
UNDISCLOSED SEASON 2: **THE STATE VS. JOEY WATKINS**

ADDENDUM 13: **POLITICALLY PROACTIVE**
POSTED: **OCTOBER 13, 2016**

LANGUAGE WARNING

Jon Cryer: Hello! And welcome to the *Undisclosed Addendum*. I am Jon Cryer, and you are listening to the podcast about all things *Undisclosed*.

In Episode 13 of *Undisclosed* – ‘Almost Invisible Money’ – Rabia, Colin and Susan attempted to follow the money trail in law enforcement’s arcane and, perhaps, purposefully opaque, system for rewarding people who come forward with information.

And with us today is one of the hosts of *Undisclosed*, Rabia Chaudry. She is an attorney, a fellow at the US Institute of Peace, and she blogs at *Split the Moon.com*, but she’s also a *New York Times* best-selling author of *Adnan’s Story*.

How are you doing, Rabia?

Rabia Chaudry: I’m good. Hi Jon, how are you?

Jon Cryer: Very well, very well!

Now, a few episodes... I teased a very special event. I was very cryptic about the whole thing. But now, I can finally reveal, that the event is going to be a live recording of the *Undisclosed Addendum* podcast! In Washington DC, November 17th, at New America. And Rabia Chaudry *will* be there, *and* Susan Simpson. I believe Colin will join us via Skype--

Rabia Chaudry: And most importantly *you* will be there! Which is the most exciting thing for us.

Jon Cryer: Yes! Oh yes! I totally forgot. [laughs] But I’m excited about this. New America is a Washington think tank, and I’ve always wanted to party with a bunch of think tank egg-heads who been to-- [laughs]

Rabia Chaudry: Nothing like being with a bunch of wonks.

Jon Cryer: [laughs] Yes, exactly! But mostly, I’m excited to finally, actually meet you in person. And Susan, obviously. I’ve heard that *some* chance of me meeting Mr Beans, at *some* point, I’m hoping?

Rabia Chaudry: We’ve totally got to coordinate that, yeah. And get some authentic Pakistani food into you.

Jon Cryer: *Nice!* Oh, I’m just so looking forward. And I’m hoping you just aren’t struck dumb by my profound baldness.

Rabia Chaudry: [laughs]

- Jon Cryer:** That's all--
- Rabia Chaudry:** I'm just happy it's not going to be like-- You know, I want to be around people who are relatively in my height range. [laughs] You know what it's like hanging out with Susan and Colin, and feeling like, you know, I'm just like a little lump of clay that got left over.
- Jon Cryer:** [laughs] Hey! Wonder Woman was a lump of clay – if you remember her origin story. Which I'm sure Colin can fill you in on, because he's the king of those mythical origins.
- At any rate, *also*, we have with us today, W. Kamau Bell, critically-acclaimed comedian and the host of the Emmy-nominated CNN series *United Shades of America*. Kamau is also the host of the public radio show, *Kamau Right Now*, and he hosts two podcasts – count them, *two* – *Politically Reactive* and *Denzel Washington is the Greatest Actor of All Time Period*.
- But he is not the greatest actor of all time *periods*. I have not seen him in a Restoration comedy [laughs] I have not seen him do 'caveman' – there's a lot of eras that he has not done.
- Rabia Chaudry:** We've gotta get behind that title. Yeah.
- Jon Cryer:** Yes, exactly. Thank you for being here, Kamau.
- W. Kamau Bell:** Well thank you for having me. And now you're going to have to be a guest on the *Denzel* podcast, just 'cause, you've opened up a vein there.
- Jon Cryer:** [laughs] Well, I'm *so* excited that you're here today. I'm a big fan of *United Shades of America*. One of the things I love about it is that it takes a sort of beautifully humanistic view of everything, and you bring your sense of humor to all these, you know, all these subjects that are very dire and scary. Have you gotten any kind of criticism for that? On this show I've gotten *some* criticism from people saying, "Hey, this is a very serious situation, please don't make jokes". Have you experienced that?
- W. Kamau Bell:** Yeah, I mean you get that from some people, but I think a sense of humor is what helps us move through these difficult times. If you don't have a sense of humor you can be crushed under the weight of all the sadness. So for me it's like there's a difference between making fun *of* something and making fun *out of* something. So, I'm trying to make fun *out of* things, not making fun *of* them.
- Jon Cryer:** Also with us today is one of my favorite people, Bob Ruff! He is a producer and the host of the *Truth and Justice* podcast. He previously served his community as a fireman for 13 years, and three years as the fire chief. He has served as Director of Fire Science at South Western Michigan College since 2008, and he is with us here today. Say "Hello", Bob.
- Bob Ruff:** Hey Jon, how you doing?
- Jon Cryer:** Very, very well. It's so great to talk to you, man. And now this season of *Truth and Justice* has been *epic*. I mean it started with an investigation into Kenny Snow, who is a prize fighter serving 40 years for two robberies that he may not have committed, but the show has just mushroomed into a look at two infamous murders, and a wide-ranging exposé of what appears to be rampant corruption and misconduct in Smith County, Texas. So, could you give us a *quick* overview of those cases? Quick though! Because it's super complicated.

