

Weber Shandwick

Kellogg Conference

Plenary Session

“Power, Privilege and Democracy”

Moderator:

**Charles Ogletree,
Jesse Climenko Professor,
Harvard Law School**

Panelists:

**Donna Brazile,
Political Strategist;
Barbara Arnwine,
Executive Director,
Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law;
Ian Haney Lopez,
John H. Boalt Professor of Law,
University of California, Berkeley;
Peggy McIntosh,
Associate Director of Wellesley Centers for Women,
Wellesley College**

Location:

**New Orleans Marriott
555 Canal Street,
New Orleans, Louisiana**

Time: 8:30 a.m. CST

Date: Thursday, April 26, 2012

*Transcript by
Federal News Service
Washington, D.C.*

MS. : Good morning.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Morning.

MS. : One more time, good morning.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Good morning.

MS. : I'm going to ask that you please come in and be seated as quickly as possible. (Pause.) We have a busy day ahead, and we do need to get this panel started as well as the rest of the day. So please go ahead and find a seat. (Pause.) I think I may sit to do your announcements. I just kind of like the feeling of this. This is different.

All right, everyone. A number of quick things: First of all, because somebody may be frantic that they've lost this, I have a yellow claim check which may be for a car. If that car is super nice, this may not be around for long. If you have lost a yellow claim check, please go to registration after we're done in here or as soon as you realize that you can't get your car, OK?

All right. A number of quick announcements, if I might have your attention. For those of you leaving today, please check into the registration area prior to dinner. They need to see you at the registration area prior to dinner. (Coughs.) Excuse me. It says that the – there's a beta launching of a new project. This is the Healing History project that's on the second floor. This is an online interactive documentary series to show how racial healing and racial equity can help communities understand racial injustices and heal old wounds. And this first Healing History focuses on a community here in one of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation's priority cities, New Orleans; and that would be the Central City part of New Orleans.

Please take time when we have breaks or in the off-time to go to the Healing History display. That would be on the second floor. We encourage you to visit the kiosk or computer stations. They will be staffed with people who can help you to walk through and answer your questions and get feedback on your experience at those kiosks. We're also live-tweeting this event and panel today. So we do want you to go ahead and follow the conversation online and to participate as well by using the racial equity hashtag. So again, for those of you who are a part of the Twitterverse – I am guilty as charged – please go ahead and do #racialequity for your tweets that are related to this meeting.

We're curating the online and offline conversations into a daily wrap-up, so you can get a sense of the conversations that are happening throughout the course of the day. And there have been some interesting things that have been popping up on Twitter in terms of your thoughts about yesterday's conversation with Mr. Belafonte, as well as things that came out of the healing sessions, et cetera. So it's great to see and hear what your peers are thinking about, their experiences while they're here.

Again, a gentle reminder to please remember to wear your name badges at all times. There are other meetings going on in the hotel. And it's helpful to our staff to know who you are so they can be of help to you throughout the day.

We have had a wonderful, wonderful response with regard to the open space sessions. I think you surprised all of us – pleasantly so – with the number of sessions that have been proposed. With that, if you have not voted for your open space session, please be sure to do so as soon as possible. We will be working to place those sessions in rooms or areas based on the number of respondents. So some of these breakout rooms have capacity at a certain number, and we just need to be able to place those. And then later on we'll tell you where each session will be. Some of the smaller ones will be in this room and held more as roundtables. We'll space them out as much as possible. But we are going to go ahead and try to accommodate all of the sessions that we're proposed, because we want to honor that.

Thought leaders, please make sure, for those of you who have proposed sessions and are thought leaders, that you check your emails throughout the day and your cellphones for text messages that will provide you any logistical updates associated with the open sessions – open space sessions that you've proposed. Concurrent session assignments are posted. If you have not seen those already, they'll be out by the registration area. If for some reason you have not chosen your concurrent session for later on today, you can go ahead and look to see those which have space, and those are the ones that you should select to attend.

Again, another reminder about evaluations. The light blue evaluation pages, throughout the course of the day after this panel, please you those to give us your thoughts and your feedback. And it's very important that at the very top, you tell us what session it is that you are evaluating. So again, please remember to do your evaluations. And staff will be around to pick those up, or at any time feel free to drop those off at the registration area as long as you have the session title at the top.

Also, as I mentioned yesterday, there is the Kellogg 2012 racial equity survey. This is really important to get your thoughts regarding your community as well as what's happening in the country, and will help to inform the foundation's work. So they really, really need to hear from you so that they can get that feedback and incorporate that into how they move forward in the work.

