

Kris Turner:

Hello and welcome back to Wisconsin Law in Action, a podcast where we discuss new and forthcoming scholarship with University of Wisconsin Law School professors. I'm your host, Kris Turner, and my guest today is Professor Joshua Braver. Professor Braver's scholarship explores what happens when law and morality come into conflict and how to challenge unjust rules responsibly. His recent paper, *Disobeying Lawful But Unethical Orders in the Army*, looks at the ethics of disobedience in the military. And his 2023 book, *We, the Mediated People*, examines how ordinary citizens in South America have taken on the task of rewriting their country's constitutions, sometimes by breaking the law to do it. Professor Braver joins us today to talk about his research, the delicate art of principle disobedience within legal and ethical frameworks and how the tension between legal authority and moral legitimacy threads through both projects.

Thank you very much for joining the podcast today, Professor Braver.

Joshua Braver:

Thank you so much for having me, Kris.

Kris Turner:

Of course, I'm looking forward to our discussion. So let's just dive right into it. You said before that all scholarship is semi-autobiographical. Where does your own interest in disobedience come from? Was there any moment in your own experience that first got you thinking about rule breaking in a very serious way?

Joshua Braver:

Yeah, I think I was a disobedient child, my poor parents, especially like a lot of young kids around the junior high age, around early teenage years, 13, 14, 15. And just kind of thought if there was a rule that was in the way of what I thought was right and just, that I should pay it no mind or heed. And that was sometimes very self-indulgent and narcissistic, and sometimes I was wrong about that rule. And sometimes even if the rule was wrong, having some rules was more important than whether the rule was right or wrong. The breaking of the rule was even more destructive than the rule itself.

So that's a little abstract, but basically in junior high, I was a little bit of a disaster and I had very good parents, luckily, who were patient about it. And so I learned to think about carefully, the lesson I took away was not all rules are great, all laws are the best, but to be smart and thoughtful and careful about when and how you break rules. And I'm nowhere near the stature of these figures, but that's kind of the same attitude of people dealing with much more substantial injustices than I was, of Martin Luther King and Gandhi, really being careful about narcissism, self-indulgence, and collateral consequences when you take on a system that's responsible for order in a society or in an institution.

Kris Turner:

You can certainly draw those parallels through just everyday life or just being a teenager that's going through these kind of troubles that you mentioned. I definitely had a bit of a punk rock background or history that I might feel we might have some similarities there for a little while as well.

But let's bring it up to the present day and talk about some of your current projects that you've been writing on. In your recent paper on the military, you ask when an officer might have to disobey a lawful but unethical order. How did this topic first come onto your radar?

Joshua Braver:

The topic first came out of my radar in the summer of 2020. At that time, Washington, DC was wracked by a civil disturbance, much of it peaceful protest, but there was significant property damage and even a threat to the integrity of the White House at that time. There was a fire burning across and people pushing on the lines. I don't want to exaggerate the danger by any means, but there was cause for concern. And then and now President Trump thought about invoking the Insurrection Act, which is the necessary legal authority if you're going to send the military onto America streets.

So Trump is considering in response to these disturbances, deploying the military, an extraordinary act. And Mark Milley released a memo, that was the Joint Chairman of the Chiefs of Staff telling soldiers, implying to them that they should disobey. And he was invoking the Constitution and the values of the Constitution. At the same time, he was not saying it was an illegal order. And in fact, later he goes to Congress and testifies saying that for the President to invoke the Insurrection Act, all he has to yell is insurrection three times. So there's this kind of bizarre thing where he's saying, remember your oath to the Constitution to disobey a lawful order. That would be something that's lawful but unconstitutional, which is a paradox or maybe just nonsense for us as lawyers.

And so I started thinking, where's this coming from from Millie? Is this just his own bizarre interpretation of the officer's relationship to the Constitution, the military officer's relationship, or is this rooted in something deeper and that has more wider purchase than just Mark Milley?

Kris Turner:

Your paper is about lawful but unethical orders. What do you mean by unethical?

Joshua Braver:

I mean, it's a violation of our professional ethics. So a few buildings down from me, there's the philosophy department and they teach Ethics 101, Moral Philosophy 101, and that's about morality in general, a morality that each and every person as an individual has to follow. But professional ethics are different. Professional ethics are about we as a doctor or as a lawyer or as I'll talk about, as a military officer, what are the unique responsibilities that are a part of that profession? And that will allow us to do things that in other contexts we normally wouldn't be able to do. As a military officer, you kill people. That would normally be immoral. As a lawyer, the way you treat someone on the stand can often be brutal and very unpleasant. And the interesting question that I'm thinking about in terms of a lawful but unethical order is when you have this professional role, what are you supposed to do when there's a conflict between the law and your professional responsibilities?

