

Community without Conformity by Helen Pluckrose

Keynote address by Helen Pluckrose delivered Oct 3, 2026 for the annual North American Unitarian Association Summit.

I am best known as a critic of postmodernism and an opponent of the Critical Social Justice—or “woke”—movement. Before I began addressing these subjects full-time, I was a New Atheist. I criticised the forms of religion I opposed and the woke movement for the same two principal reasons.

First, they rejected reason and evidence as our best means of discovering what is true.

Second, they advanced illiberal beliefs and sought to impose them on others, denying people individual liberty and freedom of belief.

More recently, I have also been criticising the identitarian, post-truth populism of the right—and for precisely the same two reasons.

This all sounds very “anti.” It defines me by what I do not believe in -God -and what I oppose: postmodern left-wing identitarianism and post-truth right-wing identitarianism.

But there is a danger in developing a purely oppositional mindset. It can lead to tribalism: to dividing the world into in-groups and out-groups. It can foster an “ends justify the means” mentality in which principles are allowed to slide and evidence and reason become secondary to the preferred tribal narrative.

Disbelief in God, combined with concerns about illiberal manifestations of religion, can become contempt and hostility towards religious people. Objections to the epistemology and ethics of postmodern identitarian leftism can become antipathy towards the whole of the left—or, even less justifiably, towards the people these theories claim to speak for: women, racial minorities, sexual minorities. Opposition to the epistemology and ethics of the post-truth identitarian right can similarly result in treating all conservatives as evil, or in becoming callous towards the groups for whom they claim to speak: men, white people and people who value heterosexual monogamy and traditional family life.

It is much better to define ourselves by what we stand for than by what we stand against. When we begin with positive principles, we can apply them consistently—even when doing so is politically or tribally inconvenient.

What I stand for is liberal humanism, empiricism and rationalism.

Liberal humanism is not a list of correct beliefs. It is a set of broad principles that enables people with profoundly different beliefs to seek truth, have honest and productive conversations, live together peacefully and to recognise one another as fellow human beings with a common stake in the world we share.

This allows me to regard a very wide range of people as “my people.” People who care about what is true and reasonable, who defend individual liberty and who value our shared humanity can be of either sex, of any race or sexuality, and have a great variety of identities and ways of presenting themselves. They can be found on both the political left and the political right.

And, increasingly, I am finding that my people include Unitarians.

Some might think “liberal religion” sounds almost like an oxymoron. Religion is often associated with faith, revelation and moral authority; liberalism with reason, individual freedom and doubt. Yet Unitarianism demonstrates that religious belief can develop in a liberal direction. I am also honoured to know liberal Christians, Muslims, Jews, Hindus, Sikhs and Buddhists.

The crucial distinction is not between religious and non-religious people nor between the left and the right. It is between those who believe that everyone must be made to conform to one particular ideology, set of values, or concept of the common good. and those who recognise that honest and sincere people will always disagree about such things and must be able to do so and that we can co-exist and cooperate anyway.

Today, I will speak about the core principles of liberal humanism: how we arrived at them in the modern period and why that development was so revolutionary; how the rational and empirical legacy of the Enlightenment sustains them; how postmodernism and Critical Social Justice threaten this progress; and why the populist anti-woke backlash is not the solution, but another manifestation of the same underlying problem.

Wherever you stand politically, spiritually or religiously, I will urge you to see yourselves as part of a liberal humanist coalition: to oppose illiberalism and anti-humanism within your own circles, while finding unity with everyone who values individual liberty, pluralistic tolerance and our shared humanity.

In anticipation of this talk, one of you said that if we are going to apply the concept of liberalism across left and right, it would be good to have a clear definition of left and right. It would! Unfortunately, this is often easier said than done because those who consider themselves to be left or right will always be considered not to be by others on the left or right! This also varies by culture. Nevertheless, in our political culture, both UK and US, we do tend to have two political parties and people gravitate towards one or other of them. This doesn't clear things up perfectly, because libertarians and social conservatives who both tend to vote right don't have that much in common and neither do traditional Marxists and queer theorists who both consider themselves left. However, we can see two continuums here:

The economic. At one end we have Marxists and at the other small government/ free market libertarians. The left and right wing parties generally try to appease them although they are not generally successful.