Another gentle reminder – I know it's been more than 20 minutes that Gail promised – but it's time to remind you again that this is a proposal-free zone, so we ask that you honor that. And lastly, if you could please go ahead and take a check on your cellphones – I know you thought you already did it – please go ahead and double-check and make sure that your cellphones are preferably off – because we'd like for you to be as present as possible – at the very least on vibrate, although again, I'm part canine and I can hear people's vibrating phones. So just, you know, go ahead and turn them off if you can. With that, I'm going to go ahead and hand off to Gail, who is going to get us started for our panel this morning. Thank you. (Applause.)

GAIL CHRISTOPHER: Thank you, Natalie (sp). I am just so full this morning with a sense of appreciation and thanksgiving for what – for the gift we were given yesterday on so many levels. So I just want to express my appreciation and invite you to do the same. I want to thank, if – everybody in the room that's been part of the team that helped to bring this all together. For the last six to eight months we've had, I would guess, 30 different people working to make this happen. You know how we do that at the end of the conference, when everybody's thinking about leaving? I want to do it now, while we're all still here in the present moment and

while we're aware of what a gift we are receiving, both from the Kellogg Foundation, from the hearts and minds of so many people and – pardon my digression – I think we're receiving it from the universe or the divine as well.

So could all of the Kellogg folks who've worked so hard, and the consultants, could you all just stand and be appreciated, those that are in the room, please? (Applause.) Thank you all very much.

This panel this morning is about power and privilege and democracy, and we couldn't have anticipated a more natural follow-up to the experience of yesterday afternoon. So we have some wonderful panelists. I just want to take a moment to offer my – again, my heartfelt appreciation to Professor Charles Ogletree, who has agreed generously to moderate this panel as well. (Applause.)

We didn't know when we were planning this -- and we'd gotten confirmation that Harry Belafonte would be with us, and so we were searching for who would we have to have this conversation with Mr. Belafonte. And, you know, we were throwing out names like Oprah Winfrey and, you know, all these other people, and someone reminded me – I saw on the list that Professor Ogletree had agreed to come, and I said, well, that's who we need to have talk with – I did not know that they were lifelong friends at the time. So once again, I think we get some help when we don't even realize we're getting it.

And so he did – you did such an amazing job yesterday. And they have graciously agreed to allow us to put this up on our website once they sign off on it, so others will experience that moment of tremendous inspiration. So without further ado, Professor Ogletree and our wonderful panel.

Thank you so much. (Applause.)

CHARLES OGLETREE: Thank you so much. We have a great panel today. I'm joined by Peggy McIntosh, who will start us off; and then by my good friend Professor Ian Haney Lopez; and then followed by the great Barbara Arnwine, for the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and the Law; and the cleanup hitter, of course, Louisiana's own, New Orleans own Donna Brazile. Please welcome our panel. (Applause.)

It's a very challenging set of topics we're going to be talking about today, and I'm giving you the advance notice we're going to have a few minutes for Q-and-A. There are four people with microphones out in the audience that we'll have toward the – toward the end of the session. And I just wanted to remind people – there's so many brilliant people in this room that have very brilliant questions – it's no more than eight words. (Laughter.) So you can start the process now of editing yourself and getting down to precisely what you want to say. We have your credentials. We have your criminal record. We have all that detail. (Laughter.) So think about the thing, the pointed questions you may want to ask one of the panelists at the end, and we'll make sure we cover that.

We're talking about issues of gender, of race, of class and of democracy, with all that means. And Peggy McIntosh has been in this battle for many, many decades, talking about it, and she's going to kick us off, and each of the first three panelists are going to give a brief overview. They know they have 10 minutes. We have a timer right here in the front. And she has insisted that if anyone goes over, she's going to come on stage and take the mic away from us. So all I'm doing is, you know, trying to make sure that she doesn't take my mic. So – (laughter) – three minutes, OK, I got it. OK, I'm moving fast.

So welcome first, to the introduction for our session today, please welcome Peggy McIntosh. (Applause.)

PEGGY MCINTOSH: Power, privilege and democracy. Privilege confers power, and privilege conferring power interferes with democracy. I was taught not to see privilege. Now I see it this way: There's a hypothetical line of social justice below which people are pushed down, discredited, neglected, starved, colonized, disbelieved, not entrusted with power, and may be victims of genocide. Above the hypothetical line of social justice, the part I was taught not to see, through no virtue of their own, some of us – I as a white am pushed up, believed, credited, fed, kept somewhat safe, considered to be reliable, considered to be worthy of advancement. All that sector of – from above the hypothetical line of social justice diminishes democracy.

My work has been about trying to lessen, among other things, racism through lessening privilege. And I think it is irrational, even crazy, to try to work against racism without addressing white privilege. Janet Langhart and Bill Cohen gave a big conference in Washington a few years ago – 60 speakers – didn't refer to white privilege. The only speakers who addressed white privilege as part of this conference on race and reconciliation were those that are in the universities, and they've been teaching about privilege systems in departments like sociology, sometimes psychology, sometimes anthropology, sometimes history.