And we as lawyers are somewhat familiar with this and so too are doctors. And I can tell you for the doctors, the American Medical Association Code, it says when this conflict presents itself, "Ultimately, ethical responsibilities should supersede legal duties." If you're a doctor and there's a law that violates your responsibility to the patient, you have to just violate that law. For lawyers, it's different. The ABA, it says as an officer of the court, you've got to just follow the law even if it violates a zealous representation of the client.

And so the story I'm trying to tell is what about for army officers? What is the nature of their response?

Kris Turner:

So what is that dilemma for military officers when they receive a lawful but unethical order?

Joshua Braver:

Traditionally, there's not a good answer, unlike for the doctors and the lawyers about what they're supposed to do. And that's because both the legality of an order, the fact that the order is lawful, and the ethics of an order really pull very tightly for a military officer. So on the one hand, obedience is so central

to the military. It's a matter of life and death. It's what's necessary to fight and win our nation's wars. And it's also a part of civilian control of the military. That order, no matter where it starts, goes all the way up to the President of the United States who's elected in a way that an enlisted soldier or an officer just isn't. It has this kind of democratic legitimacy. So that's why you got to obey the order.

On the other hand, and I think this is not well understood outside the military, is there's this idea of professional responsibility. They really believe themselves, in ways that I think even lawyers don't believe themselves today to be, to be professionals and to be bound by this ethic and that they're experts who are bound by professional code. And they believe, and I think they're right about this, that if you don't follow this professional code, then the military can't function in a society, that it will lose its legitimacy.

And so that's classically about non-partisanship. For the military really to be an institution that's trusted by the general public, an institution that has the ability to overthrow the government, it's a constant threat, and that can really hurt civilians, that has disproportionate firepower, that no police force, even with the newly militarized police forces we have today, for them to be trusted, they have to be nonpartisan and that they need to stick to their expertise. And that expertise is in war fighting, not say domestic policing.

So they're stuck in a contradiction because when it's a lawful but unethical order, the law says you must obey and their ethical code says, you must disobey.

And just one last beat on this, the classic text in political science and for the military itself, I can't tell you how many times I've been told this is by military officers, by people at the top ranks, this is our Bible. It's taken more seriously by the military than by political scientists, even though it is considered the classic in political science. People have lots and lots and lots of problems with it. So any political scientist listening, I'm aware of that.

But what Sam Huntington says, Sam Huntington's the soldier in the state and he's dealing with Hitler and the generals and he says they're in such a dilemma, because on the one hand, they have to obey Hitler's orders. On the other hand, those orders are unethical because they're dismembering the military, because they're doing ideological litmus tests to determine who gets jobs rather than on the basis of merit. And he says, "The generals will resign, they'll sign back up, they'll obey, they'll disobey." And he says, "The only person who could really come to some kind of resolution was a general who joined his regiment on the battlefield and threw himself into enemy fire." He killed himself. He killed himself as a member of the German army, poetic suicide.

And that poetic resolution is obviously not what you can teach at a service academy or an ROTC. It's profound and disturbing, but I am trying to come up with another solution that's short of it's impossible or always obey or always disobey.

Kris Turner:

The stakes are high. There are contradictions, there are so many different philosophies here. So I think this all leads to my next question is, what is your solution?

Joshua Braver:

Yeah. My solution is that you should only disobey a lawful but unethical order if it's patently unethical, where it's a flagrant violation of the military code. And that violation is something that's a matter of a community of practice, a group of experts kind of consensus.

In the military, they have professional journals, just like they do for doctors, just like to some extent they do for lawyers, and they're constantly hashing out these problems, thinking them through, talking about dilemmas. That's what they're doing in classes. And so they debate these ideas. And there are some places where people disagree. People don't really know whether it's ethical or not. It's something they're going to continue to contest and debate.

