

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION  
BROOKINGS CAFETERIA: On racism and white supremacy  
Friday, August 9, 2019

PARTICIPANTS:

FRED DEWS  
Managing Editor, Podcasts and Digital Projects  
The Brookings Institution

ANDRE M. PERRY  
David M. Rubenstein Fellow  
Metropolitan Policy Program  
The Brookings Institution

VANESSA WILLIAMSON  
Senior Fellow, Governance Studies  
Senior Fellow, Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center  
The Brookings Institution

DEWS: Welcome to the Brookings Cafeteria, the podcast about ideas and the experts who have them. I'm Fred Dews.

Racist violence in Charlottesville. "Go back to the country you came from." A migrant "invasion" at the southern border. The language of racism and white supremacy is all around us. People are getting hurt and also killed. Racism also pervades our public policies. To address these issues and how to move forward, I'm joined today in the Brookings Podcast Network studio by two Brookings experts. Andre Perry is a David M. Rubenstein fellow in the Metropolitan Policy Program. Vanessa Williamson is a senior fellow in the Governance Studies program and also in the Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center.

This is I think one of the most important conversations I've had on this show. I hope you'll agree.

You can follow the Brookings Podcast Network on Twitter @policypodcasts to get information about and links to all of our shows including Dollar and Sense, the Brookings trade podcast; The Current; and our events podcast. If you like the show, please go to Apple Podcasts and leave us a review. It helps others find it.

And now on with the interview.

Andre and Vanessa, welcome back to the Brookings cafeteria.

PERRY, WILLIAMSON: Thanks for having us.

DEWS: It's good to see you both here again, although it's under somewhat difficult circumstances in our nation. As we are recording this and releasing this, we are about to observe the second anniversary of the violence in Charlottesville. Also, in the wake of recent statements and tweets by the president of United States calling four members of Congress to go back to their countries and the terrible mass murder of over 20 people in El Paso, Texas by a man who claimed that he was fighting the Hispanic invasion, which again echoes some of the rhetoric that we've heard from the president the United States. I want to start with the Charlottesville anniversary, and I'm going to ask you both, is this going to continue to be an important milestone in our country that we observe in the history of racism and white supremacy as we move forward throughout the years?

WILLIAMSON: I think that is an important milestone in certain ways. First of all, I think it was a very important milestone for many Americans to really recognize that what a lot of people I think would prefer to see is an exclusively fringe movement had really moved more towards the political center, and in particular I think that, you know, the combination of seeing Confederate

flags and Nazi flags really brought home to a lot of people that racism isn't a foreign matter in this country. And so, I think in that sense it was very important.

More generally, the election of Donald Trump coincided with a really striking surge in hate crimes in this country and a lot of very good political science has suggested that it's not just coincided, that those things are deeply related. For instance, those hate crimes occur more commonly in places where Trump has held rallies. They are more commonly in places where Trump got a higher percentage of the vote. So, I think that we have seen a little bit of an inflection point, but at the same time, I don't want to underestimate the extent to which this is part of a long history.

PERRY: In many ways, it is a milestone, simply because it was one of the first incidents under President Trump's watch. But let's not forget the battle to either save or take down the Confederate monuments that existed for quite a long time. And I came to Washington, D.C. from New Orleans, where one of the Robert E. Lee statues, one of the monuments, was taken down under Mayor Mitch Landrieu relatively recently. But these types of events have occurred over time, from the lynchings, church bombings, to race riots throughout our time. President Trump is making this his signature issue. Charlottesville was an event, but he made it a signature issue by comparing, doing these false equivalencies between different groups, basically calling hate groups, equating them to groups that are fighting for freedom. But he's making this a signature issue. And so that's what I think is the difference.

DEWS: On his way to El Paso to console the city, to console the victims of the mass shooting that took place there over the weekend, he apparently said to reporters on his way that "I'm concerned about the rise of any type of hate. I don't like it any type of supremacy whether it's white supremacy or antifa." Can you break down what's going on there?

WILLIAMSON: Well, I think that's a very good example of the kind of false equivalence, that kind of both sidesism that is a really dangerous part of our politics. We need to be more honest about what's actually going on in this country. There isn't any equivalence between people who hate and people who think hate is bad. Those are very different. And so, I think that it's troubling and troubling in the same way that comments about how there were some very good people among the neo-Nazis in Charlottesville. This isn't a one-off statement. This is part of a rhetorical commitment and a legislative and policy commitment, the Trump administration has to underestimate the significance of white supremacy, of white supremacist violence, and fear mongering when it comes to immigration.