But only in the universities was this idea being kept alive, that the upside of discrimination is privilege. So I bless the teachers in colleges who have the fortitude to teach about privilege. And I'm trying to do the same with K-through-12 teachers. But they're oppressed too. They went through the schools that oppressed them. And unless they can recover their own understanding of how everybody suffered in school, even those who, quote, "did well," they're not much good at bringing along the diversity of human beings that are their students, who are also suffering under the privilege systems in schools.

So what keeps the power structures going? I think there are five major myths connected with privilege that are installed in the culture as I knew it and still very visible in media, in government, in business, in health, in law. The five major myths that I've identified, which are part of a paper on some of your tables, go this way. The myth of meritocracy asserts – teaches us that the individual is the unit of society, and whatever the individual ends up with must be what that individual wanted and worked for and earned and deserved. The two parts are important, that the – that the unit of society is individual, and that the individual gets what he or she deserves.

The second major myth which keeps privilege in place is that monoculturally there's just one big system in the United States, and we're all experiencing it more or less the same way. And if you're not experiencing this great, unified culture of the myth in the same way other people are, then there must be something wrong with you or with your behavior.

The third myth is manifest destiny, that God intended white people to take over all of what is the continental United States now, take it away from the people who lived here – whose land it was, and that in the colonial sense God intended us to do that around the world. So President McKinley had a dream that God told him we needed to take over the Philippines for their own good.

The fourth myth is the myth of – it's hard to word. It's white racelessness, but I know I was taught that the word race applied to other people. I was just normal. (Chuckles.) Barbara, they know I'm not that normal, but the thing is – (laughter) – as a white person, I was taught not to see the realm of privilege within which I have more than my share. I just saw that race applied to people other than me. That messes up a whole lot of research and a whole lot of policy – to think that whites don't have a racial experience. We certainly do.

The fifth myth is harder to word, but I grew up with this sense – white people – the people who are in charge are in charge because they're so good at what they do. (Laughter.) You find that funny? (Laughter.) It's funny, but it's also tragic. McNamara apologizing to the Vietnam War decades after it – and I know some who advised him: This war won't work. You must pull out. And he said – this is a direct quote from one of his consultants: I don't do that.

Look at the catastrophe of human life here and in Asia caused by that macho, white male conviction that pulling back is a disgrace. Schools implicitly and explicitly teach these myths. But the teachers, as I said, are suffering too. My main work with teachers has to do with their recovering their past and understanding the power they have to make a difference for the future of children.

I love Alice Walker's statement: The most common way that people give away their power is by not realizing they have any. Despite all the oppressive use of teachers as neutral pass-throughs meant to accomplish other people's objectives with students, they do have power. And it is exhilarating for them, in groups in the SEED Project, to mine their experience for what it tells them about power, privilege and democracy.

Once they have positioned themselves in the universe more securely, once they have positioned themselves in the social systems more securely, they can do this for students and not be afraid of students noticing power. One oddity of education, as far as I'm concerned, is that students aren't in the, quote, "educational literature." You can get a Ph.D. in education and read whole stacks of books, stacks of articles, get a great set of footnotes, and there will not be a single student quoted on their actual daily experience of being in class.

Now, we claim education's for the students. Why are they not part of the curriculum themselves? And why is their experience not part of the school curriculum? The co-director of SEED, Emily Styles, says to her students at Westfield High School on the first day of class: Half

the curriculum entered when you did. Democratic education uses techniques like serial testimony – go around the circle, everybody has one minute – to elicit students’ experience, not their opinions, their experience.

And we do that for teachers in the SEED Project – one minute each. It sounds brutal. On the other hand, it lessens the privilege of the speaker. It increases the power of those who usually listen. And that democratic mode of being present for your minute transforms teachers’ understanding of school, of each other, of educational systems and most of all of the reality and validity of every child in their care – ever child, that sacred (center ?) in their care. Thank you. (Applause.)

MR. OGLETREE: Very well stated. Thank you so much, Peggy.

And now Professor Ian Haney Lopez, who has written extensively on the whole issue of inequality where it comes to race and ethnicity, will give us an overview of these challenges.

Professor?

IAN HANEY LOPEZ: Thank you.

So good morning, everybody.

So is race relevant to the presidential election of 2012? (Laughter.) OK, but precisely how? Is it relevant because there are some bigots? Is it relevant because of the tea party? I want to suggest that it’s relevant in a way that’s much more fundamental – indeed, much more fundamental than many of us appreciate. But, in order to do that, I want to start with a hundred-year history.

Now I’m going to sketch it, and “sketch” in this context means no full sentences. (Laughter.) So a hundred years ago, we had great concentrations of wealth, incredible concentrations of power, great social misery and the start of a Progressive movement, the idea that government had an important role to play in regulating the economy, in cutting back on concentrations of power, in facilitating people’s chances of actually leading a good life.