The cultural. Here we have what could be considered progressive and conservative values. Progressives tend to make their priority those they see as the most vulnerable – minority groups and the disadvantaged. Conservatives focus more on conserving the traditions and institutions that they believe have stood the majority in good stead.

Trying to narrow down a clear definition of left and right is probably not something that we will do today. For the purposes of this talk, it's probably easiest to say, if you are somebody who considers yourself progressive & most concerned with the vulnerable and/or wealth distribution, you have a choice whether to go about furthering these goals in a liberal way that values the shared humanity of everyone or an authoritarian way that does not. Likewise if you consider yourself to have more of a conservative drive or favour a minimal government.

This is how I think we should understand liberal humanism. On the most fundamental level, of course, it combines liberalism and humanism.

Liberalism, the philosophy underlying liberal democracy, begins with a simple principle: people should be free to believe, speak and live as they see fit, provided that they do no material harm to others nor deny them the same freedom.

But liberalism, as it has evolved in practice, encompasses much more than this. It values individual liberty, universal rights, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech and inquiry, equality before the law, limitations on state power and government by the consent of the governed. It supports viewpoint diversity as an engine of knowledge production and peaceful conflict resolution. It recognises that no individual or institution is infallible and therefore prefers reform to revolution, persuasion to coercion and criticism to enforced conformity.

Humanism is an ethical orientation that places human value, human experience and human wellbeing at its centre. It draws upon evidence, reason, critical thinking and the scientific method to establish what is true about the shared world. Its ethics focus on promoting human flourishing and reducing human suffering rather than demanding obedience to any unquestionable authority or received doctrine. It respects the capacity of individual human beings to evaluate ideas for themselves and to determine the course of their own lives.

Humanism need not entail atheism. Religious and non-religious humanists may disagree about the existence of God or the ultimate source of moral value while agreeing that human beings matter, that suffering matters and that our shared problems must be addressed through reason, evidence, compassion and honest dialogue.

Liberal humanism, I would argue, can be understood through three main principles: individualism, pluralism and universalism.

Individualism: The individual is the primary bearer of rights, liberties and moral worth. People must not be reduced to their race, sex, class, sexuality, religion or any other group identity.

Pluralism: Human beings will disagree—often profoundly—about religion, morality, politics and the good life. A liberal society does not eliminate these differences but enables peaceful coexistence across them. The combination of individual liberty and viewpoint diversity also allows knowledge to be produced, errors to be corrected and conflicts to be resolved without coercion.

Universalism: The same fundamental moral standards apply to all human beings. Rights do not depend upon identity, ancestry, belief or social position. We may have different beliefs, cultures, experiences and capacities, but we are united by our common humanity. We can understand and empathise with one another across all manner of difference, and we owe one another duties of care.

These principles depend upon one another. Individualism without pluralism and universalism can become blinkered and selfish. Pluralism without individualism and universalism can deteriorate into relativism or tribalism. Universalism without individualism and pluralism can become an imposed conception of the common good—or an incoherent mass of benevolent feeling that achieves very little.

These liberal humanist values are the underlying foundation of Western liberal democracies. We now tend to take them for granted. To understand how revolutionary liberal humanism was, we have to understand what preceded it. My academic background is in late medieval Christian history in England and, to a lesser extent, Europe more broadly.

Premodern Europe was not known for valuing individual liberty, viewpoint diversity or universal human rights! Religious authority and knowledge were closely intertwined. People inherited their social position and religious identity and they were told what their views were to be. Truth was largely received from recognised authorities, and dissent could be treated not merely as error but as spiritual corruption and political danger. Communities were organised around a substantive conception of the common good which individuals were compelled to serve. Of course, individuals with diverse viewpoints and a common human nature existed then and always, but this was largely regarded as a problem to be managed.

This began to change gradually, unevenly and often violently. During the Renaissance, scholars rediscovered and reinterpreted ancient Greek and Roman philosophy which contained more scope for individual thought and reason. Intellectual life expanded beyond theology into literature, history, politics, art and the study of humanity itself. This widened the range of subjects considered to have legitimate worth and invited people to contribute to multiple forms of knowledge and creation. It encouraged greater intellectual autonomy and attention to human agency—initially, of course, chiefly among wealthy and educated men.

