

Monday, March 17, 2025

RA: Thank you so much for making the time to speak with me. I know it's also a Monday morning, it's early. We really appreciate it. To start off, I kind of wanted to get a sense of what your impressions were of Columbia when you first got on campus. Yeah, let's start there.

ARS: I think some of my first impressions—I was definitely struck by the core curriculum even more than I—I mean, I obviously knew what it was—but I think how intensive and, like, Eurocentric it was. It was a lot to take in, even freshman year, just reading the syllabus and everything. I experienced a lot of different things. I think some, like, elitism and things like that that were uncomfortable to see play out with other students and with the institution more broadly. But I was really lucky to find community with a group called Students Against Mass Incarceration really early on my freshman year. That's sort of where I found my people as a student for the first time. We spent a lot of time in the back of the Malcolm X lounge, reading and talking with one another. And then I met—I had come out of Chicago's, as a high school student, youth poetry network and found some people who've been a part of similar programs as teenagers in their cities. And so we started doing some art stuff that was another way to build community. And then I found the IRC (Intercultural Resource Center), and started hosting open mics there, and eventually moved in and lived in the IRC for the rest of my time. So I feel really lucky to have found those pockets of other students who were thinking critically about the world and wanted to do something about it, and those became the folks that I organized with on campus.

RA: What drew you to Students Against Mass Incarceration initially?

ARS: I was really interested in—well I think one, I was pulled in by it being a Black student group and wanting that sense of community for myself. And I think then in particular—just like, more specific than the general kind of Black student organization, which I also was involved in—it was smaller, it was a space where we were thinking a little bit more like politically and specifically about how we saw the world. And that's sort of what I was looking for. I had come out of a youth poetry space in Chicago where young people were working to make sense of the world through poems. And I think we kind of all left that with some hunger for something a little bit more like, what can we do as young people that's more than just write poems, and the Students Against Mass Incarceration group felt like a little bit of that answer to me at 18, right?

RA: Yeah. What was the general political vibe on campus like while you were there? I know you mentioned that you were able to find your pockets, but generally, what was it like?

ARS: Yeah, so I was at Columbia from 2012 to 2016, and so 2012 and 2013 you had the Trayvon Martin case playing out in national media that first summer after my freshman year, you had the acquittal of the racist vigilante that killed Trayvon Martin happen, and that sparked massive protest. 2014 was the Ferguson uprisings and the murder of Mike Brown. And then in New York City there was the murder of Eric Garner and the acquittal of the officer that killed him around the same time as that of Darren Wilson. So that's what was going on in general. And I

think all young people everywhere I feel like were impacted and connected to that movement. And I had been a part of co-founding a group called Black Youth Project 100 in 2013 and so I was involved in some off-campus organizing that informed my time. And I think just all of that was very alive on campus in terms of conversations about race, about anti-Black state violence, around policing—but it was definitely contested. Certainly, there were many students that were not paying attention to any of that. And I think because I had this community off-campus and back home in Chicago where we were building this organization, we were involved in this bigger movement, and then I had this group of students that shared those values on campus, that sort of desire to draw that connection is where some of the organizing that we ended up doing around private prison divestment at Columbia came. And I think once we started leading that campaign, it was a container for us to bring many more people in the campus community into those conversations who otherwise may have not felt like it was relevant to them, but because we were like, ‘Actually, our university is invested in the private prison industry. The private prison industry, you know, has done XYZ things to lobby for and create the laws that have led to the explosion of mass incarceration, and that’s related to the national conversations being had around policing and racism, and that’s why we should be talking about it on our campus.’ So, yeah, that’s a little bit of it.

That’s to say, we launched that campaign also in 2014—I have a timeline of it written up somewhere that I’ll send you in case I mess up any of the dates—but on the campaign, I think it may be officially launched in 2013 or we started working on it in 2013 we’d gotten a list of the University’s investments, and then throughout those years, we’re very much trying to make sure that we had a presence in all the different schools of the University.

RA: I’m curious about what student engagement was like then? I know that you had a lot of political education events, and Spec and Bwog have pretty extensive coverage of your work, but I’m curious about what it looked like for students to be involved, and how much of it was your group leading the campaign?

ARS: You mean student engagement, like us as student organizers, engaging other students, right?

RA: Yes, yes.