Opposed to that was a notion of social Darwinism, the idea that the role of government was to be extremely limited, that it was only to set up a market and to protect the nation from foreign aggression, and that people would find their own place within the rigors of competition in the economy. Social Darwinism led to – there’s a sort of ethos of governing associated with it – led to the Great Depression and then to the New Deal. And the New Deal marked a radical reconceptualization of what liberalism meant.

Liberalism used to mean freedom from government, the libertarian ideal, freedom from government. We are most free when government plays the least role in our lives. But the New Deal suggested a new meaning of liberalism: that we achieve liberty not from government, but through government; that to the extent that government ameliorates the vicissitudes of life, that it provides education, that it assists with shelter, that it assists with welfare, that that’s the way the

majority of our population achieves liberty, achieves a chance at a full and fulfilling life. That's the modern liberalism that America embraced over the course of the 20th century, and nothing better illustrates that embrace than the 1964 election.

So, in 1964, LBJ is running against Barry Goldwater. Goldwater is the last of the old pro-business libertarian conservatives running on a naked plank against government regulation, for smaller government, for tax cuts, and Goldwater goes down to a massive defeat. There is a national repudiation of the sort of libertarian critique of New Deal-style liberalism. He wins only in Arizona and in five states in the South, including Louisiana.

Why does he win in the South? The South, which loathes Lincoln Republicans, the South which was solidly Democratic – why did he win in the South? Because his small government mantra in the South translated into states' rights, and states' rights in the South translated into pro-segregation.

And so there were two groups that had major epiphanies after Goldwater's triumph in '64. The first group were politicians themselves who realized that whatever their position, they could get elected by mobilizing white voters through race, through coded racial appeals. But even more consequentially and in a way that we have not focused on, the second group were the pro-business, big-concentration-of-power libertarians. And they realized that they could sugarcoat the bitter pill of social Darwinism through coded racial appeals, and they began to devote their resources to this sort of politics that appealed to whites through coded references to race, getting them to vote against government, not because government was seen now as helping all of us, but by presenting government as helping only some of us, the undeserving among us – blacks and Latinos.

So this is the sort of politics that we've been dealing with since '64, more since '68. If you think about Nixon and the Southern strategy, if you think about Ronald Reagan, if you think about George Bush and Willie Horton, this is the sort of the politics that we've been dealing with. This is where we are now. You may think it's most evident in terms of Newt Gingrich and his references to a food stamp president, but I say it's most – it's most evident in Mitt Romney and his endorsement of Paul Ryan's cruel budget.

This is a budget that will shred, that will decimate the middle class. It's a budget that's associated with massive cuts to modern liberal programs, with deregulation, with massive tax cuts for the wealthy. This is a return for social Darwinism. Why is Romney polling more or less equal with Obama? Because people don't think they're voting for social Darwinism. They think that they're voting – sorry, let me try it this way; you heard about driving while black – how about voting while white? (Laughter.) They think that what they're doing is voting to shrink a government that is no longer for or by them. They think they're voting to shrink a government that is for undeserving minorities and now by undeserving minorities as embodied in President Obama.

Why is race as relevant in 2012 as it was in 1964? It can only be because racism has evolved. It has changed. And we need to think about how it's changed. I want to suggest that it's changed in its material form. Yes, there's still segregation, but now mass incarceration, mass

deportation and more generally the unraveling of the New Deal state. It's also changed in terms of the categories, who counts as white and who doesn't, and I'll come back to that very briefly.

Most importantly, it's changed discursively – now here if you want a signal, the discourse of race is important as it relates to the material changes. But we need to pay attention to the discourse. How has the discourse changed? It has changed in terms of the rise of what I call dog whistle racism, coded racial appeals that are clearly about race – Nixon, for example, referring to not allowing the integration of slum children – clearly about race – but in which politicians maintain plausible deniability, all right? So dog whistle racism. And I think if you want a quintessential example of dog-whistle racism in 2012, think of the phrase “illegal alien,” because whenever anybody says that's about race, the retort is illegal is a crime, not a race, right? So a focus on cultural behavior, not on race – dog whistle racism.

Second big change in racial discourse – colorblindness. Colorblindness allows conservatives to say, A, we are foursquare against racism, and then to say, B, racism is any expressed use of race, and illegal alien is a crime, not a race, and, C, it allows conservatives to say: But I do know that somebody's talking about race. Oh, you liberals keep race and racism, playing the race card, right? What is then the result of colorblindness? Colorblindness protects dog whistle racism, allows it become pervasive, and at the same time has been successfully used to cow the liberal response, because we're so afraid of being tainted and tarred as the real racists in the room.