The Reformation produced another breach in authorised knowledge. The principle that individuals should be able to read and interpret scripture for themselves weakened the monopoly of a single religious authority. It also encouraged literacy and extended a measure of spiritual autonomy beyond scholarly elites, including to women and ordinary working people.

The Reformation did not immediately produce tolerance. On the contrary, Europe's religious wars are an exemplary illustration of the catastrophic consequences of trying to impose conformity on societies of disagreeable humans. Catholics and Protestants persecuted one another; Protestant sects persecuted other Protestants; states attempted to enforce religious settlement through law. Some of the English dissident Protestants took flight to America and the memory of this persecution stayed with them and informed the spirit of religious tolerance that found its way into the US Constitution. Likewise across Europe, gradually, toleration became not only a moral ideal but a practical

necessity. If people could not be made to agree about salvation, political society needed ways for them to coexist despite disagreement.

Meanwhile, the Scientific Revolution transformed the means by which claims about the natural world were tested. Observation, experimentation, mathematics and systematic criticism increasingly challenged appeals to tradition and authority. Claims to knowledge increasingly had to be supported by evidence and remain open to revision when new evidence emerged. The achievements of figures such as Copernicus, Galileo and Newton showed that human beings could discover regularities in nature through disciplined inquiry.

The Enlightenment extended this confidence in reason and evidence into questions of politics, morality and society. If no church possessed unquestionable authority, perhaps no monarch did either. If human beings shared a common nature and capacity for reason, perhaps government required their consent. Freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, equality before the law and limitations on state power emerged as means of enabling fallible people to correct error and manage disagreement without persecution or revolution.

This expansion of intellectual liberty and pluralism also encouraged an innovative, collaborative and competitive culture which enabled free enterprise and an extraordinary increase in material productivity.

Religious tests and restrictions on religious minorities were gradually dismantled. Rigid class hierarchies weakened as the assumption that some were born to rule and others to obey came under challenge. So too did beliefs in racial hierarchy and segregation. Liberal principles, applied consistently, demanded that women be recognised as competent adults: able to own property, vote, enter professions and participate fully in civic life. Homosexuality moved, slowly from being prosecuted as sinful, to being medicalised as a disorder, and ultimately towards recognition as a morally neutral variation in human sexuality.

None of this progress was automatic, linear or complete. Liberal democracies repeatedly betrayed their own principles, and reform was achieved through struggle. But those principles provided the framework with which reformers could expose the contradiction between professed universal rights and actual exclusion. In premodern England, such ideas would have been simply baffling.

Modernity did not rid human societies of disagreement and factionalism. That will never, ever happen! Instead, it provided systems for managing this reality and making it productive—reason, evidence, criticism, individual liberty, pluralism and democratic reform. This was genuinely revolutionary and counterintuitive to many people then. It remains counterintuitive to many today. We must not get complacent about it.

The authoritarian impulse appears to be strong in our tribal, territorial species of ape. And it begins with a refusal to let people think for themselves. It asserts that some authority—religious, political or ideological—already possesses truth and that people cannot be trusted to examine it freely. They might dissent or reach conclusions considered dangerous to others or the social order. The authoritarian mindset treats freedom of thought not as a human right to be protected or as a valuable resource to be harnessed, but as a risk to be managed.

This is why authoritarian systems are characterised by attempts to control thought and speech. If people question doctrines, compare rival explanations and express disagreement, the authority's claim to certainty is threatened. Dissent must be censored, punished or redefined as morally illegitimate: heresy, blasphemy, sedition, treason, hate speech or violence. The vocabulary changes, but the demand remains the same: the dominant moral orthodoxy must not be challenged and attempts to do so render the dissenter, in some way, evil.

This does not only deny individual liberty which matters in its own right. It prevents knowledge production and self-correction. Cultures stagnate. It also denies individual moral agency. A person who is told what to think and compelled to affirm it is not being persuaded or educated. They become an instrument through which somebody else's worldview is reproduced. Even when the doctrine is intended to promote the common good, the means remain illiberal and anti-humanist because they deny our capacity for reason, conscience and judgement. Nor does this even work to eliminate dissent. It simply takes away the ability to resolve conflicts peacefully. Disagreements remain, but when their peaceful expression and negotiation are forbidden, they are driven underground and can ultimately emerge as violence.