But there are other areas where there is a high level of consensus, where everybody understands if you go to a rally in your uniform, that is a violation of the nonpartisan ethic. When Mark Milley, it's kind of similar, went to Lafayette Square for a photo op with Donald Trump in the middle of the 2020 civil disturbances, everybody in the military establishment was like, "This is a huge mistake. What are you doing? Why did you do this?" And he issued an apology. Patent violation of the military ethic. And it's those cases in which you have to disobey when the possibility of obedience can be such a fundamental threat to the military's legitimacy and to the survival of democracy.

But short of that, you have to obey. You have to obey because you need to protect civilian control of the military and because it will often be a dangerous situation in which lives are at risk. And so I can't resolve the contradiction, but I can mitigate it. I can make it less egregious. I can make the moments at which we're going to confront it less frequent and less severe.

Kris Turner:

I think I've started to hear this in some of your answers already, but you've mentioned in your research that you have a lot of respect for the military's own approach to ethics. What stood out to you most about how these soldiers and officers think about these issues?

Joshua Braver:

That they take them very seriously. They're very aware of them, that they do not think they're easy answers and they're working hard to come to a resolution. And the other thing that's impressive about them is it's really their butts that are on the line. And they, I think would not be doing this, especially the ones who are further along in their career, if they didn't really believe in these professional ethics and these professional norms and their responsibilities. And so the level of dedication and intellect is inspiring and awesome.

Kris Turner:

The word dedication is what came to my mind while you're answering that question. It sounds like that's something where people have dedicated their lives to these ideals and they are standing by them, or at least trying to resolve these contradictions and these concerns.

I want to shift gears just a little bit because recently you also published your book, *We, The Mediated People*, which takes us to a different context, South America, where ordinary people have taken it upon themselves to rewrite constitutions even when doing so is technically illegal. What drew you to that subject?

Joshua Braver:

You can see there's a line, a through line in my work, which is about trying to discipline and channel illegality. And again, it comes from a similar school of hard knocks thinking through in my own life, what's the best way to handle situations where I might disagree, disagree with authority.

And the other thing I'll say is I was originally interested in the French Revolution and what I figured out about South America is that the French Revolution happened in 1791, there's another Constitution, 1793, there's another one in 1795, but the stuff happening in South America is like now. It's like today, and they're dealing with the exact same problems and thinking about them with the exact same vocabulary. And so that opportunity to talk with a modern day James Madisons and Alexander Hamiltons who are thinking through what does it mean that if people make a constitution, in settings that are similar and also different to what the Founding Fathers confronted, was just a wonderful opportunity when it realized to me that that was possible.

Kris Turner:

Continuing to draw those parallels, these are moments of illegal constitution making. When you were reading and studying about that, what did you learn about the strengths and limits of democratic systems?

Joshua Braver:

The issue with democratic systems is always that you might have people who are a majority who don't want to follow the law, laws that are necessary sometimes to just channel an orderly way of confronting a problem and laws that are sometimes necessary to protect minorities. In the countries I studied, this was before Donald Trump in a lot of these countries but not all of them, but it's very similar to what we've seen with Trump, there are a bunch of people who think the system is completely broken, corrupt, and want to trash it. And the problem is is that that kind of breaking of rules and laws can lead to chaos and can lead to authoritarianism.

Kris Turner:

And that kind of leads us back to the common threads between your book and your work on military ethics about how obedience to law might actually threaten justice sometimes. Do you see these projects as part of the same conversation?

Joshua Braver:

Absolutely. So another situation that might help illustrate this is the context of civil disobedience. All three of these are places where there's some need to violate the law, but the question is when and how. And the answer about when and how will vary radically by context.

In the civil disobedience context, we are most familiar with this, it's an important part of American history, Martin Luther King said, "If you're going to disobey a law, you must do so openly, cheerfully," he says, "Even lovingly, but accept punishment." When you accept punishment, even though you violated the law, at the same time you've kind of vindicated a part of it. You've said, "I recognize the validity of the legal system judging the illegality of what I did." And so what I try to do is bring a similar place where you can respect law at its outer boundaries as one political theorist puts it. And I do it in the context of constitution making and I do it in the context of disobeying lawful but unethical orders.

The one thing I'll add to the previous answer I had about lawful but unethical orders that relates to civil disobedience is that there is an ideology among quite a few people, and it's something I have to do more research on, but that if you disobey a lawful but unethical order, just like with Martin Luther King or just like with civil disobedience, you don't lie about it. You don't hide it. You say, "I want you to know, commanding officer, that I disobeyed this order because I think it violates professional military ethics."