What are the takeaway points? First and foremost, racism is useful today. Racism is not just about unconscious biases; it is not just about bigotry. It is a tool that is quite helpful today. So yesterday we heard about how, in terms of unconscious racism, only about 2 percent of our mental processing is conscious. That 2 percent has been harnessed to the project of making racism a continually relevant language in America today. Second, racial discourse is pervasive, but that racial discourse is coded in terms of dog whistle racism, and the (last/left ?) is almost entirely absent from the public discourse on race. Three, racism is central to the material harm to nonwhites – harms that are – that have in some senses become increasingly worse over the last 40 years, but racism is also central to material harms to the middle class that includes everybody.

Last point – well, penultimate point – long term, we need to reinvigorate the language of race, even if it doesn't currently poll well. And realizing that our primary audiences in the short-to-medium term may be communities of color and a limited number of progressive whites, because we need to reinvigorate a social justice movement that understands and talks openly and expressly about how race continues to be the primary astringent of American life.

Final point – and this I – which is my plea for a question on this: Demography is not on our side. And this goes back to the point about how categories of race are shifting. We might think demography is on our side; it's not. Thank you.

MR. OGLETREE: Thank you very much. (Applause.)

And next we'll hear from Barbara Arnwine, who worked very diligently in the legal service community in North Carolina before coming to Boston to head the Lawyers' Committee

for Civil Rights, and now is the executive director of the national group the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and has been doing a phenomenal job in bringing people up to date on what's happening with voter suppression and what we have to do to fight against it.

Barbara Arnwine.

BARBARA ARNWINE: Thank you very much. Good morning, everyone.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Good morning.

MS. ARNWINE: Yes, I had to lean forward so my feet will touch the ground. (Chuckles.) So I wanted to start by taking us back to November of 2010. In November 2010 there was an election held around the country, mid-term. In that election, 25 million people who had voted in 2008 did not come to the polls. Most congressional elections that were decided throughout this country were won on less than 2,000 votes.

As a consequence, there was a plan put into place to figure out how do we, now that we have taken over so many state legislatures because of the absence of voters – how do we now dominate the landscape going forward? There's only one way we can do that, and that is by imposing voter suppression laws that will make it impossible for those 25 million and more to come back to the polls and vote.

So what came out, and what blew my mind, was that all of a sudden our state allies are calling us and saying, we have a voter suppression law saying that the only way you can vote in our state is by having a governmentally issued state ID. Let me be very clear. That definition did not mean your worker's ID. That definition did not mean your student ID. That definition meant a governmentally issued driver's license or non-driver's license, or it meant a passport. But of course in certain states, as you can see, this is a massive change.

When I started talking about this a year – you know, more than a year ago, people's eyes would glaze over, because I would give this list of states where people were trying to pass these laws, and nobody got it. And my son said, Mom, why don't you do a map? And I said, that's a great idea. (Laughter.) And I talked to my staff, and they were just brilliant. And they just took it, and they came up with this formulation of the map. And all of a sudden people started seeing it. Our communities started rallying.

Now when we created the map, we called it something like the “map of voter suppression throughout the United States.” And I looked at it one – and I was looking at it and I said, you know what, it reminds me of my father. He's a Texan. And my father used to say, that's a sin and a shame. (Laughter.) And I said, hey, that's a map of shame. (Applause.) I said, that's a map of shame, because when you look at this, the –

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Off mic.)

MS. ARNWINE: – (chuckles) – the goal and the objective is to make sure that people cannot vote. So even in the great state of Texas – when they passed their voter ID law, they

made it so that you could not use – at that point there was a big fight about the student IDs. Even veterans, even military ID was (out of the ?) question.

But guess what they allowed to the youth: your handgun registration. (Laughter.) So you see, I mean, if we have any idea of who was in the crosshairs, who was – who were they after? Let's be very clear, it was minorities, African-Americans, Asians, Native Americans, Latinos, students. They hate students. I don't get it. But they just hate student voters. They say they're too liberal, too young and that they just going to vote the wrong way. So students were a big part of it. So that's why we've had this fight and all these states filed for student IDs.

We also – in the crosshairs were the elderly, because they were the unintended victims and they don't care, you know, because as long as they can keep those minorities away from the polls, as long as they can keep those students away from the polls, they didn't care. The disabled, clearly within – you know, people with disabilities, clearly within the crosshairs of these laws.

So what we do, it said, if you look at the map – and we passed out these handouts all over the room, you should have this – it's that if you look at the map you will see that there are these red states. Those are all the states that have passed these voter ID laws. If you look at the map you will see the yellow states. Guess what, folks? Those are the states where they're still trying to pass these laws.

If you look at the map, you'll see the blue states. These are states where they tried to pass these laws but people said, OK, instead of passing a requirement, we will, quote, “encourage” people to show photo ID. So you know what that means? Confusion. Let me show you the next slide, because this slide is what they intended to do. This was their dream. This is ALEC. If you want to see what it's about, what it wanted to accomplish, this was their dream.

