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>> ARIEL SIMMS: Hi everyone. We are going to get started in just a couple of minutes. We are waiting for a couple of more people to join us. Hang tight and we will get started in just a couple of minutes.

Hi everyone. We are going to get started in just a couple of minutes. If you are participating, if you are a panelist of the webinar, you will be able to un-mute yourself and participate in a moment. If you are in the audience of the webinar, you are muted and will stay muted throughout the presentation. Don't be surprised if people can't hear you. If you need any assistance or you are trying to get in touch with me, just sent out a message [indiscernible] and I can chat with you there. We will get started in just a couple of more minutes.

Hi everyone. We will get started in just another minute. Lorell, if you are on, can you send me a message by the chat box. I don't see you listed on the attendees list, but let me know if you are on here and I will get you set up.

Hi everyone. Welcome to the The Arc's National Center on Criminal Justice and Disability in 2017 Policing People with Disabilities Series. Please forgive my voice; from time to time, you might hear a little squeak or something of that nature. I started losing it last night and it has not markedly improved, so please forgive that.

Before we get into the meat of our conversation, I just want to cover a few basics, including logistics, for those of you who may be using WebEx. [audio is fuzzy]

If you are participating and listening then you are going to be in listen only mode. You will be muted. We won't hear you. If you are having technology issues while listening to the webinar or watching the webinar, please call the WebEx help desk at the number shown on the slide and also in the chat box. If you would like to access live captioning during the webinar, just copy and paste the link that I provided on the slide and in the chat box into the browser and you can pull up the captioning service and the webinar side-by-side.

Our webinar today will start with a series of speakers. At the end of the individual presentation, I will ask the panelist to participate in a general discussion. At the end of the discussion, there will be time for questions from our participants in the audience. You can post your questions in the Q&A section on WebEx and also on the right hand side of your screen. If you don't want your name shared with your question later on, type the word private before you type the question.

You can also email questions to us directly at [ON THE SLIDE] and that will show up later on in the presentation in case you prefer to use it. If we don't get to your question during the presentation itself, we will make sure to follow up with you afterwards.

Important note that this webinar is being recorded and it will be posted on our website along with a PowerPoint slide and a transcript from today.

One last logistical request: a short survey will pop up after the webinar has ended, please take just five minutes at the end of the webinar to complete it. This really helps ensure that you are satisfied and provides valuable feedback to us, as well as our panelist. This webinar is recorded and archived-- that covers logistics.

I want to tell you a little bit more about NCCJD and our webinar series. The national was created back in 2013. We advocate at the it did not. We work both on the victim witness site, but also with those who are incarcerated in the United States.

Our overarching goal and mission is to build the capacity of the criminal justice system to respond to gaps in existing services for people with disabilities, and as we are part of The Arc, we have people with disabilities. Activities are training, technical assistance, resource collection, publication, and education. This is the first webinar and we plan to provide an overview-- including women of color.

I would first like to take a moment to say that this conversation can be difficult one, when we are talking about the topic of police and disability. Our goal is to bring about the capacity of the criminal justice system to respond to this problem. We really want to step outside of our traditional purpose on disabilities to acknowledge the truly intersectional nature of this issue. To that end, we have invited an impressive group of people to educate us on this topic. You can see the names on the slide. We are fortunate to have another person to join us on the topic, Janine Jackson.

This first webinar, the goal is mostly to a focus on the overarching problem, trying to figure out what it is and educate people who may not be aware of the issue, and that we hope to use our second and third webinars in the series, Policing People with Disabilities Webinar Series, to highlight [indiscernible]. We hope you will join us for those conversations. If you know the unit program or policy of addressing this particular issue and the Intersectionality piece of that, please share that with us at the email address that's listed on the slide.

I just wanted to lay down a couple of basic norms, given the difficult nature of this conversation, to make sure we are having a productive discussion. You will see it on the slide. Be present and engaged in the discussion. If we touch topics that are important, we want to make sure people are engaged. We might hear things that not everyone agrees with, and I would just ask about as a norm, we challenge the idea not the person, and we really have a norm of curiosity about that particular idea. We are also going to hear a variety of perspectives on the webinar today; perspectives on the problems, perspectives on how we might approach different solutions. So, just a quick note that every perspective is valid, and I think it's something that we can learn from each of those perspectives that are presented.

With a brief introduction, I would like to introduce Leigh Ann Davis, Director, Criminal Justice Initiatives.

>> LEIGH ANN DAVIS: Thank you, Ariel. I would like to thank the panelists for taking time out of their busy schedule to be here today, and everyone who has joined us.

Before we hear from our speakers today, I want to briefly give a background about why we decided to have this topic on Intersectionality. We will also be including the issue in our 2017 white paper on policing people with disabilities.

As Ariel Simms said, my aunt is Leigh Ann Davis, and I'm Director, Criminal Justice Initiatives and I oversee NCCJD. In my experience of working the area of criminal justice and disability issues, I've had an incredible opportunity to work alongside people with disabilities and professionals and family members and others just like you, who are working to ensure that people with disabilities have equal access to justice, whether they are suspects or victims.

Given that we recently celebrated Martin Luther King day, I wanted to begin my comments with one of his words. That is, "Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter".

That's a profound thought, not being silent about things that matter. This is a philosophy that NCCJD strives to live by. We purposefully set out to uncover and demystify topics that may be viewed as unimportant, controversial, or just too complicated to address. At the end of the day, our primary goal is to provide a platform for people with disabilities and others who are often marginalized in our society to be heard and supported and then validated.

Dr. King's quote also raises a springboard to questions that we want to know about and we are presenting to you today. As you listen to our speakers, just be thinking about these questions and mulling them over in your mind.

First of all, how and why are we silent about this issue? How are people with disabilities included or excluded when it comes to these kinds of discussions. What are we afraid of uncovering if we do dig below the surface?

For example, are we afraid of finding out about our own unconscious mindsets or are we afraid that we will have to change them? What tools will be used to create authentic, genuine communication, which can lead to more genuine and authentic communities and environments in those communities.

With the establishment of NCCJD in 2013, we became increasingly interested in this issue. There's really two reasons for that, and I wanted to address this quickly. One is because we are working on developing law-enforcement training, and specifically training for crisis intervention. These are specific teams that work with the police department that focus on the issue of psychiatric disabilities. Sometimes, intellectual developmental disabilities are addressed, but most of the focus is on psychiatric illnesses. We are working to really bring more of a conversation around people with all types of disabilities, including intellectual developmental disparities. We want to be able to address this with Police Department's nationwide, about how hour own biases can affect how we treat people who are not like us.That's one of the reasons why we wanted to focus on this topic specifically, but also, because we have a national information and referral service, where we get calls from all over the country from different people with disabilities and family members, attorneys, and others in the system.

For one of those calls, we came across Reginald “Neli” Latson. This one stands out because of our work with the Arc of Virginia, and to clearly solve the issue of autism in this case, and yet, the court system and those involved in the criminal justice system really did not look deeply at this issue. We worked with the Arc of Virginia and other disability groups on this, and Mr. Latson was caught in a recurring [indiscernible] due to the disability. In 2010, he was standing in front of a local library, wearing a hoodie, and the police officer wanted to question him because they were looking for an African-American with a gun. Latson had autism and became so fearful about this that he started acting violently and that caused injury to the officers.