ARS: Yeah, so just a little bit about our structure. So there was Students Against Mass Incarceration that had its leadership body, and that was an all Black student group. And then the prison divest campaign was kind of an offshoot of that that had a broader like multiracial core organizing group that was kind of leading and coordinating things and determining our strategy. And then we had lots of, lots of other people involved. I would say there were like hundreds of students who were actively involved in organizing in the campaign at various points. And we did really regular teach-ins on issues. So we had a kind of standard thing where we talk about the private prison industry, we put that in context, and then we talk about the University’s investments. We did a lot of class wraps. So I think at some point, like every day of the week, we were sending someone to some professors’ class to speak to them about our campaign. You

know, sometimes we'd be given a whole class to engage students in this debate, sometimes we'd be given 10 minutes. But we had a really—we would go through the course catalog and email any professor we thought might be sympathetic, to see if they'd give us space, or just see if there were students in a class where they could maybe ask because they were in it in a certain program.

So speaking to classes was one thing we did. We did a similar thing with student clubs. So there was a very long list of other student organizations that signed on. And I think our general principle was like, we don't just want to be kind of preaching to the choir, we're going to try to reach the broadest net of groups that we can, because we think that's going to be the most strategic thing to win the support we need to make a change in the University, and then also to bring people along with us. So, we got a lot of support across schools. I remember the Black Law Students really jumped in and wanted to support at some point, there was a lot of support from the School of Social Work. And, you know, then we were presenting to like the College Dems, which maybe weren't all like activist students, but were a part of something where they were involved and that was a path to engage students in a conversation. So that was one thing.

And then I think we tried to also be doing activities that were kind of more public, where we had a maybe [less] captive audience. So we tabled—yeah, we tabled in the main walkway on campus, when it was warm enough out, we would table in Lerner. We had a pretty robust—like, every day there was outreach happening, and we had kind of bi-weekly meetings that just anyone could come to who wanted to get involved. And that was always like the main thing we had folks sign-up for. We would do a short training on how to have conversations about it. We had flyers, and there was a schedule for the week of things to sign up for where you could do that type of outreach, lots of stuff. At some point we had a big petition that was a way that people could sign on and take action. And then I think we tried to be intentional about building relationships with students who were in the campus media, who wanted to cover it; in student government who wanted to push it forward in that space because we knew we needed that. And, yeah, that's kind of some of the student engagement efforts, we're trying to talk to everybody.

RA: And what kinds of groups were you working with outside of campus? I was listening to an interview that Kelsey [Kitzke] did with Dunni [Odeyumi], and she was talking about how you worked in coalition with people in the community who were protesting gentrification in the area as well—in Manhattanville most specifically. So if you could talk a little bit more about that work too.

ARS: Yeah, that's a super important part of the story. So in 2014, Columbia collaborated with the NYPD—well I mean, the NYPD led, but Columbia collaborated with them to lead these big raids on the Grant and Manhattanville housing projects, which are just a couple blocks north of campus. And the NYPD was kind of bragging that these were the largest gang raids in NYPD history. Columbia sent an email to all of its students congratulating them. And what they had done was they had essentially built on a multi-year investigation of all the young people that lived in public housing in this area and waited for many of them to all turn 18, and then conducted a raid where they arrested 120, I think around there, Black and Latino young men. It

was like almost all the young men of that age in those housing projects. And a part of the story of that was—and so our political analysis is if you criminalize a neighborhood, you can create a story that then justifies gentrifying and displacing people in that neighborhood. And that is a part of what we have seen play out with Columbia's expansion. I mean, every time that I'm back in New York and I go up there, it's like this is a totally different neighborhood. There are just like massive glass buildings that weren't there before and all of that. And that's encapsulating these two housing projects and this community that you know exists in West Harlem.

But part of the story of how they did those raids was that four years earlier, a young woman had been killed, kind of shot and caught in the crossfire of a conflict between some really young boys, like 14 year olds. And I think the criminalization was really like elevating what was conflict between teenagers who, like, did enact violence, but probably needed something other than all of their peers being arrested four years later. And her father was actually a really—Taylonn Murphy—really incredible community leader who had done youth mentorship, and since then has done even more work in his community. He had worked to go through some kind of restorative justice [process] with the mother of the person that killed his daughter. And just done all this really beautiful work to bring together the parents of young people who were criminalized and young people who were killed due to community violence, to think about what's a different way that we can approach this problem. So that had been going on, and the police department had really manipulated his daughter's story and used it to justify this criminalization against his desire.