You see, they counted on a number of factors. They said people would be in the post-Obama bliss. They said there would be inattentive during a nonelection cycle year; that they would move quickly before anybody was aware of what was going on, that the disorganization, the underfunding, the lack of resources in the civil rights community would not be able to overcome it. But guess what they didn't count on? They didn't count on us. (Cheers, applause.) Us – they did not count on us.

And as a consequence, as ugly as that ideal was, here's what we've been able to do. We have – because in the map of shame you saw those scales of justice, those are the places where we either through litigation – and I mean we, I'm talking about everybody – the ACLU, NAACP, Advancement Project, Lawyers' Committee, Brennan Center, Demos, all of us coming together in this united fight and to stop this voter suppression.

And what you see right here in this map is that because of our fight, we put so many of these thing on hold – we vetoed law, we litigated against law, we got the Justice Department to bring Section 5 objections in Texas and in – you know, and in South Carolina and, you know, in other states. And we're still working on getting more. So these are the only states right now where the laws are currently in effect.

But don't sleep. Don't be lulled to sleep, because all those Section 5 decisions have to be reviewed. They might take – they've taken up the court, we're fighting in Texas in court, we're fighting in South Carolina, we're fighting, you know, in the – you know, the district courts and court of appeals in the District of Columbia on all of these laws right now. We're fighting.

The majority decision was very powerful, but they've come back in other states, like in Wisconsin where we won and are trying to do ballot initiatives in Minnesota. There's appeals going on. So all of this is fluid.

But guess what else? They have secretaries of states come up with regulations. And they will come up with very restrictive and horrible regulations that we will also need to fight. So our fight is critical, folks. We are the difference here. We are what will make all the difference.

Next slide.

So what we need to do is look at what the challenges that our voters are going to be (faced with ?), because not only – because of these laws that they tried to pass already, 5 million voters are under attack and may not be able to vote if we do not win ultimately this battle. I know different. One in four eligible voters in the United States – 51 million people – are not registered to vote. We know that in the United States that of the electorate in 2008, 11 percent – 21 million – did not have this kind of governmental-issued ID that people are pushing in these bills.

So what we have had to do, and what we must do going forward, folks, is create the resistance movement. We have to be just as clear going forward that this is our work to do.

Next slide.

So we have created election protections because we have to do this work and we want to make sure we can do it.

Next slide.

We are – components of election protections is to proactively take on these threats, by litigation, by legal support, by educating and empowering voters, by supporting voters; and your reports of what's going on in your state; on Election Day doing what we can.

Now the last slide.

How do you get involved? Because we can't do this without you. You are the key. You are the empowering part of this fight. And what we need, every organization. I don't care if you're a health care organization, you have a part of this fight. It doesn't matter if you help women who are abused, you have a part of this fight. If you are an educational institution or an educational rights organization, you have a part of this fight. We need everybody, everybody to inform voters in these states how to get IDs.

And so you will see that in one of your handouts we talk about the resources that are at your disposal, everything from the (map of shame ?) to the Got ID report that just came out, that shows people in the states and community groups how you can get these – how you can help people get identification, how you can fight these laws in your state.

We have the most game-changing of all our programs, and that is we're going to be issuing a mobile application that anybody can use on their smartphone to find out how to register to vote, how to go to your polling place, what the laws are in your states, how you can get information, who can help you, all of that great stuff, because, you see, we are the answer. This is the problem, the (map of shame ?), but we are the answer. And I look so forward to working with every single one of you going forward and beating back this, giving people their God-given rights, making sure that democracy in America is open, accessible and empowering to the people who need it the most.

Thank you so much.

MR. OGLETREE: Thank you. (Cheers, applause.)

So now let me turn to my dear friend Donna Brazile. Most of you know Donna Brazile from the great work she's done around the country. Many of you might have forgotten, because it doesn't say in the bio, that she is the person who basically placed Al Gore in the position to be the president in 2000, and then nine people said it would not be. And what's amazing is that Donna hasn't spent a day shying away from the idea that we need to have every vote and every vote counts.

And I see her virtually every night on CNN, calm, placid, laid back. And I can see that sister in her saying, that man's talking some nonsense. (Laughter.) It absolutely – and she can't curse, she can't slap and she can't knock him out. I know what she's feeling. It's obvious, right?

MS. : Yes.

MR. OGLETREE: And now, Donna, I'm just thinking back to what our parents and grandparents went through, the whole idea in the 1940s and '50s, fighting from a basic human right. There are two: the right to serve on a jury, that race, class, none of that should matter, gender; and the right to vote. Race, class, gender should not matter. But we have seen a transformation of our process. Even though we've got all these social networks and all this, the idea, it has been used as a tool against us rather than a tool for us.

So what's your sense about what we can do, having heard these three presentations? What can we do to get back into the political arena to make democracy work and to make it work for both gender and race? What's your sense about what's next?