- Bob Ruff:** Yeah. Very quickly, our main case right now is the case of the murder of Elnora Griffin, who was attacked, found by her cousin in her home. Nude, beaten badly, and her throat slit. The ‘neighbor boy’ was arrested and convicted for that murder.
- I believe through our investigation, that has been ongoing for about seven months now, that he is absolutely *innocent*, and right now we’re in the process of narrowing down suspects to figure out who exactly *did* do it. And as Deirdre Enright said on *Serial*, “You don’t necessarily need to figure out who did it, but you need to figure out who *did* it.”
- So, well, the Innocence Project of Texas has taken his case through our show, and they’re working the legal angles, and we’re working the investigation. The other is the murder of Linda Jo Edwards, which was the Kerry Max Cook case, which has been noted as the most egregious case of police and prosecutorial misconduct in the *country*. One of the largest injustices, most notorious injustices, in the country. And we’re also working on his case right now.
- Jon Cryer:** Well, that’s just been fascinating, by the way, watching you peel back the layers on that and how the Kenny Snow *and* Edward Ates *and* Kerry Max Cook cases are all, actually, somehow interconnected. That’s been remarkable.
- Bob Ruff:** Yeah. They all come out of Smith County, Texas, and there’s an incestuous thread of police officers and prosecutors, and that county that just one leads into the other, leads into the other, and they’re all – like you said – they’re all interconnected.
- Jon Cryer:** So, Kamau, actually I wanted to ask you a question: Have you been able to listen to this season of *Undisclosed*?
- W. Kamau Bell:** I have listened to this season – I’m not 100% caught up, I have two young daughters so-- [laughs] I’m doing the best I can, but yes, I have listened.
- Jon Cryer:** What are your impressions so far?
- W. Kamau Bell:** You know, I think the thing that first struck me was the fact that this is a *white* guy.
- Jon Cryer:** [laughs]
- W. Kamau Bell:** You know, as a guy who thinks about race and racism all the time, and the criminal justice system, I was like, “Look at this! A white guy who’s not been treated well by the criminal justice system.” And I sort of appreciated that as someone who focuses on a lot of that with *black* people, and people of color and the criminal justice system, that the lesson is, if you’re poor and white it’s also not going to work for you either.
- Jon Cryer:** That’s been a big part, also, of the case that Bob was working on, down in Texas. It seems to be that it happened to Kerry Max Cook – who happens to be white – but it’s also happening to Ed Ates, and uh, Kenny Snow, who are African-American. So, you know, obviously you can’t deny the amount of racism that’s inherent in the criminal justice system as it stands *now*, but it’s nice to know that, you know, it gets around. [laughs] It eventually spreads around.
- Rabia Chaudry:** Steven Avery, right?

- Jon Cryer:** Yeah, Steven Avery. Yeah. In fact, what Bob was mentioning, and what he and I have talked about in the past is that the economic distribution of injustice does appear to be a big component. Wouldn't you say, Bob?
- Bob Ruff:** Oh, absolutely. At least, specifically in some of the cases that I've worked, I think that- Kerry Max Cook, on my show, put it really well when he said that the color, the racism that goes on – at least in Smith County, Texas – is *green*; it has a lot more to do with your socio-economic status than your race.
- Rabia Chaudry:** There's also demographic issues, right? Like I don't know what the demographics are in Smith County. But like, where Joey Watkins is, and you know, kind of rural Georgia area, is a heavily white population. So, certainly the potential of somebody who's *white*, obviously, to be arrested by law enforcement and to have to deal with these issues is much higher, because the number of black people are just *less*, there.
- So, I'm assuming in Smith County it's maybe something similar. But then you have situations like Baltimore and larger cities where you have more minority populations. So, I think demographically you have to look at this phenomenon too.
- Bob Ruff:** Yeah, I would agree with that.
- W. Kamau Bell:** Rabia, you're not suggesting that they bring in more black and brown people into these counties so the white people are treated better by the criminal justice system, are you?
- [laughter]
- Jon Cryer:** Actually that's what we were getting at, yeah. [laughs]
- Rabia Chaudry:** You know, that is... I'm coming up with a 10-point policy plan for criminal justice reform and that's exactly-- [laughs]
- Jon Cryer:** Bring in the white people!
- W. Kamau Bell:** Problem solved.
- Rabia Chaudry:** But you know, the vulnerabilities depend on, like the demographics, so... But you know, I think it's an important point for our listeners. And this was something that actually when this case came to us, was something that jumped out at *me*, as well. Because this was a case that first came to Susan, and as a person of color, as somebody who has experienced the criminal justice system.
- I mean, especially with Adnan's case, where you have a witness who's black, you have a defendant who's South Asian, you have a victim who's Asian – there's so many complicated racial dynamics that are happening in this case – I was also like, "Oh wow, everybody in this case is *white*."
- And I wasn't even sure I was completely comfortable putting in this many resources. But then I realized, "Okay, that's kind of a really unjust reaction on my end" to say, "Well..." To just the fact that he's a white defendant he should have the resources, or he would have a 'leg up' on the system anyways." But I was very cognizant of that, and I thought this will be interesting to see how people react to this issue.

≈

[11:52]

Jon Cryer: This episode of *Undisclosed* actually went into great depth on the use of rewards and Crime Stoppers tips, and these kind of things. Now, wasn't a Crime Stoppers tip also involved in the Kenny Snow case, Bob?

Bob Ruff: Yes. We haven't determined, officially, who received the reward, but yeah. It was, again, where the police had left it undisclosed as to who called it in, but we did catch in one of the interviews where the police seemed to let it slip. That was Kenny's boxing manager, Joe Costello, was the one that appears to be the one that called in the tip.

W. Kamau Bell: Did you just do the thing where you say the name of the movie *in* the movie?

Bob Ruff: Yeah!

[laughter]

Jon Cryer: Yes.

Bob Ruff: It was a plug!

Jon Cryer: Now, as a layman, you know, I've only come in contact with the criminal justice system tangentially. But you know, the concept of posting a reward seems simple. You know, it makes sense. It was only listening to the first season of *Undisclosed*, and the Adnan Syed Crime Stoppers situation that sort of opened my eyes to the way that whole system can be abused. I think, to the 'Average Joe', it sounds like a reward makes sense.

And apparently the Crime Stoppers system has yielded enormous results. You know, they credit them with more than a half a million arrests, and more than *four billion dollars* in recovered property. But that sounds like it's become basically a huge – almost an industry – with no transparency. Which is very troubling.

Rabia Chaudry: I think that the troubling aspect here is not being able to document. Even as, like, attorneys or investigators who may be-- I mean, there's ways to be able to provide the information to people who are working on a case, without publicly outing somebody.

Because the fear is, obviously, you want to protect the identity of a tipster so they don't fear retribution or retaliation from others in the community, or whatever. But there *should* be some documentation.

So, whether in Adnan's case, Joey Watkins' case, I'm assuming Bob in your case, we know, we are positive, pretty much, a reward was given out, but *nobody* can tell us who got it. Like, not a single agency – everybody deflects it. Which either means that we're just getting the run around, or it means that documentation has literally been *destroyed* by the State. And that is *really* troubling.

Because *that* is what opens the door to abuse situations. Because anybody can be a tipster, and you cannot verify the information. You don't know if this person got-- Like, what kind of benefit they got. And how that impacted whether or not-- Like, if they testified, would it impact their testimony? It's crazy.

Because, imagine if you'd been accused of a crime, and you're told, "Well, we have a person who gave a tip and got a reward, but we're not going to tell you what that tip was, or who that person was." Like, how do you *defend* yourself from that?