PERRY: It's hilarious to equate to. I mean, there is no antifa supremacy. White supremacy is rooted in law, in public policy, in our systems. Slavery was a part of white supremacy in that it established an economic base for some citizens and stripped away wealth from others, and liberty from others. There is no antifa supremacy. And this is what the problem is with a lot of this discourse. We want to say racism is anything one says that's mean to another group. No, this is about policy. This is about wealth. This is about restricting liberty for some and not others based on a hierarchy of values that are predicated on race.

DEWS: I want to say on this point for a moment Andre--racism is about policy. I think a lot of Americans incorrectly think that racism officially ended in 1965, '64-'65 with President Johnson signing the Civil Rights Act, and the Voting Rights Act and that the removal of signs like "white entrance" "colored entrance," the elimination officially of Jim Crow segregation, ended racism and people think, "well racism is something you know happened in the past, just like slavery happened in the past racism happened in the past." But I know that's not true. We know that's not true. So how do you explain to people who might think that, that racism continues to exist all throughout society today?

PERRY: Well, for me, I look for it in the evidence, the evidence is pretty clear. I mean, I do a lot of studies on housing and what we find that homes in black neighborhoods are price 23 percent less about \$48,000 per home, about \$156 billion of lost equity essentially in homes simply because of the concentration of blackness around it. We built up housing policy. We built up a legally discriminatory housing structure in which those practices are still in existence. Those attitudes. And by the way the, for example, assessors are 90 percent white in this country. The practices, the policies that were in place 50, 60 years ago didn't just go away because there was a change in law. People who think that a change in law automatically shifts attitudes, practices, procedures all those things are highly mistaken. And so, the evidence shows that there is significant discriminatory practices in employment. We can go down the line of looking at hiring practices. When you look at who gets called back for jobs along a slew of discriminatory or differential policies in terms of immigration. We are still living in a state in which there is discrimination and we just have to do our best to weed it out year by year, day by day.

DEWS: Vanessa where do you see racism expressed in the kinds of policy areas that you research?

WILLIAMSON: Yeah, I think you can see it across the board. I mean housing is I think one of the most obvious ones. And if you look at things like the racial wealth gap, which is largely based

in differential values of homes, what you will see is that for 100 bucks that a white family has, a black family tend to have about five. And those differences continue. If you take account of income, if you take account of education, if you take account of family structure, anything an individual has control over doesn't explain these differences. Systems explain these differences. I think one of the areas we haven't mentioned yet is maternal health. A black woman is three times more likely to die giving birth in this country than a white woman. So, it's not even just about how well off you are, it's about your actual chance to live. And we see that obviously the criminal justice system as well.

In my own area policy, people often think it's not a particularly race-oriented policy, but I think that is untrue. I work on tax policy. For one thing, we don't actually have the data that I wish we did on the differential effects of tax policy by race because we don't oblige the IRS to collect that kind of data the way we do for some other agencies. But the connection between tax and race in this country is actually really deep. So, everyone has heard the stereotype of the welfare queen and the sort of racist stereotypes that Reagan relied very heavily on, a lot of people have relied heavily on, about a black mother who wasn't working and was cheating the welfare system. Who was the other person in the story? We forget it's the taxpayer.

So, there's this dichotomy that is really deep and conservative racialized rhetoric. It actually dates back to the Reconstruction after the Civil War when for the first time, there were black officeholders across the south. Former Confederates reorganized themselves in taxpayer leagues, and they use that language of the taxpayer because they were obviously the property holders still, right. Slavery had been over for about five minutes at this point. They used this phrase "taxpayer" to seem colorblind and modern and having moved forward. But actually, it was the same old story. And you saw that when they came back to power. So, I think that there's a real deep history of racism in the tax code but also in the way that we talk about taxation.

DEWS: My understanding also is that in the Social Security program that was implemented in 1935 also has a pretty significant racial component built into it. Can you talk about that for a second?

WILLIAMSON: That's right. When we started building programs to take care of the elderly in this country, we excluded two kinds of people: farm workers and domestic servants. Those are groups of people who are traditionally racial minorities in this country. So, for a long time, or at least at the beginning of the Social Security program, people of color did not have the same access to Social Security benefits that others did. You can see the same thing in discrimination in access

to the G.I. Bill, in its in access to housing, and the other programs that came around in the same period.