DONNA BRAZILE: Well, first of all, it's a great honor to be part of this panel, part of this discussion, part of this conference. And when I first heard about it, of course, I was here in

Louisiana and I heard, and of course one of my good friends said, come on back. But as some of you might know, that when you're from this part of the world, you try not to come back so often, because you need to leave every now and then just to lose a few pounds to come back and then go back and -- (laughter). You know, our four seasons are not like winter, spring, summer and fall. It's shrimp, crab, crawfish and oysters. (Laughter.) So I told Chuck last night I had to go and taste the oysters to make sure that they're fresh, and the crawfish. So I'm going to get on back to Washington, D.C., tonight before I get into some other seasons.

MR. : There you go. (Laughter.)

MS. : The most important thing I want to leave with each and every one of you, I don't think -- I once said this. And this is not a way of bragging, but this is a way of, you know, sort of giving you a sense of how long and how deep I've been involved in politics. I started at the age of nine, right here along the banks of the Mississippi River. And it was simply a request to build a playground in our community that motivated a child like me to go door to door, urging my friends to get their parents to go and register to vote. That was 1969. And here we are in 2012, seven presidential campaigns, 56 congressional, 19 state and local. I've worked in 48 states. Two more states, I will become Ms. USA without the bikini. (Laughter.)

But throughout my entire -- the decades I've been involved in politics -- and Barbara Arnwine -- she's known me since I was a kid, working in the Jackson campaign -- I mean, I never thought I would see the day when we would spend most of our time and our resources protecting and defending the gains that we've made. I mean, the years that we spent ensuring that we had early vote, vote by mail, absentee vote -- I mean, I'd support naked voting if we could get the Internet cleaned up. (Laughter.) Vote naked.

And you know, the amount of time and resources now that we have to spend to protect -- a 96-year-old woman in Tennessee -- you might have heard of her -- Dorothy Cooper -- she's voted in every election but one. And the one that she wasn't able to vote because she moved and forgot to register in a new county, but -- and she lives in Tennessee. And she's voted in every election until 2010, when she appeared at the poll and didn't have the proper ID.

Now, she had a photo ID from the housing agency. She's 96 years old. She had a birth certificate. She had all these forms. And yet she didn't have the right ID. This 96-year-old black woman was turned away at the poll. But because of individuals and organizations like the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights, the NAACP and others who went to bat for her -- so I think Cooper had her voting rights restored. And if she is blessed -- and I'm sure she will be blessed -- to see this coming November, Ms. Cooper will be able to vote once again in the presidential election of 2012.

So how did this occur? Part of it is that over the last two years, we've had this new wave -- yeah, you call it tea party, you -- John Birch Society -- I'm on TV. It's really -- to me, it's just a throw-back to a bygone era. But we've seen the resegregation of the South. I mean, three years ago the majority of black politicians in the South were part of majority state-wide coalitions in terms of state legislature. Today, only 4 percent of black lawmakers are in the majority. There's been a resegregation of our politics.

And the amount of money – and I ran Al Gore’s campaign, and yes, I believe we won that election, but you know, five people thought otherwise – but we spent \$150 million. Today we’re going to spend upwards of \$6 billion – \$6 billion. So let’s start with the assumption that we’re not going to match them in terms of money. I’ve always been at a disadvantage with money. It’s a blessing to grow up poor because you never relied on money. Seriously. Those of us who understand poverty, poverty wasn’t just about the lack of financial resources – you made up for that in many ways – but there were other challenges. We have to increase the level of civic engagement and civic information and civic education in communities of color. We cannot rely on politicians. We should not rely on political parties. And God, please do not rely on the media. (Laughter, applause.) There are going to be lies told that you will not be able to deal with the lies.

The reason why I stay so calm is because my mother taught me, when I was a little girl, it’s not what they call you: It’s what you answer to. (Laughter, applause.) So I tried not to deal with the foolishness.

But the truth is, my friends, is that the disinformation campaign that will be spread – it’s not just the voter ID laws that worries me, it’s when you tell people that vote (all pages ?) – that’s what happened in Duval County in Florida – or when people get up that morning and they are told that the election was cancelled, and therefore, come back on Wednesday. Yes, my friends, that has also occurred.

We have to be prepared, whether it’s 2 million or 6 million – it’s – the – it doesn’t – it’s a small amount of money. The one thing I could tell you about communities of color – I’ve never had the benefit of white privilege – (laughter) – but one day I will tell you about communities of color, is that when you can focus in on telling communities of color that the election is X day, and here is what you need to know, they will show up.

The problem is, is that less than 40 percent of blacks, less than 20 percent of Hispanics and less than 25 percent of Asian-Americans receive information about voting. We don’t communicate. We don’t talk to them.