And then the idea is, is the Army going to prosecute you for this? If you go to a court-martial, a panel of your peers, people who have raised it and breathe every day in and out the set of professional ethics with you both share, if you really have violated it within the consensus that I spoke about, if it's against an order that's patently unethical, then you're going to be judged by that professional community. It becomes not only a legal proceeding, but something kind of similar to a professional disbarment. And if you're right, at least the thinking goes, even if you violated the law, there'll be a kind of professional nullification.

So the formula is you can disobey if it's patently unethical. That has to be patently unethical, not just according to your judgment, but according to the judgment of the profession as a whole, and that you do so openly and subject yourself to punishment, possibly at a court-martial. And the hope is that at a court-martial, you may actually be vindicated.

Kris Turner:

What a wonderful explanation. That really laid it clearly out for me after reading through all your work. I really appreciate that.

But one thing that has stood out both in this interview and in your work is how you blend philosophical questions with the real world stories of people that live through them that we're living through today and in the past 5, 10 years or so. How do you blend these two? How do you strike the balance between theory and lived experience?

Joshua Braver:

My work is inductive. I start not from a grand philosophical premise and then try to work things through from there. I start from people's real life experiences, their real life struggles, and I find that there's incredible insight in those struggles.

What I add to the formula is that if you're constitution maker, if you're a military officer, when you're making these decisions, you are overwhelmed with problems. And not just the problem I care about, but a hundred other problems as well. So your reflashes of insight, your interesting remark, it's often inchoate, nascent, underdeveloped. And so my job here is to take that idea and fully flesh out its implications and even maybe alter or rethink or modify it on the edges.

And so I never claim with these ideas that they are the grand solution to the philosophical problem of say lawful but unethical orders. I really do think that tension is irresolvable. But what I've done is find the best solution or worked with the best insights on hand and try to refine them, shape them, buff them up so that the problem is less severe than it was before.

Kris Turner:

And the people you are getting these experiences from, you've talked to people who haven't had to make these hard decisions, soldiers, civic leaders. What have those conversations taught you about how people think through the questions of right and wrong?

Joshua Braver:

It's taught me that they think about it a lot, that they think about it at a particularly higher register than I guess I would've realized. I'm an academic and I'm like, woo, theory, let's go. Let's talk about it. They are thinking about it in really profound and deep ways, which is encouraging to me in a shallow way, just because it means my work, I hope, has some kind of mild importance, but also because it's encouraging to me that people with a great deal of power are taking that power very seriously. Not all of them, I should say, but far more than I would've realized before.

Going back to your question before for a second, part of the reason why it's great to ground things in people's real experiences too, is it means that my answer that I offer at the end, hopefully will actually be connected to, reflect, and maybe even useful to people on the ground. I believe in the academic pursuit of truth, I believe in all kinds of approaches in academic scholarship, but for me at least, I have perhaps a fantasy or at least a hope that because I'm grounding my work in the vocabulary language and lived experiences of real people, that there's some possibility that my work might actually help those real people, that my work actually connects in a real way with the problems that they're confronting.

Kris Turner:

The name of this podcast is Law in Action or Wisconsin Law in Action. I think that your work is definitely falling in line with that and going to not just the borders of the state of Wisconsin, but beyond that to really have people think about these ideas and these issues. So I think it is doing exactly as you just described.

You have a couple of newer pieces out I want to touch on for sure before we let you go for the day. What do you think of the courts invoking the Whiskey Rebellion as precedent for President Trump's deployment of the National Guard?

Joshua Braver:

Thanks, Kris. I have a piece up in Lawfare about this, and what's going on in California, Chicago, Portland has certain superficial similarities with the Whiskey Rebellion that happened in the founding era. All of these cases involve federal officials trying to execute the law. In the case today, it's deportations, it's immigration law. And in the case of the Whiskey Rebellion, people may be vaguely familiar with this, it was a tax on whiskey, and in both places there is significant resistance on the ground. What happened in the Whiskey Rebellion is that they eventually sent in the militia to put down this rebellion. And so the natural instinct for some of the courts who are, this is the Ninth Circuit, particularly Judge Nelson's concurrence, is to say, "Well, if we could do it in the Whiskey Rebellion for a whiskey tax, why can't we do the same thing for obstruction of immigration?"

And there are at least two or three problems with that. And what I did in my work to discover these problems is, other people have written about the Whiskey Rebellion from an historical perspective but they really haven't done it from a legal perspective, from the perspective of legal history. And so I went back through all the letters of the main actors and saw what they did.