This led to questions and was placed in solitary confinement for most of the time. This was not the man that police were looking for, and yet, he ended up confined in the criminal justice system for far too long. He was eventually pardoned by the Virginia Gov. McAuliffe. This was also included with one of our panelists today-- there are many other cases like this across the country, where we have to start uncovering Intersectionality issues, and it is our hope that NCCJD that we will be able to start the conversation here once again, using this webinar, and that we will be able to hear from many of you at the end of the webinar on ideas of how we can really start to begin having better conversations around us that can result in better solutions.

Thank you for joining us today. I look forward to hearing from all of our panel is now. Thank you.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: Lorell Kilpatrick is not here yet, so we will start with Janine Jackson. Janine, if you can go ahead and unmute yourself and turn on your camera, and I will give you presenter privileges so you can move the slides back and forth. Janine, I don't think we can hear you just yet.

>> JANINE JACKSON: I'm here.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: Now you have control over the slides, so use that to go back and forth.

>> JANINE JACKSON: Should that mean that you will forgive my slide ignorance? I'm not seeing control of my slides. I still see the Neli's slide. I'm going back to slide one. There we go. I will move forward as I want to advance--is that correct?

All right, then. Without further ado, I'm happy to get started. My name is Janine Jackson. And I'm a board member of the African-American policy forum, and I work with a group on media research on behalf of the African-American policy forum, as well as for myself. I am very pleased to be part of this void filling conversation.

Intersectionality, which Leigh Ann has just mentioned, is a term coined by African-American policy forum cofounder, law professor and legal [indiscernible], criminally critical. I'd like to talk a little bit about that terms origin and its function.

Prof. Crenshaw was struck by the story of a woman named Emma DeGraff and Reed, she was a black woman who applied to work at a car manufacturing plant and was then let go, she believed due to discrimination.

Her lawsuit, the lawsuit she filed was thrown out by the judge, and the reasoning what was so interesting. It was ruled that the plant did not show racial bias because they hired African-American men for industrial work, for maintenance work, and she could not argue sex bias because the plant hired white women, usually for secretarial or front office work. The judge said specifically that it would be unfair for DeGraff and Reed to combine two causes of action. He said that would be like giving her two swings of the bat when African-American men and white women only got one.

The point is, it wasn't simply that the DeGraff and Reed was in reality discriminated against, it was because of the way she was discriminated against; her problem was not just invisible, you could say, erased. There was no legal frame to hold her experience, the way those two biases compounded. What we find is that if you don't have a conceptual frame to hold a problem, then it's very difficult, if not impossible to address it.

So the African-American policy forum has worked very hard to integrate this idea of Intersectionality into debate and policy and activism and a number of issue areas, but in particular, in the area of police or state balance of people with color. Our campaign is able to confront effort to increase awareness of and response to the abuse, including legal force by police--

We often begin conversations with an exercise, in which the audience is asked to stand up, and a list of names has been read. When folks hear a name they do not recognize, they are asked to sit down. It will begin with Michael Brown, and most folks stay standing. With each word, more people were not. But then when the speaker says Sandra Bland, it starts to shift. The Tosha McKenna, Tanisha Anderson, after just a few of those names, most of the group is seated. It doesn't matter if these are law students or women's rights advocates, it really doesn't matter who the audience is, it's physically illustrates the gulf that exercise shows between the public awareness of African-American men who were killed by law enforcement and that of African-American women.

The reality is that African-American women are also killed, disproportionately, and in unacceptable numbers, and in situations that should spark equal outrage. Some statistics there. Again, the issue seems to be one of Shelly Frey. We have a picture of Frey, who is being killed by police, of who is vulnerable, and that picture of it like that is framing. Black women don't fit in that frame except for grieving mothers or sisters or community members. That's what The Say Her Name ad campaign is about.

It's true, this framing issue, not just for media, which I focus on, but also for policymakers and even for advocates. What it means concretely is that many black women are ignored. Their families are denied that measure of solace that comes with having people go out in the street and say, never again, and that's a real thing. It also means that the dimensions of the problem are being mis-measured. The specificity of people's experience of being missed, and so, those experience are not being used to help shape our social and policy response.

For example, black trans women have been singled out for victimization by law enforcement on the basis of race and class and gender orientation, in the case of sex workers and occupation. It's not just one of those identities or qualities, but it's fair intersection, and you can't simply store their experience into some sweeping definition of the problem whose face is about young black men.

I think we can see the relevance of this for our efforts to address the role of disability and incidents of police misconduct. And indeed, the list of the Say Her Name support includes Charisse Francis, a woman with schizophrenia, whose family reached out to police when she was off of her medication and was especially distraught. When she refused initially to go to the hospital, she was pinned down on the sidewalk by four officers, one with a knee in her back, and she stopped breathing during that altercation.

Kayla Moore, a transgender black woman, whose roomate called police for help when she was in mental health crisis. Instead, the police who arrived tried to arrest Moore on a warrant for a man 20 years her senior, but who shared the name that she had been given at birth. Kayla Moore was suffocated in her bedroom, after they--

The list also includes Michelle Cusseaux, and she was killed by a police officer who was charged with moving her to a mental health facility. He said that she had that anger in her face like she was going to hit someone, so he shot her in the heart.

With people with disabilities, as with black women when we are talking about this question of police misconduct, there are commonalities. For example, there's an absence of basic data, and I know that David Perry is going to address that as one of the real void fillers in terms of missing data. There's an absence of basic data being collected; it is very hard to address the problem when you can't see it, when you can't see its shape, it's outline.

But there's also a need for more understanding of how these marginality's or vulnerabilities reinforce one another; they don't simply combine.

What's the connection, for example, between cases of people with mental disabilities being killed by police in a community, and the availability of healthcare resources in the community? What is the relationship between the availability of healthcare resources and the racial makeup of that community? These things are integrated. How does what we know about implicit racial bias, seeing black people as bigger, or more powerful, or impervious to pain, these ideas that we've heard about implicit racial bias, how does that combine with the tendency by law enforcement to read noncompliance as a threat? Is it too much to imagine that a noncompliant black person is read as more threatening than a noncompliant white person? And of course, different sorts of disabilities will require different sorts of understanding.

We have an urgent need for concepts and narratives that make it possible to hold more than one thing at once, and then move us away from the idea of zero-sum justice, in which concern for one group precludes or set aside till later the same thing, concern for other groups. I want to talk at that point about Michelle Cusseaux's mother, Fran Garrett, who exemplifies, in a way, the work that's being done. She, as the slide indicates, has taken the pain of her daughter's death and has translated it, has worked with it and working in changes for police training and in hiring since her death, and she has had an impact in the adoption of measures for the police permit.

If we are going to point to training of the officers for people with disabilities, Intersectionality demands that this training be transformative, that it make these concerns part of a core work. It can't be that you learn policing for extra credit, you do 10 hours about working with people with disabilities. No, I want to, has to be at the core of the work, has to be integrated with the recognition that racial biases, for example, and anti-disability biases and gender biases, again, don't just combine but compound.

Finally, I would say, and of course, I'm looking forward to questions and answers later, but I want to end by saying that officer training, while necessary, is not sufficient. There needs to be a multidimensional approach, as Michelle Cusseaux's mother is saying, there needs to be a multi dimensional approach that incorporates the fight for discrimination on all fronts, and includes a vision of restorative justice, where those who have been victims are listened to and our leaders in bringing about the change that we see. I'm very happy to be part of this conversation. Thank you, and I will end right there.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: Thank you so much, Janine. We really appreciate that. Up next, we will turn things over to David Perry. David Perry is the Professor of History at the Domincan University. With that, David, we will turn things over to you.

