. Yeah, it's fine. But what's it about? "Flow" is this really majestic story about a cat. And it is a cat that finds itself alone during a flood, in hard to say when or where. And there are no humans in it, and there's no dialogue in it. It is like other robots. Is it like "Stray," the PS5 game? No, but it will make you kind of feel like "Stray" when you first start watching it. You're like, I've seen this; I've played this game. But I'm not going to lie to you. It really, it really goes. And like the animation is incredible. And if you are one of those people that has emotions about animals, I don't recommend it. It will not be a good time for you. So only psychopaths should watch it. Maybe like I'm sure you might like it and just cry about it. I don't know. Yeah. All right, Ethan, we'll catch you up on the Oscars. Pat, what's got you? Yeah, I think it's a little bit similar, but more specific to the Oscars. So we talked about Adrien Brody playing the what looks like. I already think they tell us about the Oscars. All right, Pat, what about you? It's also about the Oscars. What is Pat would have just gone? I hated it. So Adrian Brody wins for "The Brutalist," which we know, but it was super controversial. And I think we actually began to touch on this in a previous episode, but we weren't able to have a full conversation about it. Artificial intelligence was apparently used at points in the dialogue of "The Brutalist" to help make Adrian Brody's accent sound more authentically Hungarian. And for me, this really jumped out because I was just reading it. I'm not someone who closely follows the Oscars scene. But given the idea of culture, given the idea of representation, it really, really struck me as should he have won. I know people were pissed that Shala Megan went and he played Bob going on his own, right, without assistance. Do you guys think that the use of AI to alter Brody's performance, no matter how light it is, should disqualify him from entry into the best actor field? It feels, to use a sports analogy, a bit like PEDs. Is it working toward this idea of authenticity in a fake way? I mean, and I think it's fine that we're having these conversations over and over again. And I think that we should. But I think in this specific circumstance that what? I'm just dead that you said I'm glad we're having these conversations over and over again. Well, I'm like, AI has come up in movie production stuff. Like I get it's risen to this level, right? He's winning for Best Actor in this way. That does feel like an. Escalation of the conversation that way. I definitely, but that's what I'm saying. I think it's fine to have the conversation, but in the specific circumstance, I do not see it as an issue. What would you say that auto-tune and music is like an issue? Auto-tune is not an I can't remember the last. That's what that. Yeah, it's using a computer program to make this sound like this. That's all that re-speaker does. But the idea of right, there's an objective quality to all the tune, right? If you're trying to not music that, some should throw out a note, right? Like B flat, right? There's an objective quality that the songwriter has in their head, and they have a voice that they are trying to have a voice, right? But they're trying to hit the particular note. Sure. Are we saying that there is, we're going to treat culture the exact same way, where there is a sound, a note of Hungarian that we ought to be striving for, right? To your point, if we use your analogy in that way, are we moving toward shivier actors winning because we can help them along? Basically, everybody that I've heard kind of speak on this speaks to the fact that Hungarian is terribly difficult to master and to speak. So I think that striving for that authenticity in this way to make it sound right to people that are from Hungary and Hungary. Yeah, the people from Hungary. From Hungary. So the land of big dick people. The level of difficulty for you is the big, and like you guys, right? Like the level of difficulty, specifically that a Hungarian accent that justifies these. But I'm not on his boat. I'm on my boat. I don't know what boat I was on. But I'm on the, I don't think I'm in trouble. I probably think there are two different conversations that need to be had there. I don't think I'm troubled by one of them. I don't think I'm troubled by the other one. I actually don't think that I am troubled by him winning. But I do think that, like what you're pointing out about culture is probably a much, much bigger hang up for me. And whether or not we're okay with the concept of we are going to adjust somebody's voice so that they can play somebody from a specific culture. Because not only are they not from that culture, but they also don't have the ability to portray that culture in that way. That's like, so we'll just use AI to fix that so that we can use the actor we want to use. I probably have a bigger problem with that than I do the idea of like, hey, if this little thing happens, then he can't win the Oscar. No, because quite frankly, like I haven't seen this movie, but I mean, I know Adrian Brody is a beautiful actor. And I'm sure that he won because he is incredible at emoting. Like that's what he's really good at. I'm sure that's why he won. I don't think he's too damn much. I don't think that he won because he spoke excellent Hungarian. And that's where I think that there's like two problems. One, I don't have a problem with the other one. I'm, I am pretty concerned. Can you clarify what you mean by, so you're talking about the culture piece, but you don't have a problem with, I don't have a problem with him winning because of AI. I don't think that that is inherently an issue here, but I do have a problem just like a little bit culturally with this conversation of us morphing individuals to represent specific cultures. I find that slightly troubling. That for me was kind of the piece and either I'm curious because it sounds like