And so anyways, I'm kind of going off, but that's Taylonn. I eventually got very close with him. And he really worked to bring some of the students, after those raids happened, into broader community with some of the other community efforts that had been happening in West Harlem. And there was—also what kind of came together, there had been a coalition against gentrification group that a number of students were a part of. And so particularly once those raids happened, there were some big like community meetings that brought together students, parents, residents, Taylonn was a part of that, to really talk about how do we not let this idea of student safety, because that was a big part of the story too, be weaponized against other people in the community. And so those were efforts that were kind of going on around the same time. I think we had always hoped that the divestment work, especially once we won, could feed into a bigger fight against gentrification in our neighborhood and in some ways it did, and in some ways it was just a bigger fight in terms of what we were up against. And yeah, I wish that we'd been able to win more, but the community that was built was really beautiful. And yeah, Taylonn is someone I'm still in touch with and have learned a lot from,

RA: Yeah and that must have been around the same time that Columbia called NYPD onto campus during the die-in or was that—how did that overlap?

ARS: So we launched our divestment campaign in 2013. The year of 2014 is kind of like the beginning of the height of a Black Lives Matter movement. Also in 2014 were the raids. And then 2015 there were really massive Black student protests on campuses all across the country, and we were one of them. And so I believe it was in 2015 that we did a big action. There's a video somewhere that's the spectator made of us talking about this action at the big tree lighting ceremony that happens. And so there were a number of elements to it. We had students like all

throughout the crowd passing out flyers about our campaign, about what was going on in the world in terms of anti-Black police killings. And we were able to have a student—we convinced the organizers to let a student sing the song 'Strange Fruit' on the stage. And so as that was happening, we were passing out information, kind of with the story that we're in the midst of this movement, it's having this manifestation here in our city, these raids have happened. We connected it to the murder of Eric Garner that there were big protests around that same, I think, day. So we did that. And there's this moment where they light up all the trees on campus, and there's a countdown, and this massive crowd turns and looks at the trees. And so we coordinated for hundreds of students to do this like die-in in the walkway where the trees would be lit up. And so the trees were lit up, the crowd turns, and then you audibly hear like a gasp, because we had prepped all these students to lay down and were holding kind of prop tombstones as a part of the protest, calling out people who've been killed by police violence, people who died in the custody of some of the private prison companies that we were targeting, and different pieces of information about the campaign that we were running. So it was a really emotionally powerful moment, and that lasted for some minutes, and then we stood up and started chanting and protested in the street. And a lot of people who were just there for the tree lighting left the celebration of it and joined our protest.

I mean, they did call NYPD. They were present. We did take the street. It wasn't a super disruptive—I mean, we went like half a block on 116 and then down 114th Street, which was like the block that the IRC was on. I was like, this is, like, our street. And held that block for a while. And NYPD was present, but there was no big confrontation like some of the things that we saw happen to students on campus last year, they were just there. And then eventually, this was when the protests around the murder of Eric Garner were happening in New York City, so then we took a big group of students down on a train downtown to those protests that night.

RA: And what was the process of deciding at what point escalation was necessary? Because I know that, you know, working with administrators, there's a very bureaucratic process and something that they ask you to kind of cohere to, and it's like they try to prolong as long as possible. And I know that the work with the ACSRI was, it took a while and had seemingly some hiatuses. So what was it like to balance the bureaucratic process with student engagement and political education in parallel?

ARS: So we knew that we were going to have to employ multiple strategies to win our campaign, but also to meet our campaign goals which were bigger than just divestment. So—I promise I'll answer your question—

RA: Take your time.

ARS: —so we found out that Columbia had investments in the private prison industry. We thought this was a strategic thing to make the broader movement that we're a part of relevant on campus, and we're specifically targeting—they were invested in Corrections Corporation of America, which is now called CoreCivic, which is the largest at the time and first in the United States private prison company that has been responsible for drafting many of, and pushing forward many of the horrible laws that we see in this country that have fueled mass

incarceration: truth in sentencing, three strikes laws, they were at there's something called the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), which is a conservative kind of think tank, go between organization that in many ways, laid the groundwork for this far right-wing political movement that we're seeing play out in a national scale now. And so ALEC would bring together corporations like these private prison companies and conservative lawmakers to come and conspire around how they would, you know in the case of the issue we were working on, criminalize, but in other areas, you know, reduce taxes on corporations, deregulate capitalism, create more space for far-right, free market version of capitalism that guts the public good. So that was a lot of our political education, it was talking about ALEC and the roots of why do we see mass incarceration? Why is there so much racialized policing, and how does that fit into a bigger story and effort to push the country to the right and uphold the most exploitative version of capitalist society? So anyways, that's why we thought our campaign mattered.