>> DAVID: Thank you. I'm assuming everything is working fine. If not, someone will tell me if it isn’t. It's an honor to be on this panel. Let me see if I can advance.

I have a number of things to say. Mostly, I'm going to really just focus on the media issue as opposed to the whole issue. I want to pick up on what Janine just said, there's a lot of narratives within the media and with the government and with disabilities rights groups and police reform groups, that the solution of this problem is to put in more crisis intervention team training, certainly the city of Chicago where I live is investing billions of dollars in that. Crisis intervention team training is something we'll talk about more and you will hear more about it. If you pay attention to this issue in the news, you will hear about it constantly. It's not a bad thing, but every thing that Janine just said about that solutions have to be intersectional, as well, I want to endorse that.

I have traveled around the country and have been involved in many different kinds of trainings, and none of them are bad but none of them are solutions on their own, either. With that, it would move forward talking a little bit about the media issues, because both of our media culture, as well as our broader culture, resist this kind of intersectional approach that Janine has just talked about.

I am a journalist. I write a lot about disability rights issues, as well as other issues. I think like a lot of white, middle-class parents of children with disabilities, I came into this issue to the death of Ethan Saylor, a young man who was 26 with Down syndrome, who was killed in a suburban mall in Maryland by off duty police officers. I quickly and hope it's true for most people, came to see was a much bigger project, and a project on which was kind of a grassroots-- had been worked on for decades and decades, and we have to both center their efforts and honor their work as we go forward, and I'm hoping that those who does participate in that will make it to the webinar.

Media coverage as part of the story, thanks to you, video and power of social media to take what stories-- move media narratives by a social narrative in particular, police violence and, has as I think everyone on this webinar knows, become a new kind of national story. It's not that there weren't stories about police violence before the rise of video; you can look back to the Rodney King beating, which of course was caught on video, but the frequency and rapidity with which of these kinds of local stories can become national is certainly unprecedented. The violence itself is not unprecedented, and historians of police experts debate what is new and what's just more on camera, and that's not the debate we need to have here. But clearly, we are in the midst of a long complicated, often quite divisive conversation around the police use of force in America, particularly around issues of race,

What we and the disability rights community needs to do is two things: first, we need to join in the broader civil-rights conversation, but also, asserting and recognizing the fact that disability is a major part of this conversation. We need to communicate that message outwards to people not with a disability rights world, but also in words, to say that if what you really care about is disability rights in America, you need to think about issues of state violence, with the police or a carceration or otherwise. That's kind of the big picture.

The problem is we don't have good information in general about the police force across the country or in any context, but certainly, disability has not been well tracked, and we still have the data that we would like to do that kind of sophisticated data analysis or that social scientists are particularly fond of, and often really reveal report findings about our society as a result. We don't have that information.

The media is another place you can go for data, and the media driven database, particularly the Washington Post and Guardian, are based on surveying other media reports and then trying to cover it. Again, we find that disability is either written out or covered fairly problematically. You can see that on my slide, disability tends to be treated in the following ways: it either goes unmentioned, or it's just listed as a fact. In the description, he was 5’10”, black, and had a disability, but without interrogation of how the disability might have functioned within the incident, and the selections are incompetent in all kinds of different ways.

It sometimes uses impairment usually by pity or sympathy because that person was disabled and you should feel bad for them, as opposed to other people who are killed by police who are not disabled, again, that the implicit narrative within the lot of media reports.

All too often, and I suppose worse, is the use of some kind description of disability, particularly but not exclusively, mental illness, to blame victims for their deaths. One example I like to go to is [indiscernible], the African-American men killed in a chokehold in New York in 2014--I think it was 2014 but I did not write it down.

There were people who did not want to criticize the NYPD, they said it wasn't the NYPD that killed him, it was his heart and disability that killed him. His health and disability culture. Certainly, people who are defenders of police contact, but it was also applied in a lot of the media coverage, and that's fairly typical of police officers. The police officer will say, journalist will report, I gave him orders to comply and he did not comply, so I had to use legal force. They are, we discover that person was in a mental health crisis or that person was deaf and may not have heard the orders to comply, or were autistic and may not have chosen to comply, or did not give in exactly the right way the officer said. But they will end up blaming. We think we can do better.

Lastly, I was involved in the production of a white paper supported by the Ruderman family foundation. We are thankful for their support. They looked at 369 cases from January 2013 to December 2015, people with disabilities who had been told by police, including some deaths in custody and deaths in prison. When we're having this conversation about police use of force, please remember that a whole lot of a conversation of people working on them and writing about and advocating for around custody issues and the cultural system that is linked to this one.

Articles became consistent patterns of no mention of disability or medicalized disability as what people were suffering from, which may or may not have been the case, but I always like to say what people were suffering from. The moment of their death was not the disability but the bullet that went into their body or the arm around her throat or Taser stopping the heart or blaming disabilities for the violence.

Out of this white paper or in general through my journalism and through a lot of people working on this, my goal has been to really teach local reporters, not the big columnist in the New York Times, not the people on Fox News or CNN, but the local reporters in your local communities, working for the network affiliates, working on the cop reporters for your papers, really just one fact and one better practice, and I think we are doing pretty well on the fact but not as well as the practice. The fact that you can see here is that a third or half of all police killed people with disabilities. I'm pretty confident that a third to half of all people killed by police have disabilities.

Once you start looking for it, I think you will first see that fact appearing on your local channel 9 news, and I think we have done a good job of helping local reporters create context for individuals.

Second, the practice is that reporters need to reach out to disability records from the affected communities. By affected timing that, as with a person like Keith Scott with a TBI, a traumatic brain injury, they should be talking to people in North Carolina about traumatic brain injuries. They should be talking to the black community there, as locally as possible, who have these experiences who are ever coming on these issues and make sure their voices are centered and covered in all the coverage. I think we are a long way from achieving that.

Beyond that, as I started, I would really like us to regard the more training with skepticism. A lot of things that will make a difference-- if you are spending $1 million on training but you are not spending that $1 million on building health clinics or providing jobs or any number of things. Certainly in Chicago, we've seen huge investments in police and not huge investments in communities. I'm trying to help journalist learn not to assume that disability equals suffering. I'm very thoughtful about how they quote people and then finally to say the word, and this is a large part-- to say the word disability, not special needs or the euphemisms. Those are my big points about the media coverage. Thanks for having me and I look forward to further discussion.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: Thank you for joining us, David. Ronald doesn't have a WebCam, so you won't see him but you should be able to hear him for his presentation.

>> RONALD HAMPTON: Can you hear me? Thank you very much. I'm absolutely honored to participate in this program today. I agree with a lot of the things that have been said, particularly what David was talking about around training. It's not going to be solved by training alone. There should be a great deal that needs to be challenged and investigated in the mental health community and mental health services and availability and access to mental health services.

Let me start by saying that I'm here today representing a couple of things with the police accountability project, which I serve on the advisory board of. It may not be out, but I'm also a retired police officer. I've been working on the police department for 20 some years, and I'm still very active in policing. I don't like to use the word reform, I use the word restriction, because we have been reforming police departments for almost 40 years, only to be in the same place where we started this discussion.

I've also served--

>> ARIEL SIMMS: Ron? Can you speak up just a bit? We have people having a hard time hearing you. Thank you.

>> RONALD HAMPTON: I was saying that I served as a police officer for 24 years, and I've been retired for almost as many years. I've also served as executive director-- and I have a son who is a person with autism. All of this is important to me, too. I presently serve as an Advisory Board Member of the National Police Accountability Project.