you, you have got a lot of reading on this. So my, my entry into the conversation was not this film. It was the Wonka film with Shalene and then using Hugh Grant to play in Uplupa. That really pissed off communities of people with dwarfism. Because little people, they have historically struggled, right? I am, what's the name of the actor? Peter Tanklix, right? He's probably the most famous actor. He was a little person, and the roles that have been historically assigned or reserved, right? The two most famous would be the Uplupa and then the, the Ewoks in Star Wars, right? And so it's, if you are making it possible to displace people from roles that you are centering around, I do worry that the brutalist and this win signals an encroachment on to representing people's experiences to make it cheaper, right? Which is what I understand that was part of it, right? We said, well, yeah, but to make it cheaper because this was made on essentially a shoestring budget, it cost less than $10 million. So the ability to have people come in and have like even coaches or anything like that, is like severely pushed down. I mean, but like, why not just get a Hungarian actor who probably costs less than the day he's re-embroidered all then? The movie does not get made at all. But I think that's the question though, is like, do you object to the fact just at its, because I think Even before you get to the AI, the question is, do you object at the core that they didn't select a Hungarian actor? I think I'm troubled because I have a real issue with the Oscars at the level of disability where we continue to reward actors for playing disabilities when we could have just cast disabled actors. And then we praise them for it. This has always been the thing that has made me pause. Daniel Day-Lewis famously put a lot of effort into "My Left Foot" and learning that role. Dustin Hoffman put a ton of effort into learning when he interviewed Kim Peek, the character who Rain Man is based off of. I see this as a shortcut that may not allow you to honor those people with the craft or provide a pathway to understanding. That's what I think is beautiful about acting; you get to walk in someone else's shoes. But at events like the Oscars, where we honor people, it starts to make me feel uneasy. It feels like a step in the wrong direction. Then, you have to follow that path back because basically, every movie that you named, including The Pianist, just would not have been made if it didn't have that talent attached to it. So like—   
  
Heather Brown: I'm not sure. I feel like that's a tenuous claim. I'm not sure, right? I don't know. I know that would be really the honest there. But it never works in reverse.  
  
Daniel Day-Lewis: I think that's what I'm troubled by, right? We're not allowing other people. How would Peter Dinklage feel if we asked him to play AI, adjusting to whatever the proper height of the character is, he's 5'10. If we worked this in reverse, we don't ask that. That's why I am intrigued by the AI aspect and what that means for representation in that way, on the stage.   
  
Daniel Day-Lewis: Yeah, I think it's a really fascinating question. Like I said,   
  
Heather Brown: I think there is a deeper question rooted there that is more about where we are in Hollywood even before we begin to approach this AI.   
  
Daniel Day-Lewis: But does AI make it worse? Thank you for saying that. It's helping clarify for me. Is it throwing gasoline on an ember?   
  
Daniel Day-Lewis: I feel like there should be, you know, thank you for articulating your point because I feel like I agree. I think I wholeheartedly agree that I'm concerned about a lot of the same things. I just also think that there are some things that we should slow down on. Introducing technologies like AI might dilute the craft a bit. If I hear some beautifully composed work like a song, it's like, "Wow, that was amazing." But if you tell me a computer did it, it's like, "Okay, so an algorithm did this. You pressed two buttons." So now we're like, "Come on, like, back off, right?" Part of what makes the Oscars such a high honor is that some of this stuff is just really challenging. Hungarian is a difficult accent. Find a person who can do it. And if you can't find an actor who can carry the movie, then tell that actor to work on it and improve. Just be better. Like, Daniel, like with the peg leg point, Daniel Day-Lewis had to pick up everything with his foot. It's not about their ability; it's about recognition. Are you going to get people to come see this movie? Are you going to get awards recognition? Yeah, maybe. But that's how movies get funded—by attaching talent to them. Adrian Brody is talented, so he should be able to learn the accent. How much time? Again, this movie was made for $10 million, which is minuscule in terms of movies, so how much do I have to pay him and how committed does he have to be? He worked with a dialect coach for months. How far does it have to go? But if you're going to get the Oscar for best actor, the people upset that Timothy Chalamet didn't win have a point. Chalamet did it all on his own and lost to a guy who needed help completing the circle. So if you want to make the movie, make the movie. Who says that completing the circle has to be part of it? No one said the whole movie had to be in Hungarian. They aimed for authenticity and wanted to present it in this way. But is that authenticity a difficult term to use here, right? It's something we keep coming back to, which is why the discussion is so interesting. Why is it not a performance enhancer? I didn't say it wasn't, but are computers not going... To use CGI anymore? That's a performance enhancer. Well, I think the question that could be asked is why did he win the award? And did he win the award because he spoke in a flawless Hungarian accent? Yeah, like how many win the award because, and again, I haven't seen this movie. So I don't know. I can't believe any of it. I can't believe