Liberal humanism begins from the opposite premise. Because human beings are fallible, prone to favouring neat and satisfying stories over complex and uncomfortable truths, and adept at using confirmation bias and motivated reasoning to scaffold our claims, no person or institution may place their beliefs beyond criticism. We are all very good at arguing for what we already believe and spotting the flaws in what other people believe. Sound knowledge can therefore be produced by systems which bring conflicting ideas into dialogue, require arguments to be supported by reason and evidence, and enable people to engage in collaborative conflict.

Science is primary here. It holds as a central tenet that we must never be too certain that we have obtained objective truth. All knowledge is provisional. Every claim remains open to falsification. Hypotheses can never be proven, only disproven. This epistemic humility inspired the creation of error-correcting methods: observation, experimentation, criticism and replication. Together, these methods have produced more reliable and useful knowledge than any non-evidence-based “way of knowing.”

Liberalism makes the same move in political life. Because no ruler, church, party or movement is infallible, we protect freedom of conscience, open debate, viewpoint diversity and democratic opposition. No doctrine is entitled to protection from criticism, no subject is permanently closed to further inquiry, and offensiveness or emotional upset alone cannot justify suppressing speech. Everything must remain open to debate. The liberal democracies which have taken on these rules have made more advances in human rights and equality than under any other system.

These methods have corrected errors embedded within science and liberal societies themselves. Newton pursued alchemy, Darwin believed women intellectually inferior, and early sexologists classified homosexuality as a disorder. But because neither scientific claims nor liberal norms can be insulated from scrutiny, subsequent evidence and criticism enabled these errors to be exposed and corrected. Evidence undermined justifications for racial hierarchy and claims of innate female inferiority. Science and liberal ethics together transformed understandings of homosexuality from a sin to punish, then a disorder to treat, into something some people simply are.

These methods are also universalist. Science, evidence, reason and liberalism do not belong to any one group and they may be upheld by people of all religions and none. They provide a common language through which people with different worldviews can discuss claims affecting everyone. Religion, politics or other ideologies may guide a believer’s own life, but they cannot justify compelling others or placing public claims beyond scrutiny. Within that framework, religious and non-religious people can seek truth together.

The results have been extraordinary. Once inquiry became open, collaborative and answerable to evidence, knowledge became cumulative. Discoveries could be published, tested, challenged and built upon by people who did not share a worldview. Within a few centuries, human beings transformed their understanding of the universe, the natural world and their own bodies. Science produced vaccines, antibiotics, anaesthesia, sanitation, electricity, modern communications and technologies. Life expectancy rose, infant mortality fell and suffering once accepted as inevitable became preventable.

All of these developments can be considered fruits of the Enlightenment. These have always been threatened by Counter-Enlightenment currents. For much of history, these have come from religious conservatives who favoured collectivism, hierarchy, conformity and deference to authority. However, the political left and those who consider themselves progressive are not immune to this and we have seen a significant and influential threat from that quarter over the last few decades.

Postmodernism emerged in the mid-twentieth century as an explicitly Counter-Enlightenment reaction against modernity. Many proponents believed that by focusing intently on stressing its failures, exclusions and power structures they were being progressive. Nevertheless, the postmodern turn rehabilitated deeply regressive pre-modern habits of thought which were antagonistic to liberal humanism.

Postmodern theorists begin from a radically sceptical position: that objective knowledge is unobtainable because it is always biased by cultural forces and power structures. They then ask how what we call knowledge came to be socially constructed. Which power structures and dominant groups does it serve? Who decided that certain ways of determining what is true and resultant truth claims should count as legitimate while others were not?

In this worldview, knowledge is constructed by oppressive power and perpetuated through language. Powerful groups create categories and concepts which serve their interests, encode them in language, and ordinary people are then socialised into accepting them uncritically. They then perpetuate oppression by the way they understand things and speak about them. The way to address this is to deconstruct everything on principle and become skeptical of knowledge itself.

It is not that postmodernism contained no useful insights. Human beings *are* influenced by culture. Institutions *can* encode power. Language *can* shape perception, and unjust ideas *can* become so normalised that they are accepted uncritically. This was, however, precisely what the liberal Enlightenment project had been addressing so successfully by investigating specific truth claims and correcting demonstrable injustice.