There's the Intersectionality, all of these things are very connected for me. We as an autism group, for example, have been working on these issues and have adopted some strategies as it relates to the police. We don't believe in calling the police, we have created family trees, parent trees, where we call each other. For example, my son is 60 and weighs 220 pounds, and he doesn't talk, but he has those typical kind of behaviors and characteristics that a man with autism would have. Those kind of characteristics and behaviors can get you shot, pretty much like the young man down in Virginia did, although he wasn't shot but arrested.

We don't believe in calling the police. For a long time now, we have practiced calling each other, calling the parents to get them to come over and help with our loved ones when it comes to this. The police, even though we have approached them and talk to them about training, and here, they had crisis death and supposedly training, but it has not been the kind of training that has benefited young people with disabilities, like autism. Also, we worked on that for a long time and believe in that.

We believe, along with others in the mental health community, that police should not be responding to social services. There are a couple of projects in the country where mental health workers are responding and police back them up. I think we would like to see that here, as well as in other places, because again, the point that David made, it's not just training but to coach them on what they have been doing, and to some cases, they have invested a lot in training, the police officer see training as something they have been doing so they don't have to work on the street, don't necessarily take that seriously when talking about a change of attitude in the practices and behavior when dealing with people with disabilities and that's really important.

Again, there has just been a lot of attention to this. I remember spending several days at the White House this past summer -- it was also part of the present, 21st century, police project and recommendations made in the Senate, and then hopefully forwarded and included in the 54 recommendations.

Lastly, I would say as a result, because we believe we have to be working on solutions, we have been talking about what we call community control with the police. Community control with the police is that the community is involved in oversight with the police, in terms of hiring and firing, developing policies about the training of police officers. In that concept, there's also this notion that we look at the institutions that have this Intersectionality that Ms. Jackson was talking about and David was talking about, because those are the things that really make a difference. If we don't talk about the community being involved in developed policies and practice as it relates to how mental health services get delivered in the community and what that looks like, how that looks will be talked about in schools, because a lot of black men and women in the criminal justice system, they are there as a result of what happens in school.

I'm opposed to police officers working in schools. I think they ought to respond to schools to provide workshops and things; they should not be stationed in schools. School administrators tend to use them for discipline rather than the school being involved in some sort of discipline. We see community control of the police as a conference of approach to Intersectionality and being involved in it, because we can’t just oversee policing without overseeing mental health, without overseeing schools, without overseeing other institutions that are in our community that the police sometimes get called to respond to our homes, enables homes to provide services that really they shouldn't be responding to, but these other individuals and other institutions respond to those services or those calls of service.

Those are the kinds of things-- I remember back when the situation happened in Dallas and chief Brown talked about the police were called and they shouldn't have been. I totally agree but that's not a new conversation; we've been talking about it for a long time. We should be working and talking about getting the police out of our community versus having them involved more in our community. The more they are involved in our community, the more we will see the bias will creep up and create [indiscernible]. If we continue to think the solution is in policing, and that solving our problems, those numbers will radically go up again. We have to start talking about alternatives. We are going to have to step up to the plate and be involved in the process in terms of the issues in our community. We can't run away from it, need to seriously be involved and control more of the issues that affect the institutions and their response in our community.

Again, I'm really excited about the opportunity to bring this to this discussion, as well as participate in the dialogue. Thank you.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: Thank you so much, Ron. We are trying to get Lorell on but I'm not sure we will get it. I think we can still get started with the questions for the panelists. For Janine, David, Ron, I'm hoping you can take a few minutes to respond to one another and what you might have heard, and also this discussion, we know what the problem is, we talked about the problem, and we see that, but where do we go from here as advocates, as criminal justice professionals, as family members of people with disabilities, where do you think we go from here?

For this part of the webinar,I will have you all turn on your video cameras and unmute yourselves. Whoever is speaking, the video will track the person speaking. Do you want to take this one first, Janine?

>> JANINE JACKSON: I unmuted myself first, so here we go. I really want to say that I'm very happy to hear that the conversation is what I would say sufficiently radical, in other words, radical in terms of going to the root. I was a little bit concerned to say that I think that training is necessary but not sufficient. I'm happy to hear that that is understood as a baseline, and maybe, we are going even further, which is to say that improved training of police officers who are in reality going to be first responders in many of these situations. That's not ideal but the case now. Certainly some reckoning with improving that situation, but what I am thrilled to hear is that we are thinking much bigger than that and that we really are saying that we cannot focus our solutions through law enforcement, that these are social conversations and community decisions, and that they have to do with placing resources where resources need to be.

I think we should be realistic about that, that once we are talking about, specifically a matter of money, and saying that we need-- I always approach the lifeboat mentality, the idea that there's not enough money, and so if we are going to provide mental health services, we are going to have to take that money out of the wallets of police officers. That's not what's happening and I think we should resist that kind of imagery, but at the same time, moving emphasis back to communities and reducing the role of law enforcement. I want us to be prepared and aware of the push back that we are likely to see and to have our argument ready, which I think we do, but to be aware that we are going to need to make an argument that this is a movement towards making people more safe and not less safe, and getting our argument lined up to do that.

I just wanted to say that I'm very, very happy to hear that the conversation is that far advanced, I really am.

>> DAVID M. PERRY: I just-- I realized that my comments sounded like the lifeboat mentality, and I want to stress that I agree with you. I was thinking about a very specific million-dollar grant or trauma in the communities that came to Emmanuel from I think the Department of Justice. I think about an actual real million dollars, of which almost all of it did not go to the communities that are traumatized but went to police training. That's not the way it should be, but I'm thinking about, when I made the comment, I was thinking about that hypothetical million dollars, but the actual million dollars being spent on trauma in the communities not being spent on the communities in trauma. I think that's about focus, but like not that it has to be a zero-sum game, but that we have to shift the conversation in an important way.

>> JANINE JACKSON: Absolutely. I heard you talking really about the narrative and the way we need to shift it, which absolutely is going to be interpreted that way. It is the way that things are often heard, and we need to be prepared to make that counter argument that we are not trying to deprive communities of law enforcement that's necessary.

>> RONALD HAMPTON: This is Ronald Hampton. I think there's an additional case that can be made because there are communities where citizens are getting more involved in the Department of Public Safety strategies that include the services that communities need and should have. I think there's evidence that what we are talking about can be successful.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: Thank you so much. We have a few questions coming in now from our audience members. As a reminder, if you have a question for the panelists, you can type that in the Q&A box over on the right-hand side of your screen. If we don't get to your question today, we will follow up by an email. You can send your questions to the email address in the middle of your screen.

First, a couple of questions that can. I will throw these out to the group. Whoever wants to take them, if you would like to comment, that's also great, too.

The first question. If you are a person of color with a disability, what strategies can you recommend to help mitigate, navigate, or push back on the crosshairs of Intersectionality? Sounds like the question is, if you are a person of color with a disability, should you be pushing back on the problem of Intersectionality and if so, why or how?

>> JANINE JACKSON: I think that's kind of the broader issue that we are getting at, and part of the pushback is partly this conversation today. What we have found is that very often within organized activity, folks are subtly or less subtly encouraged to leave their identities, at least one of them at the door. When you are in a conversation where you're talking about racism and policing, I think there can be, even among the well-intentioned, there can be a desire-- we are just doing like this now, but we will get to disability later. That was what I was gesturing towards earlier, where there is a need in all of the spaces that we are in, whether as a researcher or as an activist, to bring your full self and to demand acknowledgment for your full self.