And we knew that the 10 million dollars that Columbia has invested in private prison companies, 1) is a drop in the bucket of Columbia University's endowment and 2) a drop in the bucket of the bottom line of these corporations. But—we believed in running campaigns with real demands to make a material change. We had hoped that we would be a part of a bigger movement around prison divestment that might have some material impact, but I did always see it as—the goal is to win institutions over to taking a better stance on issues that matter. And even if we think the institution itself has its values twisted, we can use that institution's desire to be respected as like [a] moral, educational institution in society. If we can make an investment in a private prison company as socially toxic as it should be, then we can contribute to a movement in society where that's something that mainstream institutions don't want to be a part of. So that was kind of our theory of change. The second company that Columbia was invested in was G4S which is a multinational security company that has a presence here in the US, but also operates some of the technology and checkpoints in occupied Palestine and provided some surveillance technology, I believe, to prisons in Palestine. So that was a part of the story and the campaign that we were running too. So Black and Palestinian solidarity was a really special and important part of it.

And so we knew that we both would have to engage in the University's bureaucratic processes. There was this advisory council we had to present to. They gave us the runaround. I mean, we gave like just—we were very well researched students, we had a lot of students who were putting in a lot of research capacity, and we pulled in other legal scholars from other institutions to make certain arguments; we were referencing human rights lawsuits that had been filed against these companies because the University's criteria was that you had to prove that whatever it was that was immoral or against the University's values was not possible to be reformed, that it was inherent to whatever that thing was. So we knew we had to engage in that if we wanted a chance in winning, we had to go through their process, even if we knew they were giving us the runaround. But we knew that the point was never to do it quietly. The point was to make a bigger statement. And that would mean—and so, yeah, we did protest. We protested for eight months before President Bollinger met with us, and so we knew we had to make noise to get enough attention to even get those meetings. We did one really big protest in, at the time President Bollinger was teaching a class on the first amendment, which is so deeply... ironic feels like not the right word, but just to think about what the institution has claimed to promote in the world with what's going on now is a lot to sit with, as we're seeing so

much repression of that now, so much more than we experienced. But we did a protest where we lined the halls of the building where President Bol—I mean, we had been sending emails, trying to get a meeting, being given the runaround by his staff, for a whole semester, we had all the student groups that had signed on to our campaign take a photo with their membership or their leadership saying, ‘we support prison divestment, please meet with us.’ Like every single day, a student group was going to his office, dropping off their photo, requesting, and there was like, the stack was getting bigger. So, you know, we were showing that we were in good faith engaging in the University. We were in good faith building more and more support on the campus. Another one of their criteria was we had to show that people in the University community across schools, so not just undergraduates, cared about this issue. And I think that was criteria that pushed us, but I think it was good for organizing, and it's good organizing to think about bringing in all the stakeholders that your target might care about what they think.

So we did that. And then we kind of built up to this protest. So we're showing [that] we're engaging in good faith, and then doing kind of more bold things to even just get a meeting. We lined the halls of his class. It was like a silent protest. We were always really intentional about—we wanted to be able to maintain the moral high ground, like, we don't ever want this to become a story about debating the tactics that we're using. We want it to be seen as we're the ones who are reasonable. We are the ones that are promoting the obvious, humane choice. And we want to create a situation where our tactics aren't going to distract from the issue at hand. Because at the end of the day, this isn't about us as students, this is about people who are languishing in private prisons that our university is profiting from. So we were intentional about that.

We confronted him as he—there's a video of him, kind of with his head down, walking past all these students who have facts about people who died in private prisons, about horrible human rights abuses that they have overseen. He has to walk past all of these signs, ‘Why won't you meet with us?’ And then finally, at the end, he gets to the door of his class, and we have a student being like, ‘We've tried to meet with you for eight months. This is an important issue. Will you finally do it?’ And he was like, ‘Okay, fine, yes.’ And caught it on video and spread it all over. And because we documented it and it had this kind of tone to it, I think he had to meet with us and. And that was in his—we made it in his best interest or else he looks like a crappy administrator, which obviously sometimes people in power make those decisions. But that's what we did there.