Jon Cryer:

Well, it also seems like, would you say that the police have a vested interest in keeping the system this way? You know, obviously it's had a certain amount of success, but it gives them a tremendous tool.

W. Kamau Bell:

My question is, because after listening to-- With how the thing worked with Adnan with money on the line, and how it works here, is money a good idea *at all*? I mean I understand that it helps with some cases but it seems like it creates more opportunity for people to lie than for people to *help*. I mean, even when I walk through the streets and see a sign that's like, "If you report this crime we'll give you money" I'm like, "Should I try and solve this crime?!" I mean—

[laughter]

Rabia Chaudry:

Yes! The answer is yes!

[laughter]

W. Kamau Bell:

You know, it just feels like it plays on people's worst selves. Greed.

Bob Ruff:

Personally I think it's fundamentally *flawed*. I mean, you're offering a reward for someone to come forward with information about a crime, but by definition you're looking for people that had information about a crime, and didn't come forward with it.

To me, it just seems like it's a perfect recipe for perjured statements and false statements, because, you know, if these were good, upstanding people that wanted to report this crime that they had information on, they would do it regardless of the money. *Only* being coaxed out by the money is asking for somebody to do something for that benefit.

Rabia Chaudry:

And the thing is, there is no point at which – unless you *completely trust* the police officers involved, and the prosecutor, if he's in on it, if *he or she's* in on it – there's no way for anybody to vet the veracity of that particular tipster or witness, right?

So, as defense counsel, I can't-- If I have a witness in court, I can try to undermine the credibility, I can find information about them, I can point out to the jury that--

But in a case like this where you have anonymous people that stay anonymous, and you don't even know what that tip *is*, you have absolutely no way to help make the determination that this is a person who is credible, who's information can be corroborated or verifiable.

In Adnan's case, what's troublesome to *me*, and also in a *lot* of other cases, is the phenomena where the police make an arrest, and then the tip is used – even Adnan's case – the police decided who they wanted, right? February 4th, before the tip came in, is when we know they first started pulling Adnan's records. So the police kind of decide who they want, and then: "Oh wow, lo and behold, we've got a tip."

And so, I wonder about the collection of evidence and tips and things like that after the police have already got a suspect and have made an arrest. And I feel like that *happens*, like in Joey's case, where you have *no other evidence*. In Joey's case there's no physical evidence, so what the police needed was for people to say stuff about him.

Bob Ruff:

Well and it sounds like Georgia has a *terrible* system. The way that it works-- You know, Indiana, which is very close to me, the Crime Stoppers system there – at least the way it's advertised on TV is that the reward money is payable upon arrest or *indictment*.

Whereas in Georgia it sounds like at least the state money-- They don't pay that out until after the entire appellate process is done – so our whole system is designed around *assuming* that our police officers and prosecutors are doing their job in good faith. And if you happen to find one here or there that's *not*, it's just a recipe for disaster – you're just asking for that prosecutor to continue to lean on that witness and hold that carrot out in front of them until they get their conviction.

Jon Cryer:

Well, in the Adnan Syed case, to me, I obviously have no particular proof that the police in any way abused the system, but it's easy to see how an officer *could* hint to somebody, "Hey, listen, if you'll help out with this, why don't you call in with a tip this week to Crime Stoppers, and, you know, you'll get a piece of the reward, *and* you'll help me out." You know, obviously, like I said, I don't have any proof that that's what happened, but the timeline would certainly support that in the Adnan Syed case.

Rabia Chaudry:

Yeah, definitely. And if you read the book, I think it seems kind of clear. Like something like that was highly possible in Adnan's case. And it can be-- In Joey's case, the fact that you have the nephew of the lead investigator talking about the tip, wanting, like, really pressuring somebody else to help him get the reward... These are really problematic. It makes you wonder: "Okay, what kind of question did he have with his uncle that led him to do those, like months after the crime." Right?

Jon Cryer:

Would the answer be, possibly, more transparency? Would that be, like, if a reward is offered, that that has to be introduced at trial, and they have to say if *somebody* – they could retain anonymity – but that *somebody* was in line to collect it? I mean, would that possibly help the system?

Rabia Chaudry:

Here's what I think: I think kind of along the lines of kind of 'good citizenship' and the nature of trials being public, if you have *actual information* about a crime, which to me would seem to suggest that you will then become a witness at a trial, then I don't understand how you can kind of reconcile being anonymous at the same time.

I mean, with Adnan's case, and with Joey's case, I mean, the discussion was, well should we give the full names of witnesses who testify... Well yeah! These are public records! We *have* to have transparency in the American criminal justice system, otherwise we could be like so many other countries, where things are kind of terrifying. And secret evidence is used, and stuff like that. So yeah, making that some of the stakes, that if you're going to come forward and collect a reward, it has to be, like, in the light of day. I think, could be helpful, but you know, I'm sure police and prosecutors would argue against it.

W. Kamau Bell:

Isn't it generally the fact that the cops need to offer a reward, sort of an indicator that people don't trust police in general? [laughs] Just the fact that, like, people aren't calling the cops when they have information because they don't really trust the whole system?

To me, feels like if people actually thought that they were being policed well, and trusting the system, you'd want to help the cops of your own volition. The fact that's there's a number – a *dollar amount* – put on it means like, "If you pay me, I'll help you."

Jon Cryer:

Well, that's a very good point. But I imagine there's a lot of people just out of apathy – you know, they feel like, "Well the police are on it, they're doing their job, I don't need to get involved with this", to a *certain* extent, I would imagine.

But I think you're right, as you pointed out. It's designed to attract an element of people for whom that's important. You know, maybe for people who aren't the very best witnesses in those particular situations.

Another issue with the Crime Stoppers tip is, what happens to the police once they get them? They often result in investigative tunnel vision, where, once they've gotten the tip, that's all they care about.

And you know, as we pointed out in Joey Watkins' case, you know, when you're actually posting a reward, it's inherent that there's going to be tunnel vision. Because you're *asking* for information that implicates this guy, you know? [laughs] So, it can worsen an already troubling investigative problem.

Rabia Chaudry:

Yeah. I mean, I would be okay with this system if you could prove to me that, having gotten a tip, the police have not halted their investigation of all possible suspects, right?

So, notwithstanding the tip, if you have other independent evidence that makes you think that this person is your suspect, *or* if you're looking at other suspects and you can show to me that your investigation has continued onto other suspects despite the tip, I think then that shows me that the police are really doing a thorough investigation.