it. You know, how many cinematographers have won the Oscar for best cinematography with AI-generated chats with using CGI? No, no, no, no, no, no. That's a question that I asked, right? Like how many- What do you need to define AI as then? Using artificial intelligence to generate the images. Computer outputs don't necessarily mean artificial intelligence per se. I mean, yeah, we can use- it is a form of AI that they use to generate landscapes and textures and lighting and- Of course, in terms of this specific combo where really, for me anyway, I'm really stuck on the performance element, right? So like when I think about Lord of the Rings, right, which was fantastic, especially the third one, right? CGI is in there. It's a beautiful film, right? But we honor the performances therein. And that's what I want to distinguish is like actually what is Salim Aken doing? What is Brody doing? And I think they are- And I think you're absolutely right. Like these are very, very different things that we're talking about. Like cinematography and using computer-generated imagery is very, very different from us altering a person's performance within the film using AI. Should you win for their appearances? Should you win for a CGI face? Should you win Best Makeup Design? If you didn't know, but I might- Actually do the visual effects. Sure, sure. Yeah, best effects. Yeah, absolutely. Yeah. But I wouldn't enter in that category. But like- I think that's a weird argument. No, no, it's not an argument. It's asking the question, right? Because it's the principle. Like if we are talking about, yeah, AI is cool to kind of shortcut your way to an Oscar, then why would it- Why would it be any different than something like- Makeup. I think the idea that that- That's a shortcut- Or a costume design. Or costume design. I think- Why would that be any different? I think it also- I think we're giving it undo- Wait. Wait. I don't think- For the Brody performance? Sorry, I interrupted you by the way. But I just want to clarify what you mean by that. Yeah. Like I think his emotions were real. And that's what you're gonna act on. Okay, what if they weren't though? Like let's just- What, where's the backstop? What do you mean? Like at what point is- But- Is there too much AI? But I think that's a question that we can ask. Like right, if we have a performance that we have altered all of, because we want it to look a certain way, that's a pretty fundamentally different conversation than the one we're having. But- Especially- It's the same conversation. It's the same conversation. No, it's the same conversation. I think- What person can you ask? Where does this select say right? Let's like sort of walk around. 25% is at 50% is that what you're going to ask? Yeah, even necessarily. But like the aesthetic effects, right? Like what is being altered, right? Like the voice element to me feels very significant. It's kind of nothing to look like a quasi percentage. I think that sort of bastardizes the conversation. When we're focusing on the performance, to me it's like- Ethan does seem to like, yes, the emotion is there, right? He's moving his face. He's using his body to gesticulate and do all of that. But then there's this specific piece, which admittedly, based on all of the reading, was a relatively small part of the performance. 100% Our next performance, right? Maybe it's someone who had the kind of speaking Spanish, right? And so now we're using AI to make their Mexican accent sound more authentic. And then the next time we need AI to generate tears that you can't generate. I think- I think it's up to us to decide at that point. And that's what I was kind of getting at. I want to have the conversation again and again and again because I think it goes on a case-by-case basis. And that's why I was saying with the law, how much it actually affected it based on what I have read is relatively low. So I don't see this as a- This particular one is an issue, but I am definitely on board with you guys as far as like, where does this go? But I think that's why you have the conversation again and again and again to find the backstop. Yeah, I guess where I'm at. And I think that's a reasonable place to land that let's just take it into totality, the circumstances, the scope, case-by-case. I guess in my head it's just like, I'm kind of just so done with all of this stuff. Like, Brightline rules, man. Let's just crystal clear, Brightline rules. And yeah, they might be over-inclusive, they might be under-inclusive, but it's like, look, if there's some aspect of this performance that we had to modify, like you're not actually doing it. These are not your tears. This is not your voice. This is not your facial expression. Like, we've had to change it so that it actually is better. Like, you should - that should be disclosed to the academy. You should be disqualified from certain categories. That's just where I'm at. Well, Pat, you definitely brought us a lot of discussion, man. I'm not going to say that as we close the discussion. You remember when Pat made me - made that side-ass comment where he said I tried to bastardize the car science - That's the first sentence thing. You're saying, but you're - Gosh, that's the first sentence thing. Why am I the only one on this podcast that gets called a bitch? You're going to get a bitch. You're going to get a bitch. You're going to get a bitch. You're going to get a f\*\*\*ing b\*\*\*\*. You're going to get a f\*\*\*ing b\*\*\*\*. You're going to get a f\*\*\*ing b\*\*\*\*. You're saying, look at this - we'll do this offline, but that was a completely valid argument. Now, let's get ourselves - let's keep on moving. Can you just give yourself the last word? Yeah, he always does. We've let him emcee, so we - Yeah, you better deal with it. Why don't you tell us what's got you, Chris? Because it's not the outline. I put it in the outline! It's supposed to be the wrong outline. Anyway, I'm not - you know, computers. I got two