The other thing I'd say about taxation is anytime we privilege wealth over work, we privilege white people over black people, because white people have had a lot more time and opportunity and advantages in accruing wealth. So, any policy we have that makes it easier for your wealth to get larger faster, accrues to white people differentially compared to black people.

PERRY: And related to that, there's a lot of talk about full employment recently, and we're in a state of full employment, meaning there's more jobs than people when we use the unemployment rate to measure that. Now, that unemployment rate just masks severe inequities in employment across cities and regions. So, rural areas are affected by this too. But what's interesting about the full employment numbers, when you look under the hood, Latinos, Hispanics, unemployment numbers are at the all-time low. They're not taking people's jobs. We need people. But if when you look at their wages, they're also horribly lower when compared to the white counterparts. So, there is this idea that they're attacking us and they're taking our jobs is really so far from the truth. We are exploiting large numbers of people of color.

I always remind people there was another time when blacks were at a state of full employment and it wasn't good. And so, this leveling of language on black and brown people has a purpose that is not just there to demean or to shame someone. It's also used to cover real policy agenda that is hurting others and benefiting some.

DEWS: Well President Trump boasts quite often in speeches and in tweets that because the unemployment rate is so low, that African-American unemployment is so low, that black Americans should be thankful to him.

PERRY: Yeah it's like, look what I've given you. I mean, one, the president has not a lot to do with the unemployment rates in those regard. But this is what, again, this play with language. "Be grateful for what I've given you." But the black unemployment rate is double that of whites. If we did a thought experiment and we could imagine a United States where the white unemployment rate was double that of blacks, there would be chaos in the streets.

But it's just okay to have blacks and other groups be the sacrificial lambs of full employment. "Oh, that's just an okay side effect. The country's doing well. Whites can have managerial positions and you can be Lyft drivers and you can work in the service industry and service white growth." And this is what's happening in the United States now. But this is what's happened all throughout history. In particular, the unemployment rate was almost always double

since we started measuring that of the white rate. So, this language, again, Trump didn't create it. Trump didn't create racism. He's exploiting it. He's leveraging it. His followers rally behind it. But he's not the source of this. We have a long history that we need to unpack and that's what hopefully this conversation will help do.

DEWS: I think this question of language is fascinating and very important and so, I want to stay on it for just a minute. Again, in his rhetoric, in tweets, in his rallies, President Trump called on four members of Congress, all women of color, to go back to where they came from, to go to their countries. He was very specific about go back to your countries and fix whatever problem you have there. Three of them, of course, were born in this country and one of them, Ilhan Omar from Minnesota, is a naturalized American citizen from Somalia. Can you talk about that kind of language, that kind of rhetoric, and how it intersects with racism?

WILLIAMSON: Yeah, I think it's pretty clear cut, because what it does is confuse being American with being white. And that is a profoundly racist idea. It is an idea that has had a lot of credibility in this country, unfortunately, in our history, but it is not the fact. And I think one of the ways you can see, I took that story a tiny bit personally because my mother is an immigrant -- she's from Scotland. It is inconceivable to me that no matter how much you dislike what I have to say, how much you dislike my politics, you dislike that I'm criticizing something about American politics, the idea that someone would come up with the slur that I should go back where I'm from - - unimaginable, and that's because I'm white. I'm exactly as American as three of the women you named in terms of being born in the country. And I'm exactly as American as Ilhan Omar who's been in America for 30 years, you know.

So, I think that it's that idea that some people can arrive in this country and are American right away because of the color of their skin, while some people can have been born in this country or moved to this country and do everything you could ever ask an American to do and still never actually get the credibility. That's racist.

PERRY: You know, Vanessa, you just jarred my memory. Trump, I believe his grandfather came over from Germany, right?

DEWS: His mother was from Scotland.

PERRY : Yeah, yeah. He just got here. You know what's crazy about that claim? He just got here. My ancestors have been here a long time. Brought here, enslaved here for a much longer period of time. The audacity to say that is ridiculous. But again, he's saying that to set up policy because we have a long history here in this country of saying, hey these people really don't belong

here and so they're not real members of the community. Therefore, we can create discriminatory policies and undercut democratic processes.