But the problem, like you said, is that the evidence seems to that once a tip comes in – again, totally unverifiable tip, have no idea why this person's motivated, *how* much they're getting, *why* they're doing it, *who* they are... If all your documentation after that shows that, well, the police only, basically focus on one person. *That* is where the real trouble comes in. And that's very common.

[21:49]

≈

Jon Cryer:

Now, in this week's episode of *Undisclosed*, there was a very lengthy recording of Corey Jacobs trying to induce David into giving information, or at least, *re-giving* information that he claimed to have heard from him before. He's basically wearing a wire and trying to induce him.

But we actually got a lot of social media questions about that. We got one from 'Briony Watt', who says, "I'm beginning to see why the jury convicted. Without the background I can imagine being totally overwhelmed by the sheer volume of witness evidence. I think I might end up feeling that where there's smoke there's fire. I sort of *buy* Corey's comment that the money was a lure to get the *other* guy to talk to the cops – that's believable to me. It was a great little window into the weird macho gangster wannabe thing that these guys were doing."

Now was that actually played at the trial?

Rabia Chaudry:

I don't think that the *wire* was played, but that's why we need Colin and Susan. I'm not actually sure because I haven't read the trial transcripts fully. I don't believe it was, that the *actual* recording was played at the trial, but certainly his testimony played an important factor. And it was *him*, and it was like this whole host of witnesses that we have talked about in the last two episodes, which actually has been really tiresome even just to go through, and it's like, it's all rumor, rumor, rumor, rumor, right?

And even here, it's all clear in the audio recording that this guy is not able to get the information that he wants *exactly* in the way that he wants to present it to police, to get this reward, which seems to be, like, what's really motivating him. But, you know, I want to keep reminding people that *this is the evidence*.

When people have said to us, "Well, okay, you're talking about this case, but what's the real evidence?" *This is the evidence*. What we're presenting to you *is* the evidence that was presented against Joey, and this is what got him convicted. Something like this.

So, imagine what that means: A couple of teenagers who are talking about-- Or young people who are talking about getting a reward, being motivated by that, not being able to get their story straight, things just completely contradicting each other. And this is how this young man has basically lost his life, you know, getting a life sentence for this murder. That's the evidence.

This *is* what convinced the jury – the cumulative effect of all these witnesses coming and just blowing smoke and blowing smoke.

[23:49]

≈

Jon Cryer:

We also got a couple of comments from social media: One from 'Melissa Bradley' saying, "Alright, can we just address the elephant in the room with the constant casual N-words?" And another one from 'Monica Stores' saying, "How many times do they drop the N-word? I can't keep listening!"

And that *was* an interesting window, into them, and another person asking if that *was* actually played in court, because *that* could well have turned them against, obviously, the witness – Corey Jacobs.

By the way, I *do* want to take a moment to apologize on behalf of the producers of *Undisclosed* – apparently they meant to put a language disclaimer before the description of the podcast, but due to an oversight, were not able to. So, obviously if that word shocked a lot of people, we apologize.

I guess I should apologize on behalf of all white people for, ever, inventing the word... [laughs] And using it ever.

W. Kamau Bell:

Thank you, thank you.

Jon Cryer:

[laughs] So...

Bob Ruff:

Yes. Sorry guys.

Jon Cryer:

Yeah. But...

W. Kamau Bell:

This is a good start, this is a good start.

Jon Cryer:

Yes, exactly. I imagine when I open my door there'll be a rainbow, and everything will be better now because that happened.

Bob Ruff:

[laughs]

W. Kamau Bell:

I'll also take money.

Jon Cryer:

[laughs] Well, but Kamau-- I don't know if you got to listen to this very latest episode because you're not completely caught up--

W. Kamau Bell:

Oh, yes I did. I did. My pseudonym's actually Melissa Bradley – I'm the one who wrote that comment.

Jon Cryer: [laughs]

W. Kamau Bell: I mean, even as a black guy, I'm the one who uses that word occasionally in my life – on stage, usually, when I'm talking about it – I was like, "Man, this is a lot of N-words." [laughs]

Jon Cryer: Yes.

W. Kamau Bell: And I listen to a lot of independent rap music. Like, this is a *lot*. So, I'm *sure* if you're not somebody who hears the word a lot in their life, that if you were just listening to this tape you just think everybody's guilty who has any part in this.

Jon Cryer: For me, you know, obviously it's awful, and as a white person I'm mortified. But also I *sort of* understood the culture to some extent, because, you know, teenagers always create their own sort of transgressive, you know, "Fuck you, grown-ups" sort of culture, and I guess we're going to have to put a trigger warning on *this* episode now that I've said *that*.

[laughs] But, you know... And they tried to do things that sort of positioned themselves as outlaws, you know? And obviously they're a fan of rap music, because we heard them-- By the way, I must confess, I'm embarrassed to admit that I did not know that song.

Rabia Chaudry: Oh, thank god. I thought it was just me.

Jon Cryer: Okay. [laughs] Apparently it's 'Wanna Be A Baller' by Lil' Troy...? I'm much more old school in my hip hop references, so that was news to me.

W. Kamau Bell: Don't worry, Jon, you're already a baller.

Jon Cryer: Oh, okay! [laughs] Yes, so I would have no knowledge of that song. [laughs]

But it's not like they live in a town that-- You know, this is Georgia – this is not a place that is *immune* to racial strife – they must have *some* understanding of it. Is this just part of the culture?

Rabia Chaudry: Probably a very long, deep history of racial strife, I'm guessing there, but--

Jon Cryer: Yes.

Rabia Chaudry: You know, I wanted to address this issue with our listeners. As we were recording that episode Susan *immediately* – and she's very sensitive to this – and she said, "You know, I feel like we should censor out this word; we should bleep it, or we should do something with the audio so it's not – we don't want to offend our listeners."

And I think Colin was kind of not sure which way to go on this, I don't remember how he commented on it. But I actually said that I feel like the full audio should be in. And I mean I would love to hear, Kamau, how you think about this.

I'm not a professional media person, and I don't know exactly, like, what the ethics of these things are. But for me as somebody who's a lawyer, I feel like, you know, things should be presented *as they are*. And you know, I'm not a black person but I *am* a person of color, and I

have grown up and been called a “sand nigger” – and I’m going to say, like, the full word – a *number of times*. Even as a child, as a teenager I have been called these words.