things. Play outline - I use the one that is in the f\*\*\*ing - The discord. Anyway, so what's got me - I don't know. I don't know what's got - it just got me put up or - Or f\*\*\*\*d up. It would have f\*\*\*\*d that template up or what? And now we find out - No, we're not bad. That hates AI. It's computer illiterate. Can we go like the typewriters? I don't know if I'm f\*\*\*\*d up or pumped up. I'm definitely not pumped up about it. I don't know, but I'm - So the other day, like yesterday, the United States Supreme Court affirmed a decision by the U.S. District Court pausing or preventing the White House from pausing $2 billion of USAID funds from getting distributed. And it was a 5-4 decision, and in the majority was Amy Coney Barrett. Who was a Trump appointee? Now, for the recipients of that aid, this is obviously great news. The reason why I'm kind of feeling a certain type of way about it is because she's now under threat as not a good Republican or something like that. Like she's just getting f\*\*\*ing torched like, oh, she was a bad Supreme Court nominee. She's not conservative enough. And it's like, uh, this lady helped throw out the Chevron defense. This lady helped kill Roe versus Wade. Like decision after decision, we're pretty sure she's got some pretty strong right-wing chops here. But USAID funds, this is, oh, well, I'm really upset that nothing satisfies the litmus tests for these f\*\*\*ing red hats. Like nothing does. It's just, to me, it's just bizarre. What are we going to say? I was just going to say, I feel like it's our saving grace is that they continue down this path with each other. Just until they piss each other off, because you can't be perfect enough. And obviously no one in that, never mind. Yeah, no, I mean, I just think it's, but there's another part of me that's really concerned because like, okay, it doesn't actually matter what the reasoning of it is, right? Like these people like f\*\*\*ing Charlie Kirk. He's not Charlie Kirk. He wasn't face so small. What his head is so big. It's true. His face is small. But his head is big. Where is this CGI, this f\*\*\*ing thing? He's right. I can't be honest. Actually, this guy sucks. He holds himself out as like this right-wing intellectual. I was like, bro, you didn't even read the f\*\*\*ing opinion. Well, you didn't even read it. I know you didn't read it. Why are you particularly concerned about the f\*\*\*ing thing? Because he's actually a lawyer. But he's a bad one. Anyway, it's because it's about where this goes. Like, do people actually just want a king? Like, is that what you just want? Do you want a king? Like, you don't want to live in a democracy. You don't want to have any say in government. You don't want to - How many of you are out there? Why don't you just go somewhere else? Why don't you just go to, like, an actual monarchy? Like, go live in the UK. Like, they got f\*\*\*ing kings. They're not coming. They're coming. All the ways full circle where the Democrats start saying, if you don't like it, get the f\*\*\* out of my country! Get out of my country! This is how this works. It's a 6-3 majority, bro. And this is not conservative enough. He's not pure enough for you. Get the f\*\*\* out. Get out of here. Nobody feels bad for these people. But if they match so much f\*\*\*ing power, and it's just like, I don't know where this goes, it's got me a little bit worried. Got me a little bit messed up. And now I feel kind of sorry for Amy Coney Barrett because... Yeah, don't feel sorry for her. Yeah, I'm like, that's a bridge too far. Let me... Let me... Let me retract and rephrase. I... I know that Amy Coney Barrett is just like... No matter what, like... I think it's on her now. It's really interesting because the Democrats, that whole electoral cycle, talking about the threat to democracies, forget the partisanship for a moment. Just in terms of the idea, right? Because that's really what you seem to be taking issue with, is that she was appointed, and now these purity politics mean that her decision is not enough in that way. Yeah, who knows? I'm not going to run up in her house now. Like... These people are nuts. I think, for me, I know with friends and family that maybe voted a different way, the wrong way, and that I have asked, "What does democracy look like to you?" You know, and like... I don't know. If you ever go on YouTube and you see the videos of Baron Trump, and you see the comments, they're quite scary, where people are putting "heir apparent, the next president of the United States." Right, they just want to monitor. Yeah, like, I've got bloodline stuff, what are we talking about? Yeah, it's concerning. And of all the bloodlines. Of all the bloodlines. He's... Seven. I don't know. Baron is six seven. He's seven, yeah. I can't believe. Yeah, he's... Man, I'm old. He's huge. I also... For me, the thing that is just so concerning though is more of the commentary on what the court is for, and the fact that we have just absolutely abandoned the idea that the court could be non-partisan. You know, like for a long time, the Supreme Court was supposed to stand there as this place where we had this conversation at a... Like, hey, this is the ultimate group of people that are going to try to run the country based on what the law says. And their job is to interpret the law that way. Don't get me wrong. That's never been perfect. The court has always been partisan to a large degree. But I feel like now we are just good with it to the point where it's like, hey, don't you know why we put you there? I think there's too much juggling. There's too much stuff we got for you to do. But, Maryl, with a shift. I think when McConnell held the seat open for a year and prevented Merrick, it was not super fun. Not like some crazy wing dude. He was a very milk toast Democrat. Very white guy. Very white guy. That felt like a real tectonic shift in our approach to the court in that way. Yeah, it's crazy. I'll tell you what, my folks