There's no recipe for it, because it's a difficult conversation, but it does include raising your hand and saying, okay, but what about people with disabilities, also, who are also black and also in this conversation? When you are in the conversation about disability, what about race, also, and gender, also, and orientation, you have to insert those lines of dialogue into whatever conversation you are in, and simply resist the notion that we will get to that-- we will get to that. The idea is that we are powerful selfs all the time, including interactions with police, that those multi-dimensions are part of what is seen by the officer, if we are talking about these incidents.

It really means in every conversation that you are in and every space that you are in, being mindful yourself that you want to represent all of the things that are important to you. Nobody here is saying that that always goes down easy, sometimes it doesn't, and that's what we mean in terms of difficult conversations. But to resist the idea that we can set aside some of ourselves until later, because that is part of the problem that has us in the situation we are in today

>> DAVID M. PERRY: I want to say that there's a lot of organizations doing this kind of work. I tried to as much as possible stay in my lane as a journalist, and I think, who can I quote, who can I highlight a profile and help to get into the mainstream media outlet, that's kind of my lane. There are other ones. I've been encouraged over the last year of both sort of in formal and informal work being done around this. The ACLU, last week, I think, came out in a report of people with disabilities and solitary confinement, was really driven by people of color with disabilities in a collective work. A prison project, similarly the summer, the national Council of disability this fall had a meeting on first responders and disabilities. There's the Harriet Tubman collective as a group that I'm really impressed with, a wonderful collection of activists of all different sorts with different backgrounds and trainings and professional skills, coming together to demand a two-way conclusion to tell civil rights groups not focused on disability that they have to talk about disability and some disability rights groups, they have to talk about civil rights. Those kinds of movements are the places that I think really need to be focused on, and honestly, again, funding, and talk about money and where are the resources going. We need to be funding and pushing our attention there and so those kinds of things.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: Thank you so much for that. We have more questions rolling in.

Are there any efforts to look at training for people with disabilities and workplace related incidents? For example, police being called to workplace settings because supervisors are unnecessarily frightening people with mental illness. That's a question about training in the workplace for incidents.

>> DAVID M. PERRY: I don't know if Ron can talk to that, and I have not seen that in particular. 40 hours of mental health class, where I sat in on different ones, 40 hours long, is a combination of lectures about what is disability and what it's like to be disabled, usually delivered by mental health professionals and then there's various kinds of role-playing and assessments of role-playing. I usually performed on people who are not disabled. It varies widely from place to place. There are places where people with disabilities are more involved, but I have not seen anything specifically focused on workplace, and if I'm hearing correctly, the issue behind it, what's going on is that someone else’s perspective is leading them to be afraid and so they call the police and the incidence escalates. And that kind of more sophisticated analysis of discrimination, it's not something that I have witnessed being a part of police training on either mental health issues are on developmental disability issues.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: It’s a really interesting question and something that people-- do we actually target training efforts toward dispatchers who are kind of giving information to police officers before they go out on these calls about how they might talk about whatever is being reported or being called about, so that's kind of an interesting thing, too. Ron and David can talk about that or Janine, on perhaps training dispatchers.

>> RONALD HAMPTON: This is Ron. Years and years ago, there was some investment in the dispatch system called managing calls and service, and the intent was to gather for the dispatchers, to gather as much information as she or he could, and then be able to transfer that information to the officer responding, doing the actual response.

I don't know whether that strategy or if that is something that they are using now, because now, we have seen a reversal in terms of some of the policing strategies interagency, and all we are doing is responding to calls of service, disregarding information the officer needs to have in order to adequately and appropriately handle the call once he or she gets it.

I just think that the kind of things that I was talking about in terms of community control, as the police are addressing some of the issues, because they are beginning to look at what the concerns of the people are when they are called. There has to be a comprehensive educational approach to the public when it comes to, not just police for public safety and agencies that are involved in providing public safety in our community.

>> DAVID M. PERRY: Dispatch is clearly one of the places in which practice is really diverse. I spent some time in San Antonio where they have a well thought of, built from the ground, and they would say it's not perfect, but they have built a comprehensive mental health services-- training, a percent of their offices and building, dedicated teams focused on specific kinds of issues, again, not perfect, but they are certainly trying to build community-based infrastructure from the ground up to address these issues. They were very clear on saying that one of the things I do is train everybody, every single person including dispatchers. I don't recommend it, but if you do sit down and read 200 media reports on 200 deaths in a row, you do see how often the bad information starts of the call.

To the extent that, we do focus on training. We clearly need to include dispatchers there.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: I would add anecdotally that I have heard advocates in this area say that sometimes what they are dealing with is the fight of who gets to the phone first.

>> JANINE JACKSON: In other words, when a person is in a mental health crisis, the family is concerned with her is fighting going on, because the family member may be the one who calls, and the person they are calling about is already framed as the perpetrator. When police get there, there may in fact be a sort of general confusion or general fighting going on, but whoever has been named in that initial call to law enforcement, they are the target, if you will, when you get there. In other words, it just speaks to another sort of confused aspect of what goes down in that moment.

Clearly, the point of intervention has to be some time before law enforcement arrived at the scene, and I think that's what we are all saying, but I'm underscoring that it's been told to me that it's incredibly impactful that the law enforcement arrived with a particular scenario in mind, and that has to do with what they've been told over the phone.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: Thank you. The next item is more of a comet. It says, I became a police officer in 1977. We were still talking about the same issues. I think there might also be a question there of why are we still having the same issues that we had in 1977?

>> RONALD HAMPTON: You are asking me? One of the reasons is and I think David alluded to it, the people in the police community think that it's something that training can cure. So they will talk about additional training and investment in training and then we never see the results of that. It also has something to do with the culture of policing. We also have to take into consideration that a lot of this has to do with the culture of the police union to represent their police officers and has a contract that's negotiated with between the management and individual police officers. Policing is a problem in our society.

If we are talking about successful change, restructuring cultural issues, then we will have to deal with the unions and the things they fight for in reference to what they think policing ought to be in this country.

>> JANINE JACKSON: I think we also have to look at the broader social and economic context, in which you have increasing poverty and joblessness, sort of abandonment of city centers. We see the conditions for the creation of poverty and its attendant problems, and it seems our social response has been increasingly to criminalize poverty, and to turn things into crimes that were never crimes before. At the same time, as we have individual officers sign, we are being asked to handle too much, being asked to be social workers and so on, we have a society that is systematically draining the other resources for those sorts of things.

It's very much the question of law enforcement and the emphasis on law enforcement, is absolutely integrated into broader social and economic questions. I think there's no way to separate it from that.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: I just heard back that Lorell is on the phone. In the meantime, question about terminology. The question is why do we say that people with disability as opposed to people with differing ability. Differing abilities as opposed to disabilities.

>> DAVID M. PERRY: It's not my campaign to fight. I am dyslexic, but my entry into the disability community comes with the problem of Down syndrome, and as an academic trying to study things since he was born and now as a journalist. I will say there are a lot of different terms, but I feel like people like Lawrence Carter long, talking about say the word, said were disabled, and all of the self advocates behind the identity first movement, who are not a person of disability but a disabled person, that their arguments have been very persuasive to me and so I recommend that you look them up.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: I'm trying to get Lorell set up. What we might do is take a pause in the question and answer and take a step back to make sure that we hear from Lorell. She has a really important perspective to share with us from Black Lives Matter. Let me get my gears in order here and we will back up for just a little bit.

Let me tell you a little bit about Lorell while we are getting her set up and we will turn it over to her. Lorell Kilpatrick is an organizer with Black Lives Matter, Northwest Indiana chapter and a part of the Everybody Counts North/Indiana. She's a program for the disability rights agency. She is also an instructor for Indiana University Northwest.