And then the other thing is, we knew that this was about winning lots of people over to a different world view. I mean there were so many students who were at Columbia doing whatever they were there to do professionally, who got involved in this campaign, and I believe it's changed like the lens that they have in their careers and in the world forever. And I'm really proud of being a part of something that did take that approach, where we did always want people—even if they weren't totally there, had never heard of abolition or what have you, to be brought in, and whether you are going to school for law or social work, or we're just an undergraduate student trying to figure out what path to take. I think it offered us all a lens to think critically about whatever we do in the world, how are we doing it in the most just way? And thinking critically about that.

So that's kind of how we thought about escalation. I think we always wanted to sort of build on—yeah, we wanted to build in a way. And like, you know, the tree lighting that was disruptive, but it wasn't disruptive for disruptive sake. And just like I described, we were really

careful about—we wanted to escalate in ways that would win people over. We wanted to escalate in ways that would put strategic pressure and kind of make these like gotcha moments for people in power on the campus. And that would be emotional, that would bring people into—like this is not some philosophical debate in a literary humanities class. Like this is about real people's lives, and there's something at stake, and we want to bring people into the emotional stakes of that.

There was a point where we felt like our campaign was stalling. We had like won—we were close to winning or we had already won the resolution in the University Senate. We'd gotten some meetings with Bollinger, and the next thing was that he had to bring it up to the board to make a vote. That was the next step in the process, and we just didn't know if that was going to happen. And so we decided to stage a sit-in in Low [Library] outside of his office. And it didn't—I think that we expected to be, like, kicked out of the building, or for there to be some confrontation. We expected it to be a moment, and it just wasn't it. They just let us sit there—

RA: I don't want to interrupt but I know there's less than a minute left, so if you have a bit more time could we join another Zoom link?

ASR: Yeah, sure. I'll jump over.

[Session ends]

[Next session begins]

RA: I think you were talking about the sit-in, at Low?

ASR: That was just a lesson. They just waited us out. And it was fine. We did a big—you know, lots of students came, we did a kind of full day of political education. And it was that for the students who were involved. But at that point we'd been going for a while, and they knew that we were kind of good at framing things in a way that played in our favor, and they just waited us out. And that was fine, and we did other things after that. But you know, sometimes you do something with the goal of kind of escalating and creating a moment, and it doesn't always happen. I think if they had like kicked us out of the building, and we would have been able to say, like, 'Oh, we've done all of these things,' like that would have played in our favor, and that's what we were kind of trying to provoke, and it just didn't happen. But, yeah, that's one lesson. Yeah, and I think we were a little disappointed, but I think at that point we had, in addition to the protest stuff, we had built so much popular support on the campus. We had professors, we had, at that point, like guest lecturers were coming to campus and calling out our campaign and endorsing it while they were there, it was kind of being discussed in every corner of the University. And so even though the protest moment didn't escalate in that way, we had created an environment and brought enough people along that I think the University was being confronted with it in enough other ways that they were going to have to do something.

RA: Right, yeah, there was seemingly no escape for administrators, which is an amazing feat.

You mentioned a little bit about how divestment was a part of the overall goal of your campaign. So could you talk a little bit more about, maybe what, what the broader vision was, or what you had hoped would, what work had hoped would have continued after your time at Columbia?

ARS: And I mean, divestment was our primary demand. I think we were clear that we can't have too long of a list of demands—like we want to stay focused on one thing and we'll tell the story of how it's connected to other stuff. But this is the specific material thing we want to win here. But the goal of doing that is to make the institution take what's going to be seen as like a moral stance, and to bring lots of people along with us. And, I mean, it was. You know, it was. There was a massive movement happening around policing and prisons in this country that this was a part of. I think there's no—I don't think our campaign could have or would have happened in a vacuum if it wasn't in conversation with this massive movement, with this movement around policing, this movement around Black liberation that was really alive at the time. And I think in the goals that we had listed out that we'd go through and all of our kind of student strategy meetings that contribute to the broader movement around policing and prisons was one of them. And I do think we did that, and like I mentioned, I was involved in off-campus organizing too. Most of us, or all of us who were core organizers for sure, graduated and went on to do other important organizing work in our communities that where we've won and lost many times, but I think we're learned and trained up and had this experience of organizing on campus that equipped us to do some of that work. And I think that was a really important part of the impact.