better be glad I'm not president, bro. Left after this. Y'all better be glad I'm not president. I think he's disqualified based on the content of the podcast. Chris, can I ask you actually though, on that note that I just made, in your profession, is that something that your profession finds highly concerning? It's like the shift that we have seen since Merrick Garland in the way this... Or does your area of profession just kind of like, hey, this is just kind of par for the courts. We just talk about it now. I'm just curious how that goes. No, I mean, you're talking about what Mitch McConnell did with Merrick Garland? I just think the idea that the court is fairly openly partisan. As opposed to it's always felt like the court was partisan behind the scenes. So look, like the attorneys kind of know that the court has a partisan lean depending on its makeup. So if you have any kind of an appellate practice where you are following this, like you probably aren't trying to kid yourself that the court is like this nonpartisan body. I think that in the past, despite the court having a partisan lean through the eras, I think in the past, at least most of the judges were really trying to get the answer right. And that the partisan lean would kind of come out in methodologies. They would kind of come out in very vague questions. And I don't want to make it seem like everyone on the Supreme Court isn't trying to get the answer right. Like there are some who are, but there are also just flat out like we're not even trying partisans on the court. Like Clarence Thomas is just not trying. He's a partisan. He is not the- He is the rock. Yeah. And Samuelito is not trying. He is a partisan. Like they, like, you just know exactly where they're going to vote every single time when it's remotely a political issue. Like when something that people misunderstands at most cases of the Supreme Court go like 8-1 or 7-2 or even unanimous, right? Like most stuff that gets up there doesn't really have a charge to it. So they don't care. But like whenever there is a charge to it and it's a little bit vague, like these clowns, they are not trying to get the answer right. They are trying to help their team. And that's a huge. problem. That's a huge problem. Whereas before, it'd be like, I think I just kind of know where you're going to go. Now it's like, no, you're not even up for debate. Like you're not even up for grabs. Like I know this is, you know, so that's what's kind of concerning. Instead of combating against that, the Senate is openly trying to cultivate that. They're trying to find more partisans who want to play nice. Now, I don't know, lucky for us in some way that the appointees during the first Trump administration, Connie Barrett, Gorsuch, and Kavanaugh, like I don't think that they're outright partisans per se. I do think ACB is trying to get the answer right. I just think that she's using methodologies that I wouldn't use. I don't know what happened. I'll be doing, like, he's just out here. He likes beer. He's just out here drinking beer and saying it outright. I feel like John Roberts above all is an institutionalist, right? So I think he doesn't even care about the answer being right and is trying to maintain the integrity of the court to a certain extent. And now I think it's just in a really bad place. So, you know, I think people who want the Supreme Court to save them, it won't. You should actually be more focused on state law. You should be thinking about your state constitution and your state Supreme Court. Well, you know what, that brings up a great segue, Chris, for us to get to my what's got you. I'm the last word. Thanks. And that brought me to what's got me really concerned. And that is that on Monday, the new Secretary of Education put out a letter on the Department of Education, and specifically under this administration. And seven times in this very, very short document, she uses the term final mission, that this is the Department of Education's final mission. And all but explains in this document that she has been appointed to systematically dismantle the Department of Education with basically two major goals in mind. One, giving all responsibility and power for education back to the states. And then two, making parents the primary decision-makers in their children's educations. Okay. So this is kind of the new big thing that's going on with education. Because I think before the election happened, I think everybody was talking about this has been, you know, Pat, you and I talked about it has been a Republican talking point for 40 years. The Department of Education needs to go away. And this letter really felt like the declaration that we internally, like the Secretary of Education, whose job it is to run this department is going to make it their purpose to dismantle education and send it back to the states. Now, we've spent a lot of time on politics. I really didn't mean when you have this conversation about the entire education system funneled back into the states. And what does that mean for you as educators, for you as citizens, for you as parents, for you as folks who work in this industry, I just am curious as to what your reactions are. I got my own reactions, but I want to know what like other people are feeling because obviously in higher education, this is the only thing we're talking about. So I just want to know what you guys are feeling about this. Or are you even paying attention? No, I mean, I haven't read into this. I haven't read into what this might mean in the day to day from a higher ed standpoint. But I will say that at this point, the more control that we hand over to people like Governor Whitmer and the less control that's in the hands of people like Donald Trump, I don't know, we're in the middle. It's a terrible take. Well, I mean, help me out. Yeah, this is why, right? And this is why, like, to your point, Chris, he was thinking like the parallel to access to reproductive rights, in