And when I relay those incidences to people to kind of explain to them how anti-Muslim sentiment exists in our society, I want them to feel the full impact of the *ugliness* of the word. And if I say, “sand *bleep*,” a “sand N-word” I feel like they’re not going to get the punch in the gut that I got, you know? The slap in the face that I felt.

So, it feels like, you know, I want people to be as uncomfortable and as hurt by it as I *was* in those moments, and that’s why I felt that, you know what? We should use the audio, and we should-- Because you *should* be offended! You *should* be like, “What *is* this crap?!” And I feel like if you censor all that out, like you’re *sanitizing* things for people; you’re making it *really easy* for them. And I don’t want to make things so easy for people. So that’s where I stand on the issue. So I take responsibility for not bleeping that out.

[laughter]

Rabia Chaudry:

But definitely a trigger warning, a heads up, that was an oversight and we apologize for that. But Kamau I’d love to hear *your* thoughts on these issues.

W. Kamau Bell:

Well first of all I love the fact you said the word ‘nigger’ but you said the word ‘crap.’ I love the fact that you-- [laughs]

[laughter]

W. Kamau Bell:

So, yeah. I agree with you. I think that the other thing we need to talk about here is what the podcast is *about*. The podcast is about helping people who are in jail, or have been arrested, or have been caught up in the criminal justice system. Because of things that they didn’t do, but have been framed, or whatever it is.

So, I feel like, a little bit, if you’re going to hear ugly things. This is the podcast where ugly things are going to be heard. You know, it’s not like-- This is what the podcast *is*.

So, I feel like, I understand that people are offended, but uh I think we’re here to be offended! [laughs] The thing is, get offended, and then *do* something. I don’t know – I can’t think of a podcast where you wouldn’t hear it. Maybe *This American Life*, they would have bleeped it. But I feel like this is not that podcast. We’re here to talk about ugly things.

Bob Ruff:

And if I can interject, as far as-- Because I go through this same thing, Rabia, on *Truth and Justice* – you know, I do a lot of interviews, and I interviewed Bill Cole, who was a witness, or victim, in the Kenny Snow case, and he used the term “high yella”.

And, I just did an interview with Marti Jackson this week, who was Ed’s mother in the Elnora Griffin case, and there’s a *lot* of foul language, and I was thinking about whether I should take it out or censor it. And *my* feelings were exactly the same as you, is first of all people need to see, to get a full picture about, you know, what’s going on in people’s minds.

You know, both of our podcasts are about the *truth* and getting everything out there, and for us to try to sanitize that, I just don’t think it’s right.

And then I have the other sentiment, in *my* mind, is the guys in that recording on your podcast, in- and we just heard it with Donald Trump – if you don’t want people to hear you say something, then don’t say it! You know, they said it, so it’s going to be out there.

- Rabia Chaudry:** Yeah. And it exists! And people-- Until they hear it with their own ears, I mean, like I know people who are like, well you know, just kind of sexism... Racism... I mean like, so-- [laughs]
- I want you to hear it so if you don't believe me, maybe once you hear it you'll believe we are not post-racial we are not post-misogyny, we are not post-patriarchy. These things exist, and you should hear this stuff so you can understand that yourself.
- Bob Ruff:** Yeah, I agree.
- Rabia Chaudry:** But this is also an interesting dynamic in that this is two young white guys talking to each other, right? So, they've adopted language that's-- I don't know how they're thinking about these words and what they mean to them, but we've had an interesting reaction from listeners, definitely, on it.
- Jon Cryer:** Well, it sounds like they've adopted it as their language, their *patois* between each other. You know? Like I said, I think they're just trying to sound like bad-asses – the bad-asses that have been modeled in rap, I guess. Although, boy it sounds lame from them.
- Bob Ruff:** I was thinking they were trying to sound like dumb-asses.
- Jon Cryer:** Yes, they-- Well, mission accomplished, fellas. [laughs]
- W. Kamau Bell:** I would say they definitely sounded like white guys who don't know a lot of black people.
- Jon Cryer:** Yeah. And it brings us back to-- I've been meaning to talk to Rabia and Bob about this for a while, because months ago you guys did a dinner with, I believe, a bunch of prosecutors and judges, and the topic of racism in the criminal justice system was raised. And my understanding was that they gave a lot of pushback on it; that they were arguing that it *wasn't* really a factor in the criminal justice system. Is that accurate?
- Rabia Chaudry:** That was such a surreal experience. [laughs]
- Bob Ruff:** Yeah. I think I got a little more pushback than Rabia did.
- Rabia Chaudry:** Yeah I mean like, I don't know if it was just me, but I felt like the whole audience was slightly hostile. I just felt--
- Bob Ruff:** Mm-hmm.
- Rabia Chaudry:** Especially like, the tables in the front of the room. Which is like mostly white prosecutors and attorneys. And for us to be telling them that these are issues – and systematic – you know, it was like this, almost, like: “What? Huh? Well, no. The system corrects for these things! And that's why we have like, you know, these things in place, and the constitution, and *blah blah blah*.”
- But, I also wonder: After that event, I mean, like, there was a recent filing in Adnan's case-[laughs] I'm like, “Hmm, I wonder if this contributed to that decision.”

Jon Cryer: [laughs] Yes. I did want to ask you about that later as well, but we'll get to that.

Bob Ruff: My favorite was, the prosecutor – the white prosecutor in the front of the room – telling us that I have said that, you know, 95% of the time prosecutors get it right, or 90%, or whatever it was – and she was like, “That’s only, you know, 5%, so what’s the big deal?” was basically what she was saying. You know, we’re talking about *hundreds of thousands of people* who’ve been wrongfully convicted, and these racial motivations that are out there in the system, and she was saying that, you know, 5% is “that’s pretty good, it’s fine, what’s the problem?” Stop talking about it, is basically what she told me.

Jon Cryer: If I may speak for white people-- [laughs] Part of the problem is that there are dual definitions of racism. You know, if you look it up in the dictionary, it just says, “Having the attitude of racial superiority”. But people of color understand it to mean an entire *system* that has the effect of racism. And that is why white people can, sort of, buy out. Because if they can personally say to themselves, “Well, I don’t have that attitude” it allows them to sort of buy out from ever agreeing that racism is involved in the system. So, you know, that’s ‘message from white people’. [laughs]

[laughter]

Rabia Chaudry: How do you define racism? Kamau, how do you define racism?