And so that's what he's doing when he called Mexicans rapists and murderers and not so good people, whatever that quote was. It was only a few years later he tried to jail people without due process at the border. Suggested that in a tweet. There is a connection there. And so, again, he is using the tools that we're given to essentially establish the conditions that some people don't belong. Therefore, we can do whatever to them. Now, some people take that in a very aggressive way and attack violently against people who don't belong. And that's why this racist language is so dangerous.

WILLIAMSON: And I want to follow up on that because there's actually some research, experimental research demonstrating how effective this can be. If you show people language that Trump has said versus other politicians, what those people will then say later in the survey is they are much more comfortable attacking, not just the minority groups that Trump attacks in the particular quotes that you give them, but other minority groups. It's a license that leaders can provide to people who hold certain sentiments. And if you give people different quotes of politicians decrying racism, decrying this kind of rhetoric, [in] randomized experiments you can really see the effect. You will see that people restrain themselves from those kinds of remarks. And so, this is really a question of leadership.

DEWS: This issue is so disturbing but it's also so important to me, personally, that I'll just opine for a moment, which I hardly ever do on this show and talk about immigration and ancestry. The latest ancestor I have who came to America was about 1871 from Germany, every ancestor I have is earlier than that in America. And I've always maintained the view that the person who comes here today, becomes a citizen today, is just as an American as I am with an extensive family history here. And I feel really powerful about that. And so, it really is disturbing to see people, white people saying to others who don't look like them, go back to where you came from.

PERRY: This is what is sad. The beauty of the American Dream is a belief in a mother country, that people of different belief systems and from backgrounds can come and say "under the Constitution, we are one." But again, as Vanessa said, they're trying to really make citizen, make it white, and not only white, but certain white people. It's crazy. And I don't want to disrespect those who are mentally ill, but racism is sort of an illogic that we just accept and we hurt people by. But it's completely illogical and ignorant and everything else to just tell someone, an American, to go back.



WILLIAMSON: What, to Cincinnati? To Detroit?

PERRY: That's right.

WILLIAMSON: What are you even asking?

PERRY: What are you saying?

WILLIAMSON: Yeah that fundamental illogic is so at the core of it. I think sometimes we focus, and we should focus a lot, on the way that discrimination hurts people who are discriminated against. But it's not about doing anyone any favors, right? We're talking about, you say this a lot, I mean we need to recognize the assets that are being undervalued, right? And I think that's such a valuable frame and I think you talk more about it.

PERRY: Yeah, I mean part of when I look at housing price differences the homes are devalued. I say that I like that language because one, our homes are not broken. And so much of the rhetoric is "you come from broken homes." No, your homes are not broken. They're actually an asset. They are devalued. They are made to be broken. And isn't that a metaphor for how we are living our lives today? That there are people with potential.

And you hear this in the recent campaigns of even the Democratic candidates in the last debate. You saw some of the candidates reference that we want immigrants with PhDs, and we want certain highly educated immigrants. One, as if some of the folks with high degrees from the best, most prestigious institutions in the country aren't some of the most immoral and corrupt people. And some of them, actually, hold public office, by the way. And, likewise, some of the brightest, smartest, greatest contributors don't have a college degree. If it wasn't for a woman who didn't graduate from the eighth grade, I wouldn't be here. There is no question. And if we're looking for universities, and dare I say think tanks to change the world, we're going to be waiting a long time.

And so, this idea that some immigrants, because they come from a certain country or because they are brown or they're black or they have a less degree, that they can't contribute is so far from the American ideal. But every day we have people who want to change that ideal to something that makes no sense.

DEWS: And now we have murderous violence happening, and we always have. But in particular over the weekend, a young man believed that Hispanics are so-called invading this country. He drove eight or nine hours from Dallas to El Paso, went into a Wal-Mart, and he murdered over 20 people. And we hear from the president, and we hear from certain news organizations that migrants from Mexico and Central America are, quote, "invading" America. So, talk about how that kind of language is obviously dangerous.

WILLIAMSON: Yeah, I mean the thing that I keep coming back to is how closely this rhetoric of the people who commit these hate crimes mirrors the rhetoric of the president of the United States. And there is a very long tradition that has been blessedly for some decades mostly at the extreme of American politics, of neo-Nazi white supremacist rhetoric, right? But it's an enormous step backwards to see that. And I don't think we can pretend that the rhetoric of our leaders doesn't affect these people. Right? One way you know is because Neo-Nazi groups are celebrating, right, like this guy is one of ours, you know? And that's something that I would have liked to have seen us have put behind us as a country.