And the first thing to say is the Whiskey Rebellion, I don't mean to play down really the significant disturbances happening today, I think that's too easy to do. In Portland, they shut down the ICE facility for three whole weeks. But what happened in the Whiskey Rebellion was multiple tarrings and featherings, far more great deal of violence towards federal officials. They would tar and feather them and then they would tie them up overnight. They would burn down inns that had federal officials. They lay siege to where one of them lived, a mansion, and resulted in a three-day shootout with multiple fatalities. They took over the militia in the city of Philadelphia and forced it to march against their will. They invoked Robespierre. They were threatening at one point secession. This is a huge problem that even on the most friendly to the Trump administration's interpretation of what's going on in Portland, Chicago, or Los Angeles, far dwarfs it.

And then there are two big problems, which is that the Washington administration repeatedly says this is only as a last resort. The phrase they often use is *dernier*, it's French, a *dernier* resort. And that is from every single member of the cabinet who's thinking this through. Even Alexander Hamilton, who the play is wonderful, was extremely militaristic, extremely anxious to send in the army, not only this time, but in multiple times. He thought there's any obstruction, you slap him down fast. And even though he was like, "Let's send them in now, let's send him in now," he still had to make the case that it was a last resort.

And because of that, they don't send them in the first moment it happens. It's this long elongated process where they amend the whiskey tax to make it less severe, give them the opportunity to change their mind, send in peace commissioners. They exhaust every possible measure and only when that doesn't work, do they end up sending in the militia.

The second thing to notice is, it's not only that they're good people, there's a completely different statutory framework at that time that's so different than the law that exists today. What was called the 1792 Calling Forth Act, it required judicial review. A judge had to certify that it was okay to send in the military. It required that if you were going to use out of state troops, that you needed the consent of Congress. Today, Donald Trump is trying to send in troops into Portland from California and from Texas. I'm skeptical, who knows? I'm skeptical that Congress today would approve that, and there's an expiration date about how long you could use them. I really think if we had the same statute today, it's unlikely, or at least a lot less likely that you would be able to send in troops so casually and so easily. So I think the analogy doesn't hold up very well.

And the last thing I'll say, this is getting a little too far into the weeds, but the actual statute that's governing today is not even a descendant from the earlier statutes that did the Whiskey Rebellion. So that statute has been modified, but there's still a line you can trace from the 1792 statute to what's called today, The Insurrection Act. The statute that's governing today is just from a completely different history, a completely different time, different terms, different words. So it's just such a stretch.

But the last thing I'll say, it's part of a longer project. This is not just a one-off. I really hope to show that there's a longer story to be told, a longer legal history about the domestic deployment of the military, including in the founding era. Just invoking the Whiskey Rebellion is not enough. There's multiple domestic deployments of the military to enforce a House tax, to enforce neutrality acts. The list is not that long, but it's more than any judge or any scholar has quite handled or wrestled with and needs to be wrestled with to put the current Trump context in the right historical perspective.

Some of these precedents do cut in a way that's much friendlier to Trump. The Fries Rebellion was also about attacks, it was about attacks on houses. I'm in there. John Adams was fed up. He did not use the last resort. He sent them in first thing, and that cuts the other way. So we need to think a little more carefully about all of these precedents and study them in some detail.

Kris Turner:

Well, just based on that answer, I look forward to reading this larger project, because it seems like there's a lot of great detail to be mined and to apply to the current situation. So we look forward to having you back on the podcast after that project is finished for sure.

Let's come full circle back to discussing the military ethics. So you have a recent Wall Street Journal piece out where you discussed disobeying military orders and how it is a risk. Tell me more about that.

Joshua Braver:

Yeah, they're in a terrible situation. And while I have tremendous respect for the Democratic lawmakers who released a video, a video that said you can or you must disobey illegal orders, and these are people who served in the military or in the intelligence community, I think that glosses over some of the difficulties. One of the Democratic members says something like the law is clear. And the law is relatively clear, but what's not often clear is whether the actual order you get is legal or not. And if it's egregiously illegal, then yeah, those Democratic lawmakers are right. Go ahead, don't obey the order. But many, many orders, including orders that we would hope they would disobey, it won't be obvious whether they're illegal or not.