W. Kamau Bell: I mean, I do think that we have to talk about, like you said Jon, the dictionary definition versus the *actual* definition. And we’re talking about America’s racism; we’re talking about the power to make people’s lives worse through structures and institutions. Hating somebody isn’t enough. You actually have to have the power to make their lives worse.

Jon Cryer: It’s very frustrating for me to read arguments on social media and stuff like that, because, to me, *all* those arguments end up coming back to the difference in definitions. Because I can say people get so-- By the way, this is *all* people, not just white people, but they get so angry when they feel like they’re being labelled ‘racist’ or part of a racist *system*. And they take it so personally, because they, on a daily basis, probably *try* to be fair. And *not* have racist attitudes. Of course there’s a fair number of people who are out and proud about it. But I just wish people could underscore that we’re not talking about the same thing. It’s very frustrating to me.

Rabia Chaudry: Oh, it’s more frustrating to us; to people of color.

[laughter]

Jon Cryer: Yes.

Bob Ruff: Don’t you guys understand that Jon and I are really struggling with this?!

Jon Cryer: Yes, exactly! Can’t you feel our pain?!

[laughter]

Rabia Chaudry: Yeah, I have a-

W. Kamau Bell:

Everybody relax, white men struggling.

[laughter]

Rabia Chaudry:

Good! Struggle! Be uncomfortable. I mean like... [laughs] that's the whole point there.

[laughter]

Rabia Chaudry:

One of the most fascinating things to me with Adnan's case – and *all* of these different issues – even when you look at, like, you know, *videotaped evidence* of police brutality against black men, and you *still* have this whole contingent of people saying, "What? What do you mean?" Right? Like, it's remarkable that people cannot see or accept the narratives of an entire community telling you the same thing over and over, providing evidence of it.

And so it's very much-- I mean you're talking about definitions. I think it's also about self-preservation, I think it's about feeling very defensive. And because, if you are to accept it, what does that mean about *you*? What are you now going to do about it? And how are you implicated in it? And, so it's easier to say, "Well, no, it was just that guy was just not cooperating with police." And you know it's easier to dismiss something and not have to take responsibility or, have to really think, and be troubled by these issues.

Jon Cryer:

And tribal loyalty comes into it. One wants to honor the police, and obviously police have a very hard job, and you know, but there are *completely* different levels of professionalism. Obviously there's fantastic police, and there's police that shouldn't be there, you know? But I think, what you were mentioning, that there's the tendency there to just dismiss these things as one-off experiences, as: "We're not seeing the tape where the cop did the right thing." You know, "We're not seeing *those* things, you don't see *those* go viral." Every now and then you see something that's heartwarming, you'll say, "Oh, here's a cop with a puppy!" you know? It's like, "Oh, he saved a puppy from a tree." You know, but the rest of them are horrible and alarming. And I, for one, you know, that has transformed my understanding of how these interactions are happening; just on a personal level.

[37:29]

≈

Rabia Chaudry:

I don't know if our listeners know, or if you or Bob know, that Kamau is on a tour right now. And I would love to hear about the show that he's doing. I'm really excited, because I'll get to see him perform live this week in DC, but what I've been told is that, Kamau, your show is like one of the most insightful kind of commentaries on race in America today. I'd love to hear a little bit more about the show, like your material, you know, your angles, and the response.

W. Kamau Bell:

I've been doing comedy for a while now, and it's very clear to me, as much as people are saying the *show's* insightful, it's really that people are really needing to hear this now. That we're in a very critical time in this country. And so, I can tell the difference. After a lot of shows we'll do a Q&A – it used to be three or four years ago I'd say "Q&A" and people would *leave*, and now--

[laughter]

W. Kamau Bell:

And now people are like, "Yes. I have many more questions. I have many more questions" [laughs] And so, that there's really a need for people to hear people talk directly about race and racism in this country. And so I've been talking about it for a while but I think people are ready to *do* something about it. And people are ready to engage with it in a more direct way. And that even includes good white people like Jon.

[laughter]

Jon Cryer: *Even.* Even good white people like me. [laughs] Well I try. Now where is the tour going? By the way? This is a beautiful opportunity to announce some dates, Kamau.

W. Kamau Bell: You guys with your set-ups and plugs...

[laughter]

W. Kamau Bell: It feels very awkward to plug your tour on this podcast--

[laughter]

Rabia Chaudry: No, no, please do. I don't want people to miss this opportunity.

W. Kamau Bell: Yes, I will be in Washington DC this Thursday, I'll be in New York city this Friday, and I'll be in Boston on Saturday. And then I'll be in Portland the following week. But more than that I'm actually doing a lot of shows at colleges. If you go to my website at kamaubell.com, that's where the real work is being done. Where I talk about ending racism in about an hour. And that's the generation who's super fired-up and super ready in ways that I hadn't seen before, and I've been doing colleges for years. So I'll be doing colleges for the next few months. Or until racism's over.

[laughter]

Rabia Chaudry: You've got three months, Kamau.

Jon Cryer: Yes, exactly. Exactly.

Rabia Chaudry: That's awesome.

Jon Cryer: Well, it is interesting, because, you know, I have a 16 year-old son, and the amount of exasperation that he expresses at the state of racial issues in the United States, he's just so tired of it and unhappy with it. And they just want this stuff to be over. Honestly.

But unfortunately the United States has done a terrible job. There was no reparations, there was no, no reconstruction. I mean, it's terrible! We've done a terrible job of fixing this. You know, there's still laws on the books! There's a horrifying vestigial remnant of this, and I told this to my son to sort of illustrate the 'ghost in the machine' of racism that's still in the system, is, I bought a house years ago, and on the deed was a listing that it could not be sold to 'negroes'. This is a house in Los Angeles. This is California – a place that you know, does not have the well-known history of racial strife, although it's *absolutely* here. You know, tell that to the Mexicans and the Indians that were here.

But I was trying to give him, you know, this is the home you grew up in, kid. You were here until you were four years old, and that was in the *deed*. You know, obviously there was a law that struck it down in the '50s, but it took until the '50s for a law to come out to say that that was illegal. So, you know, as I said, I think kids today are just-- They're sick of hearing about it – they want to help, and finish it. And I wish them god speed, that's for sure.