particular abortion, right? When we kicked it back to the states, the blue states stepped up, and they've done more, which has put pressure on the red states, right? And we see the situation has been perhaps the greatest force for leveling social inequality in America. And sending it back to the states is just a talking point because all you do is you reproduce the inequities that we already see, connect it. And that's true. So it's leading, probably Mississippi, probably, yeah, or are lagging. But one of the things that I'm, to your point, Chris, one of the things that I am really proud of, of the state of Michigan, is part of the role of the Department of Education is to oversee the Office of Special Education Programs, which guarantees that disabled children across the US who are entering special education have access to public ed until the age of 21. Michigan has the highest age and the most support for special education programs, supporting People with disabilities all the way to the age of 26. When we kick these programs back to the states, that means that just because a child with Down Syndrome is in Mississippi, they're not getting the social and educational support that they need. That's why we need federal programs like these. That's why I'm concerned about the Department of Education. Why are we trusting Vince McMahon of WWE fame and his conglomerate? That's where Linda McMahon comes from. My take is very troubled. My pushback on Chris would be kicking it back to the states only helps those people who are able to react to the situation and not become a victim of it. That is what I'm concerned will happen. I think Patrick, you're getting to something that is kind of the key to this. I think, Chris, to your point of what does this actually mean is that right now, the Department of Education controls funding. Therefore, they can establish regulations that say, hey, if you don't follow our regulations, we will not fund you. It encourages education systems to participate in things like ensuring that students have access to IEPs or 401. What's the number I'm looking for, Patrick? Well, we've got the SBA. But for example, schools have to provide that. Under this new system, you could have states where school districts have the option to provide those types of services or not. And I do. So I agree with you on this one, Patrick. I really do. I think that those are the things that start to get scary because as we move from state to state, we make education more accessible, we adjust the quality of education. It changes from place to place that you go. And again, you're going to just expand those inequities. I guess my concern is, though, that that blade does cut both ways. So what you're talking about is the carrot method of the federal government. The federal government uses its spending power to encourage the states to get along. Because education is the sole purview of the states constitutionally. The state police power is basically cops in schools. The Congress can't really regulate schools at the individual level. They just dangle money and say, hey, if you do this, we'll give you more money. And everyone wants their money back. So they participate. My concern is if you leave that kind of power in the hands of bad faith actors, now it's regulations that if you are currently doing something like, I don't know, celebrating Black History Month, we're going to cut your funding, right? We're going to go after your schools. We're going to blah, blah, blah. So I totally hear you that I think, you know, on net, you're fracturing the education system 50 different ways. And for some places, maybe that's, hey, you're in good hands, right? And people will be encouraged to be more invested in their local schools. And in other places, kids are going to get left behind and people are going to get hurt. I guess the other end of that sort is the person at the head of the Department of Education, if it's in their hands, then they're setting the tone for all 50 states. But they are doing that as well. But I think like three of us at this table went to a relatively under-resourced high school. You know, but I think about the things that we're providing, right? Like I was able to take ACT tests because there was funding made available for that, right? Like, we have access to second-gauley, what do they call that? We do the college stuff. Post-second-gauley, the credit during high school. Doing all that. You know, we had things like, you know, maybe food and security. So having free lunch, being able to go to school and say, you know, this piece of tastes like crap, but you know, like all of it is connected in that way. And to me, that's, I don't know, coming from that experience, I don't know if you guys were grasping at that in that way. Just there is a lived impact of these decisions. I agree. And I think, Chris, to your point, one of the lines that sticks out here in this whole, hey, the carrot and who's dangling the carrot and what does it look like, is that one of the lines in this is that taxpayer-funded education should refocus on meaningful learning in math, reading, science, and history, not divisive DEI programs and gender ideology. So yeah, they don't want to teach slavery. You're right. There's a concept for, and I think that that's a really interesting conversation to have, which is, should it be left up to every individual state which history we decide to teach in our schools and how we decide to teach it? Yeah. I think, you know, being, I have never been a public school educator. So I don't know in terms of that way, but just knowing how many people are going to slip through the cracks, you know, that worries me. Yeah. And it's a, it worries me too. It worries me that, you know, that it worries me too. I guess it's hard to not run into the, This is what people wanted. But here's the pain. I, number one, I think that's nebulous in terms of like, yes, the plurality of Americans voted for this, right? And like, that