The original postmodern project could not remain purely deconstructive indefinitely. Around 1989, a new generation of theorists began arguing that, although postmodernism was useful for exposing the social construction of knowledge and identity, simply deconstructing everything did not help anyone bring about social change.

Across several disciplines, theorists began reconstructing what their predecessors had deconstructed. In postcolonial theory, Linda Hutcheon argued that concepts of knowledge, history and truth needed to be reconstructed in the voice of the subordinated and marginalised as explicated by postmodern theorists. In queer theory, Judith Butler retained the idea that categories like sex, gender and sexuality were a social construct but turned their deliberate subversion into a political programme. Within Critical Race Theory, Kimberlé Crenshaw accepted postmodern insights about social constructivism while insisting the precise systems of power and privilege theorised by Critical Race Scholars were objectively real.

We called this development Applied Postmodernism. Within this worldview, categories like race, sex, sexuality could be deconstructed when seen to support existing oppressive norms but solidified into a real and authoritative single voice when they supported an activist objective. Claims to objective knowledge could be rejected as a product of dominant power, while identity-based knowledge granted people with marginalised identities privileged access to truth. "Lived experience" did not simply mean personal experience worth hearing. Certain interpretations of experience became authoritative.

The authentic voice of a marginalised group was therefore understood to be the one which affirmed the relevant postmodern critical theory. Members of that group who upheld different concepts of knowledge-production and different principles and values could be dismissed as having internalised oppression or absorbed the dominant discourse. The theory thereby became very difficult to falsify.

At the same times as these ideas became applicable to race, sex, gender, sexuality, disability, body size and other identities, they hardened into moral certainty. The claim that society should be examined for prejudice became the conviction that everyone had been socialised into white supremacist, patriarchal, imperialist, cisheteronormative, ableist and fatphobic systems which they perpetuated through ordinary thought and language. With this came the imperative to dismantle that socialisation by controlling what people were permitted to think and say. And there was the fundamental authoritarian move: the conviction that other people's minds and speech must be controlled for their own good and for the good of society.

This framework can produce considerable cruelty towards the very people it claims to empower. I have heard repeatedly from Indian, Nigerian and Pakistani scientists, doctors and engineers who came to Britain for their expertise, only to be told that science is a white, Western and imperialist way of knowing. Their objection to this stereotyping was treated not as independent thought, but as evidence that they had assimilated into whiteness or had their thinking colonised. Within activist circles, even racial slurs such as "house Negro," "coon" and "Uncle Tom" became permissible weapons against such dissenters.

I recently spoke to James Morris, whose cerebral palsy requires him to use a wheelchair and voice app. James campaigns for biomedical research which might prevent or cure cerebral palsy. Disability activists told him that only internalised ableism could make him think it would be preferable not to have cerebral palsy and accused him of advocating genocide. His own lived experience ceased to count because he interpreted it incorrectly. He persists in his activism, but other disability campaigners who focus on science and individual autonomy have been intimidated out of campaigning publicly.

In institutions and organisations, these ideas have produced compelled affirmation of beliefs about identity, knowledge and morality and it has led to individuals being treated primarily as representatives of identity groups. Disagreement has been characterised as harm. Speech has been controlled, and dissenters have been no-platformed, disciplined or required to undergo training intended to correct their unconscious biases. This has not only denied individual liberty but blocked the very viewpoint diversity and freedom to criticise they need to identify and correct error. It was in 2020 that I began to hear from Unitarian organisations across America and Canada that this was happening within their organisations. Some of them noted that this was very much like a revival of religious concepts of heresy and blasphemy that Unitarians had always explicitly rejected.

The similarities between postmodern-derived identity theories and premodern religion can be made very convincingly but of course Critical Social Justice is not literally a religion and such mindsets are not an exclusive product of religious zealotry. They are a pervasive aspect of human nature. But the Critical Social Justice movement did recreate an epistemology of authorised moral truth: compulsory doctrines, privileged interpreters, ritual affirmations and punishment for heresy. The same authoritarian impulse emerges whenever people become convinced that they possess an important truth invisible to others and that forcing those others to affirm it is necessary for their own good.

These theorists were right that human beings are vulnerable to narrative and motivated reasoning. They were wrong that their ideas could provide a remedy. The methods which systematically correct our preferred narratives remain critical thinking, evidence, reason, viewpoint diversity, open criticism and individual freedom—the epistemological and political achievements of the Enlightenment. To preserve those values, it was essential to counter the power and influence of the Critical Social Justice movement wherever they emerged.

Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to conclude that everybody who opposed the Critical Social Justice movements was doing so from pure liberal motives. Authoritarian movements are opposed not only by liberals and humanists, but also by rival forms of authoritarianism. The divide is not between woke and anti-woke. It is between those who care about what is true and those who prefer narratives serving their agenda; between those who defend individual liberty and those who want their beliefs imposed and dissent squashed out of existence. Those who care about individuals, viewpoint diversity and our shared humanity and those who do not.

Authoritarians who favour ideologically biased narratives over truth have been the problem on the identitarian left, yet some factions on the anti-woke right mirror this precise problem exactly. The illiberal, identitarian populist right and far-right also view people through identity categories, embrace identity-based grievance narratives, distrust individualism, pluralism and universalism and replace evidence with lived experience, conspiracy theory and the conviction that they alone are awake to reality. Ethnonationalism, Christian Nationalism, nativism, radical distrust of science and expertise, conspiracy theories about elites and assertions that the authentic voice of ‘the people’ are those which support any of the above.

We have seen a resurgence of racism, misogyny and anti-gay sentiment justified as “anti-wokeness.” Because Critical Social Justice activists declared their identity-based theories to be the authoritative voice of those groups, reactionaries were able to claim that attacking those groups is merely attacking those theories. But assuming that black professionals are diversity hires is not opposition to racial identity politics. It is racial identity politics. Treating women as agents of a gynocratic system designed to oppress men does not oppose collective guilt. It redirects it. Trying to roll back the rights of same-sex couples does not combat authoritarian strains of LGBT activism. It is authoritarian.

The same mimicry appears around freedom of speech. Some people who condemned left-wing cancel culture when they were the ones vulnerable to it now organise dogpiles and demand that opponents lose their jobs for offensive but lawful speech critical of those on the right. They, too, argue that words cause harm and potentially violence. This is clearly not a consistent and principled opposition to authoritarianism. If you oppose cancellation only when your side is being cancelled, you do not oppose cancel culture. You oppose lacking the power to cancel.

Liberals on the left failed to restrain authoritarianism from the Critical Social Justice movement because too many believed their hearts were in the right place and wanted to maintain solidarity against illiberal elements on the right. Liberals who lean conservative in their values must not repeat that error. We all need to oppose illiberalism in our own orbit while making common cause across divisions. The solution to left-wing authoritarianism is not right-wing authoritarianism. It is liberal humanism, consistently applied.

Let us return to this conference's question: how should liberal religion be reimagined, and what must we reimagine to create a more loving world?

My answer is that those who feel enriched by religious or spiritual meaning and community in their lives should be careful to think expansively about who counts as "our people." Not only those who share our theology, politics, identity or way of life, but everyone committed to liberal humanist principles.

The liberal humanist coalition can contain atheists and believers; conservatives, progressives social democrats and libertarians; traditionalists and people who challenge tradition. We can disagree about God, morality, economics, family, identity and the good life while agreeing that nobody should be coerced into conformity and that every individual is born possessing the same intrinsic social and moral worth.

What binds us is not a shared answer to every question. It is commitment to a shared higher order value for seeking truth and managing disagreement: individual liberty, universal rights, pluralism, reason and evidence, free inquiry and charitable coexistence.

None of us is immune to bias or motivated reasoning. That is why we need each other's disagreement. We must be open to critique of our own ideas as an essential condition for the production of knowledge. We must practice tolerance not as a form of relativism or indifference to truth, but recognition that truth is best approached through free inquiry rather than compelled affirmation.

Unitarians have a valuable contribution to make. You demonstrate that religious community need not require uniformity: that faith can coexist with doubt, individual conscience, reason, pluralism and a willingness to learn from those outside one's tradition. You offer community without conformity and moral seriousness without authoritarian certainty. You have an important role to play here in helping to create a better world without forcing everyone into the same beliefs. Instead, Unitarians and everybody who fits the definitions of both liberal and humanist can create it by building one in which human beings can seek truth together, tolerate differences that don't need resolving and resolve those which do using reason, evidence and a staunch defence of individual liberty rather than with authoritarian censorship or violence. I am glad to be in this fight with you!