If we're talking about the policy parts of it, we've got to talk about gun control. Right? And in particular I think it plays into this conversation, I mean that's a much larger conversation, it's a difficult question under any circumstances. But the access to guns in this country does two things at the same time. One, it means that people like that shooter in El Paso have access to an extraordinary amount of weaponry, right? Two, I wrote a book on the Tea Party and so I spent some time with some conservative groups in this country. They often were afraid of immigration but weren't violent people. They were sort of elderly white conservatives. They were really afraid of immigrants. They were really afraid of crime. And so, the access to guns actually breeds both the violent reaction and the fear at the same time. So, it plays this very toxic role in our politics.

PERRY: You know, Trump uses the language that was there, as Vanessa said, that often line on the fringes of society. But this invader language, that is coming straight from white supremacist groups. There's no question about that. But he has a much bigger microphone. He has this megaphone that is blaring loudly on Twitter, on television, on radio. He has, essentially, a cable station dedicated to amplifying his voice. Reaction to his statements also amplifies that language. He is pushing it in the mainstream, no question. And so, it's a mistake to say that he is creating this language or he's developing these tools. He borrowed them from a very sordid place and it will have a negative impact. There are those who we don't want empowered getting access to guns, getting access to violent language, getting access to social networking communities. There's no surprise that the research is clear that hate groups are on the rise. And so, this language is rallying people in the process. So, we're in very dangerous territory.

DEWS: I sort of let listeners know on the question of guns and gun safety, that the Brookings President John R. Allen has a very powerful piece that published on our web site this week in which he reflects on the fact that he was a former commander of NATO forces in Afghanistan, a four star United States Marine Corps general, and civilians in the United States have the same kind of weaponry that he and his soldiers and Marines had in a combat zone.

PERRY: And by the way, most of the shooters overwhelmingly are white men. And there's something about being a white male that is particularly dangerous. There's something there. We don't see this kind of violence in any other group. Something about American white men. And so, again, the evidence is clear, we can track the language back. We can see who's shooting. Something has to be done about racism. And I tend to focus on policy, because that's where I think its heart is. But there also needs to be a moral force to counteract that immoral force that we're seeing from Donald Trump.

DEWS: Where does that moral force come from?

PERRY: Well, I talked to some of the elders, actually before coming here and they said, for what Martin Luther King, Jr. represented. He was a radical--a lot of the folks who I consider elders now, they weren't then, they were young people--and they said their grandparents didn't like Martin Luther King, Jr. But what they liked about him as young people at the time was that he could speak about God in political terms. That this is about righteousness, about justice.

And we need a conversation about those things again. That while we should focus on policy and weeding out the racism in policy, people need to understand why we need to weed these things out. That liberty is such a fundamental part to be a self-actualized person and we have millions of people who do not have liberty, some of which are locked up, some of which are denied an opportunity to own a home, to get a quality job. We need a discussion on liberty and what it means to have it. And giving black and brown people liberty does not mean you're taking away liberties from white people.

DEWS: What about the model of, say, a Truth and Reconciliation Commission like we saw in South Africa in the 90s, as we're seeing right now in Colombia, the subject of a podcast interview that I've recently done?

WILLIAMSON: Yeah, I think that one of the things that is in some ways encouraging is I think that we've seen some change in how we understand our own history which I think it previously had been a real roadblock. You know this is the Confederate statues problem, right? That there was a version of American history that didn't tell the truth. And people were taught that version. And it allowed many Americans, white Americans, to ignore their own origin story. And that's very dangerous. I think we're seeing a change in that. Not only that Confederate statues are coming down, but that there is a new emphasis on the parts of our history that are not the American ideal.

And I think this is something that Germany has done a remarkable amount of work on, right? So, if you go to Germany, you will see memorials about the Holocaust, not just in one place-

-in downtown in some special museum--but all around the cities, all around the train stations where Jews were taken away. There will be plaques, right? But we don't have that history here. We do not have landmarks about where slavery occurred, where race riots occurred, much. But this is something I think is changing and I think it's a really important change for us to become more aware of our history.