Regarding her views on social justice, she stresses that intergenerational, multiracial assessable, antiracist movement will secure the true quality of life for everyone. With that, let me turn this over to Lorell. Lorell, I think I muted you-- I will turn over presenter. I can hear you. I will turn you over to presenter so you can turn your slides.

>> LORRELL KILPATRICK: I'm on my phone and cannot turn the slides over.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: Do you want me to put through to talk?

>> LORRELL KILPATRICK:, On the program core data for independent living-- everybody county north. We are a part of everybody counts. Work for the Hammond Center. We are now in Arizona at the silk Congress. There is a hashtag right now, #silkcongress2017. Basically focused on statewide, every state has a statewide independent counsel that supplies independent living with state funding, and they are supposed to be the body that does the advocate and legislative advocating on a state level for these areas, for people with disabilities.

Our long-standing issue has been that in Indianapolis, Indiana, in central and southern Indiana in general, for the majority of the other independent living, and where the statewide independent counsel has no relationship with us in Northwest Indiana. In Northwest Indiana, in just one of our counties, is over 47% the highest number of or highest percentage of the minority population of the state. That's who we serve and that's who we advocate for. We are very much of the belief that when they shut us out as an independent [inaudible]. The majority of black and white American people are going through-- hang on, sorry. I'm back.

When they shut us out of that process, they are setting up this demographic of people that we represent. Recently, in the December meeting of the Indiana statewide counsel, one of the things they have done to silence us is to cancel public comment. The public comment section is the only section that people who are not on the Council, that's the only section where they have a chance to voice the concerns of their area. They recently canceled public comment altogether because they did not like what we were saying and they didn't like how the people we were bringing to the meetings were saying it. They come up with legislation quite against their own rules, and they have punitive submissions that we come to you to make statements that they were comfortable with and we would be banned for life from making public comment.

Independent living, this movement was born out of advocacy, and born of activism, and born out of dissent, and born out of noncompliance, in fact, it was born out of people with a wide range of disabilities, people who were using wheelchairs, hopping out of the realtors and crawling up the steps of the steakhouse in Washington DC because it wasn't accessible. It was born out of people pushing their bodies out of these public buses, because of the bus was not going to be accessible for them-- it was born out of this.

Now, we have people with disabilities and people without, most people with disabilities using state violence in terms of the police, to silence us who have to go to these things to advocate for our people because they are not doing it.

This weekend, Congress, independent-- the Indiana silk report, and the report was very vague. Everyone was giving inspirational reports about what they are doing this day, how they are building a culture and supporting this independent living and what they are getting done on behalf of the people with disabilities in the state. The statewide independent living council for Indiana gave a very big presentation, because they actually don't do anything for people with disabilities, other than the people on the Council.

I'm from Chicago Indiana. I don't know if you've seen it in national news, but they are fighting a lead crisis right now, fighting a very serious lead crisis, in which the city is trying to forcibly affect the population. The majority are people with disabilities, so they can build structures on this land. If you are from Chicago, one thing for sure, you don't drink the water. We are home to the largest steel refineries in the country, in Chicago, Indiana. BP, British Petroleum, has the largest refinery and it's the largest in the country, sitting between Chicago and Chicago Indiana. People are dying from traditions that are related to lead contaminations. All we asked for in October from the silk was a letter to the mayor, so maybe we can move this issue forward. They've done nothing, again, because they refused to advocate for this population of mostly black and Latino people with disabilities.

They gave a report yesterday at the silk Congress that included nothing about our area. I objected loudly and I gave our report, because we found out that there's a right to die legislation that had been introduced by a state senator in our state of Indiana, and we just found out that it's not being supported by other representatives is a huge victory! It's huge, because we all know the legislation overwhelmingly affects people with disabilities, overwhelmingly negatively affects women, overwhelmingly negatively affects racial minorities, we know that. We got it to be supported and our state did not do that, we did that, the Center for Independent living. The statewide independent living counsel did nothing for that, we did that.

I was speaking to the things we have done: we made transportation in our area accessible. We're making movements to make public spaces and residential living quarters accessible. Not most of the crowd, but probably about 5 to 6 people, stood up and said to shut up on things we deal with on a daily basis. Larry [indiscernible],-- I'm legally blind in my left eye, and he came to me on my left side and put his hand on my left shoulder by my left eye and told me to shut up and leave. This is happening. I'm not a supporter of state violence and there's most things I don't call the police for, but I vote for my right to call the police and have them arrested. I didn't because there's a bigger issue than my offense.

Going into the room and telling them that what they did is wrong and trying to sell it says is wrong. He lied to the police that he felt physically threatened and told them that he wanted us removed from the Congress and the hotel. As we were trying to figure out what was going on and why hotel security guards pulled us out of a room and six to eight cops came to the area.

I myself don't use a chair but I'm visually impaired. I have a coworker who is legally blind and uses a cane. My director is hearing-impaired and uses a scooter. My other coworker, black women, uses a wheelchair. Our consultant, a middle-aged white male, uses a wheelchair. We are who he felt physically threatened by and call to the police to have us removed. They called the police to have us physically removed. No, they called the place to have us physically removed. It was so funny, because the police were asking, who were the ones being the most vocal, because they equated us using our voice to advocate for our people with us being violent and with us needing to be removed from the situation.

I'm also an organizer for Black Lives Matter, and in the slides, I'm not sure if you walk into the slides, but I make mention of our seven demands of the city. We focus on three of those demands: the immediate stoppage of county sweeps. That's when the county and city police come into the area and no matter how old they are, they force their way into people's residence and usually don't announce themselves as police in the beginning. It's terrorism. We focus on the immediate stoppage of what we call predatory. Just like in Ferguson, I don't know if you saw the documentary of Ferguson under siege, where they talk about the residents of Ferguson are the constant or are under constant economic terrorism or subjected to these motor vehicle fines for their cars, totally in the thousands of dollars. Such is the situation with Gary, Indiana. The mayor has sold people of Indiana and have allowed the police department from other cities to come into Gary. By the way, the Lake County Sheriff, he's being indicted on charges of taking bribes, particularly by tow trucking. He has been recorded saying, if you are not giving me the number of [indiscernible] that we need, he has been saying that Gary is an overwhelmingly populous city. Again, part of the area that we advocate for is the center for independent living.

We have used some of the same tactics to use our voice to use the community building to get people together to fight state violence. The reason why it's so late today is because I had to be very vigilant by recording what was going on, because it was getting so bad. There was an officer, who when I said I was recording, he asked me why, and I said that I was recording to make sure our rights were not violated. There are eight of you and five of you and we all have disabilities. He pointed the body cam and said that they were recording and they had body cams. I said yes, but you see in the news that people with disabilities are being killed by the cops all the time. Your camera will not stop us from using our rights. He laughed at disabled people dying.

I apologize for being late, but there was no way I want to take my camera off of any of this for any amount of time. I also called the Sgt. I was making another comment about them being the militarized arm of the government and doing exactly what they are supposed to do when one of the officers being seen disconnected from the issue was only doing their jobs. They said, absolutely that's what you are. It's almost the definition. You should read about the history of cops in this country as union busters and the abuse of immigrants and emigrant labor-- he asked his officers to remove me on the spot. He said, she goes right now off of the premises.