is true. So, you know, I hear that. I think we've seen this movie before. People forgot the movie. And they did. They want to watch the movie. They want to watch the movie. This sucks. They don't really know if a dude might die in office before we go through this again. So yeah, I get it. I feel like the left and Democrats, we tend to have conversations about hypotheticals, while the Republicans do a good job talking about real life. We could get back to that. Let's get rid of the esoteric conversation about how the constitution functions because nobody's functioning at that level. You know what? You didn't have $200 to pay for the AC. You're asking, you're going to college. Let's talk in those terms and see how the conversation goes. And I think when we talk in those terms, it's honestly the biggest thing that I'm concerned about. And I think anybody that you talk to who works in higher education, their biggest concern is about federal funding. Because let's talk in real terms, the real problem is, and there have already been comments coming out from various states about this, where states are like, "Whoa, we are not equipped to be the Department of Education in our own states." Like there's the prep work that it's going to take for states to be prepared to take on that responsibility. Do you realize the federal Department of Education oversees a trillion-dollar budget? I mean, this isn't just something that they're going to be like, "Oh, tomorrow y'all figure it out." The thing that really scares me when you talk about real terms is, what does this mean for state governments who are already struggling, who do not have the infrastructure to manage this? And what does that ultimately mean for the kids who aren't going to be able to go to school? What does it mean for families whom the federal government might decide, we aren't doing student loan programs anymore. Your state better figure it out. Well, my state didn't or try the private market. And then right along with federal loans. Well, what about Pell Grants? What about aid for students to go to college? If we want to talk about what's really going to happen when this occurs, we should then talk about the 504 plans, the Pell Grants, the things that the Department of Education really provides to our students that we aren't thinking about. And people are going to start feeling that really. And that's the thing that scares me when I think about the fact that just the Pell Grant is everything in higher education. But they're not going to feel the uncapped student loan payment. They're going to feel that. Exactly. Because when this comes back to the states and the states look around and go, we can't do it. We don't have funds. You know who's going to raise their big, dumb hands and say, we can? Banks. Banks are going to raise their big stupid hands and they're going to go, "Hey, we'll take on the student loan programs." And you bet they will. And they will take advantage of students. You're ready to learn subprime rate, baby. To a degree right now, but you're talking about taking it much worse if this happens. Do you think they actually will? I guess like part of the challenge with the Trump administration including this DOE conversation is, is it real or are you just barking? It's so difficult to know with them. Are you actually going to do this? I thought the DOJ stuff was real. I thought the conversation about the DOE was barking. Like you and I, again, you talked about this. This is a talking point that has been a talking point forever. This letter came out and you could feel a shift in the way that people started to talk in our final mission and act of public service to the United States is going to be to dismantle this department. So I think when you have that kind of an attitude within the department, you have no choice but to take that incredibly seriously. And I think if you're in higher education and you're already feeling programs under review because of representation of DEI and those types of things, you're already starting to go, hey, maybe this isn't all the garbage that everybody crafted up to be in campaign promises. We're really going in this direction. Now, granted, I think anybody will also tell you like, hey, the administration changes every four years. Generally, we have an ideological shift in the industry in the way that we do things. But I don't know. I've been in the industry long enough to say like I've been through a bunch of administrations at the level where I would be having these thoughts. But I do wonder if this feels different. I do wonder if anybody has ever felt a shift like this. I mean, the DOE's been around what since the 80s, and then before this Department of Health, Human Services, and Education, so it existed before. But yeah, it was kind of a cutter. Yeah. Just education. Anyway, well, I will not take us any further, guys. I'm glad that we got to talk a little bit about this. Thanks for indulging me in a little bit of that conversation. But we got to get ourselves moving, and we got to get ourselves wrapped up. So let's do a little bit of just one more. Ethan, kick us off. Give us just one more, man. My just one more this week is one of my favorite documentaries ever. It's a movie called American Movie. And it is about a man named Mark Borchardt as he attempts to make his independent film "Coven." Should be pronounced coven, but he insists on pronouncing it the other way. But it is about the American dream. It's about persistence. This dude has the biggest balance of defeatist attitude, but just go out there and do it like attitude mixed together. There is a great review on Letterboxd that kind of describes it very well. And it's about this dude. He is delusional to a certain degree because he thinks he's going to make this movie. And you can just tell the entire time like this is not like you're not the dude. But it's so sad, but it's also so heartfelt. And he has some friends that are there that I like love and I will