And the way the law is set up is that if it's a case where it's ambiguous, the law slants, creates incentives for obedience to these ambiguous legal orders. Because what the law says is, if you're not sure, if you obey, then you're in the clear. If it's not patently illegal, you can presume that the order is legal. On the other hand, if you're unclear, you can disobey if you want, but what the manual of court-martial says is that's at the peril of the subordinate. You disobey, and then if you're taken to a court-martial, the judge will tell you, great legal analysis, you're in the clear. Or no layperson with very little legal training, you are wrong and we're going to punish you accordingly. And the punishment for disobeying an order from a superior commissioned officer can be five years in the brig or in times of war, it can be death.

And so if you're just a rational calculating person, it's not the case as perhaps the Democratic video might say, they say, "You must disobey orders." Actually, no, you don't have to. You must disobey patently illegal orders. Otherwise, all the incentives point towards obedience.

And I happen to agree, by the way, that there might be many orders that are in fact lawful that they should disobey. That's the nature of my work. But I do feel some responsibility in my, at least in so far as people listen to me, in my own public work to be super honest with people, to be candid about the risks that I'm putting them in if they follow my advice, that they're not just going to be in the clear that it's not

something that you must disobey an ambiguously illegal order, but that you probably should, but the risks are going to be very high and you should be aware of them when you make that decision.

Kris Turner:

What do you most hope readers take away from your work?

Joshua Braver:

I hope they take away a sense of the profound responsibility we all have when we make decisions, that we're all political actors, that politics is not nursery, and there will always be unpredictable, scary consequences when we make decisions. And we have some responsibility to try ahead of time to wrestle with and manage those dangers the best we can. And that at the same time, not to be paralyzed by them, that you eventually have to act. Your adversary may not be as principled as you are, which may give them some advantage. So you have to work quickly, but you can't be ruthless about just getting what you want. You have to think about the larger ecological consequences of the world we all live in.

I think you've all heard me on my soapbox about this maybe 10 or 15 times during this podcast. I hope you just enjoy my work more than anything else.

Kris Turner:

That was a great powerful message and one that does resonate both with me as a listener, but also as someone who has read some of your work, it really comes through very powerfully. We'll link out to Professor Braver's scholarship page so you can find all of his work and read it through and absorb it and challenge yourself with it. Thank you very much for joining the podcast today for a fascinating conversation, Professor Braver.

Joshua Braver:

Thank you so much. And I'll say one other thing that I hope people find from my work. The real world when you actually get to talk with people or the past, when you actually get to read people's letters and thoughts are almost always more rich, more complicated, more fraught than the way that our politics or our TikToks are going to actually make them look. Because if you take people at the places that they actually are, in the environments that they actually are, in the past that they lived, they're just so radically different than what you might experience and so much richer than what you might experience through secondhand accounts.

And so at least in my work, I really wrestle with trying to be super honest and candid about the complexities of the past and what that means for the present, even if it doesn't cut in the directions that I personally believe is the right way to go.

Kris Turner:

As a librarian, I love to hear about all the joys and travails of research and historical primary reading that you have done. And again, it shines through a new work. That was Professor Joshua Braver from the University of Wisconsin Law School. You can find his book, *We, The Mediated People* from Oxford University Press, and his recent paper, *Disobeying Lawful But Unethical Orders in the Army* on SSRN. We'll share links to both on our podcast page, as well as links to his Lawfare and Wall Street Journal pieces that were recently published.

Joshua Braver:

I'm grateful for any and all interest that you all have in my work. I should say that the *Disobeying Lawful But Unethical Orders in the Army* on SSRN is very much an early draft. And for a variety of reasons, I'm

not quite ready to post the full, significantly different and rich version that I think many of the things in this discussion I said invoked and covered some of that. And so please stay tuned for the full version, which will be coming out from the Northwestern Law Review, and I'll have it up in March or April.

Kris Turner:

Well, that's great, Professor Braver. Thanks for sharing that, and we'll be sure to share the links once you've updated and published it.

Thank you for listening. This was Wisconsin Law in Action from the University of Wisconsin Law School. To hear more conversations with our faculty about their research and its real-world impact, visit wilawinaction.law.wisc.edu. Stay up-to-date on Wisconsin Law School Scholarship by subscribing to this podcast via the Apple iTunes Store or follow [@law.wisc.edu](https://twitter.com/law.wisc.edu) on Bluesky or any of your social media platforms for updates on faculty news and publications.

I'm Kris Turner. See you next time and happy researching.