I know we are talking specifically about police abuse, but for me, police abuse is one form of state violence among many forms that I see in my activism. You have cops and you have the courts. I don't call it a criminal justice system as there's no justice to it. You have the cops and the courts. Now, dancing with Trump, you have the usage of these racist groups. They use these racist groups to attack people and to violate people, and they are very much used as part of their political gain to oppress people. That's why I talk about statewide as opposed to justice. Now, again, in independent living, which is supposed to be a movement created by people with disabilities, they are using state violence. The statewide Independent living Council call the police on us regularly. They called the police on a -- hashtag-- reading a letter about-- they called an armed state patrol officer to remove her. [indiscernible] [inaudible]

Manhandling young girls. Not even talking about young men, manhandling young white girls. That situation could have been tragic. This girl was reading a letter I wrote. It’s associated with our Sen. and a granddaughter of one of my coworkers. This police officer came up to her, and I tell you what, she did better than most adults, she continued to read and she finished that letter and the people on the Council was beside themselves that the cops did not physically remove her. The cop was freaked out, too. He wasn't going to touch her. When he walked past her afterwards, he touched her shoulder to comfort her and apologize to the adults that brought her afterwards. He said that he did not want to do that but was just doing his job. This is what happens. This is how state violence is used in the community against people with disabilities who are trying to be true advocates, who are trying to actually make a difference, and at the end of the day, trying to make people do their jobs.

I'm a part of the Harriet Tubman collective, and it's the same work we are doing and the work of the Black Lives Matter. Without the appointed state entity, we help politicians withdraw their support for ending like legislation in Indiana, which is huge. People like my grandmother and my aunt, are the types of people who would choose to end their own lives rather than be what we as a society call subverted.

I'm sorry I was rambling on, and this is not the presentation I planned, but it's the presentation that happened as a result of the day. Thank you so much!

>> ARIEL SIMMS: Thank you so much. We really appreciate you coming in and sharing that perspective with us and bringing us back to the real difficulty and struggle at the grassroots level in what's happening out there. Thank you again.

I will check in with the other panelists now that we've had more information. I thought I would check in with you guys to see if you wanted to respond to anything Lorell mentioned or interact with each other a little bit more, or we can answer your questions. Panelists, tell me what you think. Don't forget to unmute yourselves.

>> JANINE JACKSON: This is Janine. I wanted to thank Lorell for that information and for telling us about that experience. It's very powerful to hear. I don't have much to say, response to say that it illustrates how dangerous ideas are. Many of the examples is the idea of who's the most vocal, that's the person who needs to leave, all of these are so emblematic of the difficulty of the work and the way that it will be resisted.

What I first wanted to say that I take away, is the positive vision that's articulated there. In other words, of the organization where there are organizations tasked with certain things not doing their jobs. I'm hearing that other individuals are springing up and filling those cracks to fulfill the work that that organization is meant to do and is not fulfilling, and that's very inspiring to me. But also the positive vision which I've long admired of the independent living community in general, which is about sharing a view of what the world could look like, of what our society could be if people were allowed the resources and the freedom to live the lives that they want to live, and the idea that they can be one in which community helps community and there is less and less role for police, makes absolute sense to me.

Despite the difficulty, clearly, the physical challenge and the resistance that you meet, what I actually took from that is a very positive vision of a way forward and a way that we can help one another forward with a vision that's not just about what we want to end, but what we want to grow. I was very inspired by that. Thank you.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: Lorell, you mentioned something that one of the other panelists brought up, that was the use of body cameras and recording behavior, whether behavior by the police officers or community. Just asking the panelists at large, what are your thoughts or views on recording devices or body cameras, both on community side and also one the policing side. Do you think there's room for that and our solutions moving forward to this issue?

>> LORRELL KILPATRICK: I think what we know now, not my opinion but what we know and what we have is observed, we know that body cameras of police officers cams, don't stop them from abusing and killing people. They abuse and tell people in the police department words being reported so it does not stop them. I think it's imperative that we continue to record. I had to use other people's phones to record because mine died, excuse me. I'm losing my voice. I had to use other people's phones to continue to record because they posed a threat to my life. I let the officers know that I know they are posing a threat to my life.

The Sgt. and other officers became extremely aggressive. After the surgeon said to get her out, and pose a threat to get me everything, the officers laughed when I said their body cameras didn't mean anything to me, because people with disabilities are going to get killed, he left. To get me out, he was legal, he was going to take the chance on putting an end to me to get me out of there. Scary. It's lethal.

I think when you are in the moment, and I've seen quite a few moments when you are face down-- I've been to Ferguson and I faced off with the police, and I believe that this constitution that protects people, when the police attacked us and all we were doing was chanting, the last barrier and symbol of safety has been broken.

Yes, I think it's imperative that people make record of their interactions, any interaction like this. I think it's imperative that they continue to record, even though in places like Chicago, recording the police is an arrestable offense. I don't know if it's a felony, but it's at least a misdemeanor and reputable offense to record police officers doing their job. Activism. Even though the cops and the courts don't discipline them when they kill people, it still makes it harder for them to supply a semblance of a barrier.

I think we should continue to record the things on tape. If you don't have a video recorder, audio record it. Don't keep it to yourself. Release it to the public. Live stream is invaluable. Is invaluable to record them and immediately release it. That's it.

>> DAVID M. PERRY: I want to jump in and say there's a difference between monitoring and surveillance, and that is very easy for body cameras and cams to become tools of surveillance rather than tools of monitoring. I don't think it has to work that way, again, I'm always concerned about cost, concerned about funneling more resources into police rather than into communities. Video has enormous power, and even if it doesn't result in convictions, it does result in allowing people to witness what goes on. Again, just as Lorell says, when video is just a tool controlled by the legal and incarcerate system, it doesn't feel like a strong pathway to liberation. That doesn't mean I'm opposed to body cameras, but that I'm just very skeptical that they are a big pathway to getting us to the right place.

>> LORRELL KILPATRICK: No, they are not. They kill people on camera. That's the experience they have. They kill people on camera. Like everything else, it's a concession, but not a concession that works for people. That's why I talk about state violence. It's all state violence. It's not meant to be a tool at all.

>> DAVID M. PERRY: Walter Scott was still on camera. The officer was implanting his weapon and it was a mistrial. I'm not particularly optimistic about the power of video in the courts at this moment.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: Thank you both for your thoughts on that. A couple of people have mentioned or have written in the Q&A box that police in their jurisdictions creating day-to-day-- vulnerable people. I thought I would ask guys to weigh in on whether creating a database of people with disabilities within the police kind of structure is a solution, or if not, what some of the pitfalls might be by creating that sort of database.

>> LORRELL KILPATRICK: In our area, when you go to the doctor, there's a list of blind folks, at least in Indiana. To tell the truth, I haven't gotten a satisfactory answer when I asked why. Why do they need a record of where people are, doesn't make sense, but they do. Again, I can't imagine what, but I think it's one more step-- I think it's just another tool of the power elite just to know where we are. There's a database of parents with children with disabilities. I think is another tool of control.

>> DAVID M. PERRY: I was recently talking to people in Iowa, and I'm generally skeptical about the databases, too, but one of the people there is a person with a disability and one of color and has frequently been homeless, and she said that when she was pulled over by the cops, she would be pretty happy if the cops knew ahead of time about her disability. I feel like that's a perspective that a lot of people have, but it's a perspective based on fear, a perspective based on knowing that you don't have some kind of reason for the cops not to abuse you that you could be in a lot of danger.