But I also think there's work to be done in almost all communities. I think sometimes when we focus on the most extreme cases, those of us who believe strongly in gun control and who dislike President Trump can feel like, "Oh hey well I'm on the right side, I'm doing okay, I'm over here on the good side." Right? But the fact is that American cities are extremely segregated. American schools are more segregated now than they were 20 and 30 years ago. So, I don't think that there is a part of the country or a demographic slice that is free from the need for more self-reflection and more consideration about how we could do a better job in all of our communities.

DEWS: So, thinking about the work to be done now and moving forward, from your perspective as experts, as scholars of the Brookings Institution, what can an organization like Brookings and its peer organizations in this space, and other institutions, do? And also what can its individual members do to address racism through the research and through the activities that you're all engaged in?

PERRY: I wrote a piece, "Racism is not a distraction, it's policy." I don't think you can be a think tank, a credible one, and not talk about racism. That racism is so braided into everything we do that if you don't have a racial equity analysis, you don't have a rigorous analysis. I was on a panel with someone from the Aspen Institute yesterday and they said they received that blog I wrote, and this person passed it around to the leadership at Aspen and said, "Where are we on these topics?".

Now, we have a responsibility to write about, to practice this stuff at Brookings because I also, while I am publicly facing, I write a lot, I'm also internally facing. I want to look at our hiring practices. I want to look at how we interact on the day to day, what our research looks like. I want to see what we resource. Because it's not enough just to talk about it. You have got to walk it too. And so, for me, Brookings has a critical role in elevating the conversation, both externally and internal.

WILLIAMSON: Yeah, I think that's right. I mean for me it's three things and this really just reiterates what you were saying, Andre. First, any explanation about American history or American politics that doesn't talk about race, I think you should be very careful that you're not missing something important, right.

So, if we're here at this institution responsible for providing explanations about American politics, that means we have to be conversant in talking about racial history and race today. That's one. Two, it's about the issues that we talk about, why do we consider important. Right? So, when we're think about unemployment are we thinking about whose unemployment? Are we thinking about wages the way we should be? So making sure that we're covering issues not just from the average, not just from how is it going for white people or how is it going for men, but how is it going for all different communities, and being comprehensive in thinking about what issues matter and why maybe some issues don't occur to those of us who end up with PhDs and work in an institution like Brookings. Making sure we're thinking about the issues that face other people.

Last thing I'd say is exactly right. It's about making sure this institution looks more like the public. More like the world that we're supposed to be studying. And I think that absolutely goes to our hiring practices. I think it's a challenge for any longstanding institution that often, your diversity numbers look kind of okay if you squint and don't look at where people are in the hierarchy. But as you get higher up, there are less women and less people of color until finally they're not.t. And I think Brookings has made real strides on that front, but I think that it's about initial hiring, it's about making sure that you get people in the door. But it's also about making sure that they can get promoted. And so that you have a diversity of voices because at the end of the day, diversity improves research. Right. Because having multiple perspectives on a problem is how you get ... that's how science works. Right. So, you need to have multiple perspectives on a problem. So, I think that it's not just about like doing like the nice thing, it's about doing what's actually essential mission critical to our work.

DEWS: Well, this has been a very powerful and important conversation. I look forward to continuing it in the future with both of you and with other Brookings experts. Andre Perry, Vanessa Williamson, thank you very much for your time today.

WILLIAMSON: Thank you.

PERRY: You're welcome.

DEWS: The Brookings Cafeteria podcast is the product of an amazing team of colleagues, starting with audio engineer Gaston Reboledo and producer Chris McKenna. Bill Finan, director of the Brookings Institution Press, does the book interviews and Lisette Baylor and Eric Abalahin provide design and web support. Our intern this summer is Betsy Broaddus. Finally, my thanks to Camilo Ramirez and Emily Horne for their guidance and support.

The Brookings Cafeteria is brought to you by the Brookings Podcast Network, which also produces Dollar and Sense, The Current, and our events podcasts. Email your questions and comments to me at [BCP@Brookings.edu](mailto:BCP@Brookings.edu) if you have a question for a scholar, include an audio file and I'll play it and the answer on the air. Follow us on Twitter [@policypodcasts](https://twitter.com/policypodcasts). You can listen to the Brookings Cafeteria in all the usual places. Visit us online at [Brookings.edu](http://Brookings.edu).

Until next time, I'm Fred Dews.