W. Kamau Bell: You went all 'white Malcolm X' there for a second, I appreciate that.

- Jon Cryer:** I-- [laughs] Sorry, it was shocking to me. I, you know, because I was just going through the document just to see, you know, because I was selling the place. [laughs] And so I was like, "Oh this is fascinating", you know, the place was built in 1937, you know?
- Rabia Chaudry:** I always wonder about where the weight of change comes from. You know, sometimes *is has* to be legislated; it *has* to have the force of law, but on the other hand, sometimes the legislative changes, like, don't come about unless there's like a big shift in public sentiment.
- And I always wonder if, like, which way it has to be. Do we as human beings need to be legislated just to the extent of, you simply cannot-- Like, is that what corrects our behavior?! Are we like inherently incapable of having internal and ethical mechanisms that say "Okay, as a society we're just going to move to a place now where it's no longer acceptable in our society?"
- I think look at, for example, issues of anti-Semitism, and homophobic sentiment. I'm not saying there's no such thing as anti-Semitism or homophobia, obviously these things still exist, but there has been *much more* success in making these things very not palatable. Right? We react very strongly when we see these things in the public discourse.
- Whereas racism against black people, racism against people of color in general... There's still a little bit of-- Not a *little* bit, there's a *lot* of leeway. I mean you can look at the presidential election and see it. But--
- W. Kamau Bell:** I mean, I *do* think that sometimes it does have to be legislated out. Look at marriage equality. The country was *maybe* about 50/50 at that point... Or 51/49 for marriage equality, and the Supreme Court did it just to sort of get us over the hump. You know? It just felt like--
- [laughter]
- Now it's-- I feel like, I don't know if I would have been comfortable waiting for the country to vote against slavery.
- Rabia Chaudry:** Right.
- W. Kamau Bell:** You know, I think sometimes it is up to the legal system to – when it works well – to lead the country into a better place. So, not something you can rely on, but I certainly think that if I'd had to wait on voting on slavery, I'm *pretty* sure I'd have a different life now.
- [laughter]
- W. Kamau Bell:** So, word to Abe Lincoln.
- Rabia Chaudry:** Basically, people suck. That's--
- [laughter]
- Rabia Chaudry:** You can't rely on public opinion.
- [laughter]
- W. Kamau Bell:** Oh, I have to go. I don't know how this works, but I have to move on to this thing.

Jon Cryer: Oh, well, we thank you for being here, it was such a pleasure. Do check him out if he's on the road and in the many colleges he is visiting. Ladies and gentlemen, Kamau Bell. *Woo!*

[claps]

We have no studio audience, we have nobody to clap.

Rabia Chaudry: Thank you so much for being on.

Jon Cryer: Thank you, Kamau.

W. Kamau Bell: Thank you! I'll see you Thursday, Rabia. I'm going to go buy a new computer. Thanks.

Jon Cryer: Okay

[laughter]

[45:36]

≈

Jon Cryer: Considering that there was an *amicus* brief filed in Adnan's case, filed by the Maryland *trial* lawyers a while ago... And actually we didn't comment on that on the *Addendum*, Rabia uh, what is the purpose of *amicus* briefs?

Rabia Chaudry: So an *amicus* brief is a brief filed by a third party to a court, that is a party that has some concern about the issues that are being litigated in the court, but are not a direct party. So, if you have a case where you have, let's say, medical malpractice, maybe there'll be other kind of consumer groups that might file an *amicus*. '*Amicus*' means 'friend of the court'.

And so what happened was, a few weeks ago – or maybe a month ago – the National Association of Criminal Defense Attorneys, a *national* association – filed an *amicus* in Adnan's appeal, basically saying that they support Adnan's right to get a new trial, that he *deserves* a new trial, that the Circuit Court's ruling was *proper*, and that the Court of Special Appeals should not entertain the State's appeal.

Because the State basically doesn't want Adnan to get a new trial. They want the Court of Special Appeals to overturn Judge Welch's ruling. What happened last week... I thought that was remarkable. I didn't know that was going to be in the works, I had no idea it was coming. And then I thought what was even more remarkable was that about a week ago, on the State level, almost *every* State's attorney from every county in Maryland came together to file an *amicus* supporting the prosecution and saying, basically, the same thing, which is that Adnan should *not* get a new trial, that overturning of the conviction should *itself* be overturned, and that he made an error in his ruling.

And when I *saw* that I sent Justin a message – Justin Brown, Adnan's attorney – and I was like, "Does this *happen* in cases? Have you ever seen this? And he's like, "No... But, like, this is a case like no other." [laughs]

Jon Cryer: Yes. That keeps coming up, that quote just keeps coming up, for some reason.

Rabia Chaudry: It's a really weird move. It's a really interesting move. And I think it was mostly a PR move on what Colin pointed out really – he'd written a couple of blog posts on this, and I encourage people to check them out because they're really fantastic – is that this group of prosecutors,

this *posse* of prosecutors who are running to the poor State's attorney's aide have cited no law, no case law, nothing. It's just like a big, kind of propaganda piece.

And on *top* of that, they're reciting facts to the court that actually are *not true*. Which is something that... I can't wrap my head around how they can keep getting away with this.

Jon Cryer:

Well, and also, they're facing an enormous uphill battle to begin with, Because my understanding is an appeal is inherently an abuse of discretion case, in this particular situation. Because they're appealing a judge's ruling. And judges are given wide discretion to make these kind of rulings – they're *allowed* to.

He cited relevant case law, it appears from all appearances that he did a very good job in buttressing his case for why Adnan deserved to have his conviction vacated. So, it puts a huge burden on the people appealing that, because they have to appeal his abuse of discretion – that he's done something wrong as a judge.

So, what you're saying is that they have given a document that is attempting to buttress the evidence in the case but not in anyway disputing the decision of the judge, which is the *whole point* of an appeal!

Rabia Chaudry:

Right, they've been giving legal arguments--

Jon Cryer:

So--

Rabia Chaudry:

Yeah.

Jon Cryer:

So, again, I guess it lays bare that it is completely a PR move. Because, as I said, judges don't want to overturn other judges.

Rabia Chaudry:

And the *other* reason it is a real uphill battle for the State right now is because they are making their appeal to the *same court* that sent the case back down to Judge Welch to take into consideration Asia McLain. Right?

So this is a court that has already looked at the case, decided that it *needs* to go back to Judge Welch. I mean Judge Welch could not have made another determination if *this court* hadn't sent the case back to him. So, they are really kind of-- That's another reason that it's going to be really hard for them to win the appeal, and... [sighs] I'm pretty sure that they are not going to, to be honest.