In the short term, the people who are deaf wants to hang up a sign in their car saying I'm deaf, please if I'm ignoring you don't shoot me, or if someone was to be in a database saying that they could be in a health crisis and don't assume I'm ignoring you, that comes out of fear and it might be a helpful short-term solution, maybe, probably not, maybe, and an individual incident, but again, it's not getting at that root that Janine was talking about earlier and we have to get there.

>> RONALD HAMPTON: Can you hear me? I have to agree, I'm not in favor of creating databases. They had people in gangs[indiscernible]. They can too easily be used against you rather than provide a measure of safety for you. Like David was talking about, sometimes people use the result of those kinds of things thinking it will protect them, and I just don't think that their trust level exists with these law enforcement agencies. I know that I would not want my name in the database.

>> JANINE JACKSON: Just to agree with what has been said, I have the same reaction of intense suspicion for the idea of a collection of names coded in certain ways. I understand the idea, to me, first of all, disability manifests itself so differently and in so many situations that the idea that police officers would say, let me check this person's name in the heat of an interaction and would change their behavior-- their behavior should be what it should be, regardless of whether the person is coded of having a disability of some sort. I'm suspicious of it for the surveillance, but I'm also suspicious of it for moment to moment help. In many situations where people are repeatedly involved with law enforcement, law enforcement to come to know that person and they know it's a person who in certain circumstances might be considered disturbing the peace or something like that. In a small town, that can certainly be the case. I don't think you can substitute for that personal community knowledge or should we on the part of law enforcement, and then in the broader picture, I just don't see-- the potential for abuse with that information seems overpowering. There are a couple of reasons that I have questions about that.

>> LORRELL KILPATRICK: There's an issue-- autistic 14 or 15-year-old, the police were doing, not police officer but usually a social worker was doing an assistance for the parents. He was agitated and it was time to go to school and he wants to put on his computer. They came in and they already knew the son was autistic and they already knew and they triggered him; they were loud and yelling. The son had a butter knife in his hand because he was trying to open a cabinet with a computer in it, and the officers chased him down to the basement. One officer shot him in the back. He turned around and the other officer shot him in the chest and they killed him.

Most recently by an action in Chicago by a grassroots organization, the police hit the biological mother with a bike. They were trying to pin people physically in an area and they had the mother with a bike. A young man came to her and put his body between the police officer and his mom. That young man was arrested. He put his body between her and the bike and they shot him and he fell over on the bike. They charged him and gave him a $100,000 bail.

If you been involved in activism whatsoever, they already have a list of people like this and they use it to do a whole media hack job on his character. They said he was a crazy autistic black boy and known to try to beat up police and that could not be farther from the truth. I absolutely agree with what was being said. February 1 will be the five-year anniversary of Savon's murder by the police. His mothers community are putting an anniversary party together. Look for the #of justice forced upon her.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: We're coming to an end and we have one more question for each panelist. I want to quickly remind our participants that if we don't get your question right now in the webinar, we will follow up with you by email and try to get that question answer. I also wanted to remind people that this is only the first webinar in a series of the topic policing people with disabilities. Look for the next webinars in the series. Policing People with Disabilities Webinar Series. There's a link in the chatbox and it’s posted there. You can also get a letter from the PowerPoint slide once it's posted. I want to point one of those things out.

Just a reminder, this webinar has been very much about the overarching problem and what is happening, kind of looking at the issue in an Intersectional way. We are really going to try to get into some solutions and programs and things happening around the country in the next couple of webinars to see if we can kind of figure out some of the solutions to this problem. Just a quick reminder in each of those.

With that, I wanted to as the panel is one final question, and that is that people are listening to the webinar want to get involved and want to help out with this issue, what can they do? Are there concrete things that they can do to help with this, health advocate in the state? I will open that to the panelist.

>> LORRELL KILPATRICK: The question is what are some concrete things that you can do? I'm sorry.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: That people can do. People who are listening. We have advocates on the phone. We have police. Where family members and people who have had the issue themselves. Would you the panelist have suggestions for people and one thing they can do to contribute or help with this issue?

Kind of a related question is, are the things people need to do different, given the new administration coming in? That's also the question coming in. You can take either of those.

>> LORRELL KILPATRICK: There were people using their voices to speak out today. I think a lot of times that people are not sure how to help. Often times it helps to just listen and help with issues, and there's a time and place for that, but if you are witnessing something happening, whether it be physical or verbal or anything, if you are witnessing it happening, you must use a voice and try to intervene. For the people being abused, have to take this ideology of support-- I read a piece from Harriet, about how we have to be more than allies, more than an ally, you have to act. You have to understand that even though you are able-bodied, you are still affected. You have to act. That's the one thing I have want to get across, people have to act, you have to use your voice and body and use your support, your something on behalf of people that are abused.

People can contact me on twitter. Kilpatrick. Probably on twitter is the way to get hold of me. There's a lot still going on. Thank you so much everybody for being so patient. I appreciate it.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: Other panelists, Janine, David.

>> RONALD HAMPTON: I agree with 100% of what she said and it's very important. The only thing I would ask about the thing that is going on-- you have to in your work to advocate for the concerns affecting your group. There are other strategies within a group to protect a group, as well as strategies every single day. It does not help us to talk about what we've been talking about today, if we somehow don't have a strategy with an organization to address the inappropriate response of the police, as well as of agencies in our societies institutions. We are constantly looking at that ourself, and replacing it with a step up strategy. We are saying that we can protect one another. We have children and other people have children in their 40s, and we know what to do, and you can call on us and we will be our best advocate, as well as our support on these kind of issues. We need to work across the community to provide a measure of safety and support to our members. That's always something we can do in organizations.

>> JANINE JACKSON: I would like to underscore the importance of actions, but also underscore the importance of getting involved at the level you care about, at the level you are working at, not imagining that you need to learn a whole issue area that you know nothing about. Travel and join an organization that's in another place, you can get involved and there is work to do at the areas in which you are already involved. It might be your child's school or your workplace and that came up earlier, all of these are places of intervention. It's not the same thing as just putting out a post on social media about it, it needs to be engagement where you are talking to other people involved in an actual conversation. It's much harder but where the work actually happens. As a media critic, I would underscore writing a letter to an editor-- responded talk back to journals. I see David nodding his head with me on that.

It is beyond thinking about it and talking about it with your friends. It's not as hard or scary as you might think, but it's taking that first step. Hey, you passed a demonstration, grab the fire, whose the group organizing it and when's the next meeting. Taking a few steps to get involved with other human beings in your community is not only going to be the important work that moves us all forward, but it makes you feel better at the end of the day because you come into community with other people who are pushing that same rock. To get involved in an active way.

>> DAVID M. PERRY: Answering the new administration issue, I think there have been a lot of people involved before who have been looking for Pres. Obama to fix this. The problem is there, we all see the problem, so why can't he or the Department of Justice fix this? That's a big conversation we can talk about another day. But clearly, that kind of attitude will not carry forward. The new Atty. Gen. is not going to be deeply involved in solutions for people with disabilities, where we generally found lots of support in the White House for. We will have to do just as I said, really look to local communities, look on your local levels and stop hoping that the White House is going to be the leader on these issues, because I think that we will see something very much to the contrary.

>> ARIEL SIMMS: Thank you so much. I want to take the time to thank each of our panelists Janine, David, Ron and Lorrell. I also want to thank our audience who participated, and for sharing those great questions and comments, and we will follow up with you if we did not get to your questions.

At the end of the webinar, you'll see a brief survey that pops up. Also if you have questions, you can take a few minutes to fill it out. It's really helpful. Thank you again for joining us and we hope to see you at our next webinar in May. Thank you.