In terms of the anti-gentrification fight, you know, if you kind of like power map a university, just as much as it's like an educational institution, it's also kind of like a real estate company. Columbia, when I was there, I don't know if this fact is still the case, but was the second largest landowner in New York City, and that's nuts. Yeah. In New York City? That's a massive amount of capital. And, you know, for them to give us a win on private prison divestment, I think was really important to our broader movement. And I think it was more important as a win for our broader movement than it was going to be harmful to Columbia. And I think that's like, where we can play out why certain fights we might be able to win a little bit more and other fights where it's going to be harder. Unlike the organizing that's happening... I think, yeah, I don't know why Columbia's Zionist donor base didn't mobilize as hard as they could have around our campaign. Maybe because it wasn't only about Palestine. But it was certainly about Palestine. But we did not have a super organized opposition. It came—there was certainly some Zionist opposition to our campaign. But it was not as powerful as us. And so I think if there's like a clear opposition that whatever institution cares about that has money or power or whatever that's going to be... you know, if the University had a donor base of private prison lobbyists or something that we're calling them constantly, we might have been a different story. And if it was something bigger than 10 million stocks that they owned, but like a real estate plan that was going to power the capital of the University, you know, it would have been a different story in terms of what we're up against. And I think that's just a part of how when we think about—yeah, when we think about our organizing, it's important to have a map of the power at stake. And I think that's why the anti gentrification fight was harder than being able to win something on divestment, but I think we did our best to make it a bridge and to make divestment, to use that as a way to at least resist what was going on and build community in the process, even if we weren't going to be able to stop it. And what else do I say? Yeah, it changed

us as people, and I think that's a good part of the big win of it, too. And yeah, anyway, I'm grateful to tell a story to folks that are organizing now.

RA: Yeah, thank you for that. I'm curious about how you think it changed you as people, and what the sort of community of the group was like?

ARS: Yeah, there were students involved in this campaign of a lot of different backgrounds and across a lot of different schools. There were formerly incarcerated students involved. There were older students involved. There were students who were coming together across different backgrounds involved. And it certainly started out as a Black-lead student effort and came out of Black student organizing. And you know, we needed a broader coalition than just that and wanted more people involved, but that's an important part of it. And, yeah, I think that for us as young people to find a place where we could—yeah, so I'm an organizer. I have helped build community organizations that have run national and local campaigns out in the world. I have worked in progressive politics. I've done elections work and but all work that in my mind is about bringing together people who alone don't have a lot of power to work together to make the world a little more equitable and just, oftentimes up against big odds. And that has led me to be a part of lots of really big, powerful things, some things where we won some really big stuff, some things where we really changed what was on the table but didn't quite win the goal that we were after in a material sense. And I think having been a young person, that was a part of something with other young people where we not just protested something, but really like came together and put together a strategy to use people power to win something and see that those fundamental things of organizing actually can work. It's not to say always will, but it does. To have that experience as I was coming of age as a young person, I think has—is something that just like fortifies me in being able to do bigger and harder things where the odds are maybe up against us, because that was one early experience where I saw it work. I saw people on our own didn't have a lot of power, go up against a powerful institution and win. And I think I probably would have gotten that even if we didn't get the University to divest, but it certainly helped. And I think that that type of story is true for other folks that were involved, too.

RA: Yeah, I think that really resonates with me as well, especially right now. Yeah, but I guess before we wrap up, is there anything else that we didn't talk about that you'd like to mention?

ARS: I think that's kind of the story of the Prison Divest campaign. I hope wasn't too scattered. I've tried to tell a story in other places in the past to students. And I think the main thing I want to say is I just am really struck by the bravery of student activists and organizers in the past couple of years who stood up against the University's complicity in the genocide. I know students have taken a wide range of enormous risk and are facing an enormous amount of repression that is so much bigger than the University even, and to see the Trump administration kind of use it as a testing ground for politically motivated deportation and targeting is really awful. And I know my generation of alums are very much following and have the backs of students now, and I don't know exactly what it looks like to be in solidarity, but I feel really connected to my own experience of standing up as a young person. And I just, I see the bravery of young people

who've done that now and are facing really big consequences. And yeah, I just kind of want to say, like we've got y'all's' back, across the generations.