But it is a heck of a PR move, and when I saw that, I thought back to the presentation Bob and I gave, and I went, I was like, "I wonder how many of them were in that room?!" [laughs] That night.

Jon Cryer:

What did you say?! [laughs]

Bob Ruff:

Yeah, right.

[49:45]

Jon Cryer: So, we got a social media question from 'Iva T' saying: "Why is this second season saying so little, if anything, about Joey's lawyers, both trial and appellate?"

Rabia Chaudry: So, we actually *do* have episodes lined up that's going to say a whole lot about Joey's lawyers, about his defense; both trial and appeal. Especially because people might not be aware, but the one law firm defended Joey was a very high-profile law firm in Georgia that his family was able to bring on board.

And so we're talking about the law firm of a gentleman who the character *Matlock* was modeled after. So we have a lot to say about his firm and the folks that defended him. And they have been very cooperative with us. We actually went down to the firm and went through the files, and were very helpful. But don't worry. We have more episodes lined up to talk about that stuff coming soon.

≈

Jon Cryer: So, Bob, as you know, I've been riveted to the *Truth & Justice* podcast this season. So where is this case going? Do you have any idea?

Bob Ruff: Ah... No!

[laughter]

Jon Cryer: I got nothing!

Bob Ruff: Well, we were really thrown through a loop a few weeks ago when I was able to track down and interview who I kind of considered to be the prime suspect, and as you heard, Mr Leonard Moseley either was telling the truth or he's a phenomenal liar. And, you know, I'm sitting in my office now looking at my suspect board, and I see all of these items in Leonard Moseley's category that seem to point to him, but I can't ignore the fact that his interview really seems to-- I even had Stanley Burke, who was with the FBI. Jim Clemente put me in contact with him. When you saw him on the *JonBenét Ramsay* special, Stanley listened to it and was like, "I just don't hear any signs of deception there".

So, *now* I'm at a point where I'm having a hard look at every single other suspect because I don't want to get caught in the trap of that confirmation bias where, you know, I've already put blinders on and made my mind up that it's one person. This past week I even interviewed Ed's mother, Margi Jackson, as a suspect. My opinion after looking into her for the last week is that *she* had no involvement. So where we're going now is as far as my end on the investigation is, we're just at this point going point-by-point-by-point; person by person, and looking at all the different suspects in depth.

But, from a legal perspective, my work with the Innocence Project of Texas has taken his case. I think we've got a really good shot of getting Ed out. That's something that I can't really talk about or disclose what the legal strategies are, but we're very confident that we can get Ed a new trial.

But the focus then shifts back to me to find true justice. It's not just to get Edward Ates out of prison, but to find justice for Elnora Griffin. So that's where we're going. To continue to go suspect-by-suspect-by-suspect until we figure this thing out.

Kenny Snow's case is looking pretty good, too. His is a little more difficult, because you know, there was no trial with Kenny. He was bullied by the detectives and was lied to by them, and

had this kind of-- Sounds like a false Crime Stoppers tip, and so Kenny ended up *confessing* in order to protect his girlfriend at the time, and plead out. So there's not a *lot* to work with on him, but what we do have there is the fact that the actual victim in the case – who was not happy I contacted him originally – you know when I first contacted him, you know, his exact words to me were, "Yeah I remember that mother fucker, that boxer." But then when I started going through the case with him has come around and said, "You know what, I don't think this is the guy that did it."

Rabia Chaudry:

Yeah.

Bob Ruff:

And so we're working on right now... We have through our crowd-sourcing we have an attorney in Texas that has taken Kenny's case *pro bono* and is working at the moment to meet up with Bill Cole to get a signed affidavit for him to try to get Kenny Snow's case back into court as well.

So, on the legal perspective, both cases are looking pretty good at this point, as far as the investigation goes, they were looking really good like, two weeks ago, and now I'm just kind of scrambling to kind of reset and it's almost like starting back from zero. You know, Laura Richards, who works with Jim Clemente, and that is on the *Real Crime Profile* podcast with him, was a former Scotland Yard profiler, is currently analyzing the case and working a profile for me. I couldn't have Jim do it, because Jim is a listener and knows too much about the case to do an unbiased profile.

Rabia Chaudry:

Mm.

Bob Ruff:

So Laura has been nice enough to take that over for me. So, we're still plugging away at it until we figure this thing out.

Jon Cryer:

Well, in the meantime, the podcast is riveting. Just so you know.

Bob Ruff:

Well, thank you! I appreciate it. Did you get a chance to listen to Margi's interview?

Jon Cryer:

No! No, I was listening to Kamau's podcast yesterday--

Rabia Chaudry:

I've got a *lot* of catching up to do because of my travel and stuff.

Jon Cryer:

The Moseley interview... Yeah. They're great interviews, and they unfortunately create more questions than they answer. But they're fascinating to listen to.

Bob Ruff:

Oh, I have to say that Margi Jackson was probably my favorite interview I've ever done. And I don't want to give too much away, but you'll enjoy it. It's *intriguing*, and it's disturbing and hilarious all at the same time.

Jon Cryer:

So check out the *Truth & Justice* podcast. I also wanted to comment on something. Last week I gave Colin some shit about his incredible use of references. [laughs] It's just remarkable. And in this episode he just went crazy with the virtuoso display – he cited the *Gospel of Matthew*, Shakespeare's *Henry IV Part II*, Jim Butcher's *The Dresden Files*, Mark Miller's Marvel mini-series *Civil War* and the John Ford movie *The Informer*. So folks, this was just Colin's way of saying, "Come at me, bitch."

[laughter]

Jon Cryer: He was saying, "Go ahead, Jon. Go ahead, make fun of it."

Rabia Chaudry: That was a middle finger directly to you, John. I just want you to know that.

Jon Cryer: To me.

Rabia Chaudry: And we discussed it-- [laughs]

Jon Cryer: I'm just going to say, Colin, "Message received. You win."

Rabia Chaudry: He is like an *encyclopedia*, and I like, can't remember my younger daughter's birthday. So...

[laughter]

Rabia Chaudry: This is like the difference in the information that he's like able to store versus me. It's pretty amazing. I have to often look up what he's talking about. [laughs]

Jon Cryer: Well, thank you guys so much for being here for this – it was a blast – and I hope to see you both shortly.

Rabia Chaudry: Alright, thanks a lot Jon, and Bob.

Bob Ruff: Thanks for having me.

≈