remember forever. But the review says this movie is often cited as an example of a documentary that exploits its subject. If you could watch this and only laugh at Mark Borchardt, then that's on you. I highly, highly recommend it. It's one of my favorite documentaries ever. It's back from the '90s. So it is a little gritty and grainy. But it is excellent. It's like I said, it's about the American dream. And I think it's a beautiful movie at the end of the day. I love it. I love it. Well, I'll put a piece of media out there as my just one more as well. My just one more is going to be, so I have recently gone down a really pretty serious astrology hole, because I can't imagine why. I was like a little bit because I'm a blonde kid for something. Maybe cry, because there has really been much like on the TV is kicking up right now. But we got the like dead period in the beginning of the year where the Oscar season is over. The TV hasn't really come back yet for the spring. So it's kind of in the middle of everything. So like I was clicking around Disney Plus one day, and I was like, you know what I can watch? I'm about to pop on some Boy Meets World. I am now like five seasons into Boy Meets World. Boy Meets World is great. Put it on in the background while you're cleaning, whatever show, and you can just watch it. But let me tell you all something. What is crazy? Boy Meets World has aged shockingly well. Like very, very specifically, there is some anti-gay and anti-trans humor throughout the show like that. But with the exception of that, the show has aged remarkably well. Now, don't get me wrong. That obviously, you in concaten. But you can like, and when I say that, I don't mean anything aggressive, but it's obviously like, any time two dudes hug each other like, "Whoa, dude, don't do that." Like all those moments, right? But other than that, I do think though, I love this show. You all know I love this show. I own box sets of this show because I grew up on the show. I think it's so cool. But if anything else, I think people should watch the show, and I think kids should still watch the show because it is a remarkable look at how people form and maintain relationships. And it is a really cool look at that for a silly sitcom that ran on teen TV. It takes on a lot of really significant relational issues and about how you handle relational turbulence and how people react to it. And sure, there are things that it needed to age with, but the message of friendship and relationships and what it takes to really have those things still rings really true. So I've been having a great time watching Boy Meets World. I love this show when I was a kid. I still love it now. Awesome. You should go watch it. So, Chris, give us just one more. Well, our son is two, and he enjoys Pixar movies, but more specifically, he enjoys the Pixar movie which is Cars. And so we've been watching Cars one, two, three, the shorts, the spin-offs kind of nonstop. And I wish I could recommend Cars to you, but I can't because I don't really like Cars. It's not my favorite franchise. But there was a shining moment where we took a break from Cars. We didn't watch Cars, and he and I sat down. We watched Turning Red on Disney Plus, such a good movie. Solid flick. And it doesn't get the love that it deserves. Like it was good when it came out. It's still good, but no one talks about it. It's not going to get a huge sequel or anything. But one day I said, "Hey, you want to just mix it up and watch something different?" And he was like, "Yeah, I guess." So, we watched "Turning Red," and he said he was into it. It captivated him. I was like, "You don't even know what's going on, man. This is a huge metaphor for growing up." But I'm into this. So, hey, if you're at home and you have little ones, maybe when kids turn 12, 13, they're into "Turning Red." It's a really good and fun movie. For the parents out there, it's also a nostalgia bomb because it takes place in the early 2000s. The main character is our age in 2002. It's all about a boy band, Four Town. Ethan loves it. If it's called Four Town, why are there five of them? Alright, you're not on my mind. The questions we really need to be answering. Patrick, wrap us up. Give us just one more recommendation. I'm going to recommend a movie as well. It's been getting a lot of buzz, "Sound of Metal." It is one of my favorite movies. Some metal music vibe, but not really. It starts with Riz Ahmed as Ruben in a metal band. Very quickly, he loses his hearing and becomes deaf. So, it's all about following the experience that Ruben went through. I really love this movie, straight up as a hearing impaired person. But I'm writing a paper about the movie, and Ethan was kind enough to send a series of YouTube videos. I liked the movie because I liked the movie. And then these videos lay out how complex the sound design of this movie is. They invented microphones for this. The instrument used to score the film is called a crystal bache, which uses metal pipes. So, the entire movie, the background is literally the sound of metal. The levels of thought given to hearing-impaired and deaf people just blows me away. "Sound of Metal," I feel like I don't normally do movies, but I would highly recommend that one. Dude, I love it. Can I ask a question? Yeah, what kind of paper are you writing? Thanks for the dissertation. We're getting there. We'll celebrate when you get there. Absolutely. But for everybody out there, thanks for joining us for another episode of The Knowledge Bar. As always, we remind you to please subscribe, drop us that five-star review, leave us a comment, let us know how it's going. You can always find more content at theknowledge.bar or email us at podcast@theknowledge.bar. A special thank you to Ethan for producing all of our episodes. We appreciate you, brother. We hope to see you all next week for yet another episode at the bar. But until then, cheers, and we'll talk to you next time. Cheers. Cheers. Cheers.