Now, of course, in election seasons, when we have a quote-unquote “person of color” running, yeah, the level of activity might increase. So if we commit ourselves today to increasing the level of civic education to give people information, they will be empowered to go out, navigate the odds and participate. It is going to be difficult, but we have to begin to put resources in the hands of people who, for no fault of their own, they just don’t have access to it. You cannot tell them to watch Anderson Cooper at 8:00 or pay attention to Rush Limbaugh at noon. It’s our obligation. We should make this our call, to ensure that everyone knows what’s at stake, that they know what’s on the ballot, they know their rights and we prepare them to go out there and make a difference.

I’ll say one last thing. This election is going to be close. So for those of you who wetting the bed at night, don’t come out. Just stay in bed. It’s going to be tight. People always ask me: Donna, what do you think?

I'll tell you what I think. I think President Obama's going to win re-election. (Applause.) But it's going to be one of those fights that when you finish, you're going to be (kicking ?) that mud. I'm going to be in the bathroom all week trying to – because it's going – it's going to – it's going to be a bruising one. (Laughter.) This is – this is when you know what you spent your entire life working for. This is when you know what you've dedicated your entire life. This is important.

This summer, my family celebrates 180 years in this city – 180 years. (Applause.) We know. I've got my minute, baby. I could do it in 30 seconds, but she's – now you've given me a minute, I'm going to do it in two. (Laughter.) I'm not Baptist. I don't start low, go slow – (inaudible) – sit down. I'm Catholic. (Laughter.) It takes a while to get it out. We don't express it the way the Baptists do. We ask Jesus. OK.

MR. OGLETREE: I think that means three minutes.

MS. BRAZILE: That's two and a half. (Laughter.)

But 180 years, my friend. Slaves, former slaves, sharecroppers and go down the line. My uncle helped to design the Ritz Carlton not far from here. Yet all of us, all of us, we were born at Charity Hospital about a mile from here. And we turned out OK. We're still OK. Storm came through, swept most of us out. But we're back, and we're rebuilding safe and stronger – 180 years. (Applause.)

I sat down at the governor's office – Susan Taylor (sp) was there – 2005. Everybody went around the room. And some people said: Well, I've been here since (almost ?) 1930. I've been here since the '50s. They were immigrants. (Scattered laughter.) I looked at everybody.

And of course, in the governor's mansion, the prisoners from Angola are serving us. And of course, it's Louisiana, they were serving bourbon. (Laughter.) I took my sip – (laughter) – just to show them that I could drink bourbon. (Laughter.) And when they got to me, I told them, my family been here since 1832, Port of Orleans – (inaudible). And I told them my history and why my family would never leave and that they would come back. I mean, my parents, my grandparents, my great-grandparents gave me a sense of empowerment. They told us what the ballot would mean if we ever had our – got our hands on it.

What Dr. King told us in 1957 – give us a ballot, we won't have to go the federal government to get our basic rights. Give us a ballot, we could elect men of good will to fill the halls of Congress and state legislative bodies. We have that ballot, and now there's a struggle for us to hold onto it, to keep it. There's power in that ballot. And we utilized that power to elect Barack Obama. So I tell people – and yeah, one day we going to utilize that to get our first woman, our first Latina, our – (applause) – you know, we going to do some stuff with this ballot.

But we have to tell people what it means to have that ballot and hold onto it, guard it, protect it. They can't take it from us. They cannot take it from us. That is what we must do this fall. It's going to be close. But if we hold onto our ballot, it's going to be sweet, because this time, see that – (inaudible)? I know you – what you're talking about. See, I wish I was as

eloquent as you are, but I always tell George Will, oh, you just want to roll back. (Laughter, applause.) One day on Sunday I told him I want his attention. That was my way of saying, you're getting slow, brother. (Laughter.)

But they know. They know we have the power. They know we have the strength. They know we can build coalitions. They know we don't need a billion dollars to turn out a million people. They know that. But do we know that? (Scattered cheers, applause.) That is why we increased the level of education. People will know what's at stake, and they will not be able to take their ballot. They will protect it like they protect their money, like they protect their children, like they protect their community. Tell them what that ballot means. Tell them. God knows they'll show up at the poll and say, what ID do you want, because I got about (eight here?). (Laughter.) And if they – (inaudible) – you want me to pull this one out too? (Laughter, applause.) (Cheers.) Pull it out. Pull it out. Pull it out.

MR. OGLETREE: So we're going to start this prayer meeting right now. (Laughter.) And where's a petition – the Donna Brazile show, right? (Cheers.)

MS. BRAZILE: You don't want me on the show.

MR. OGLETREE: (Chuckles) – oh, yes we do.

MS. BRAZILE: I'll show off.

MR. OGLETREE: We want you to show off. That's what this is all about. And it just reminds me, with this panel – I'll start with Donna, but all of you will comment I hope. There's so much that has happened. And we forget that many of the people voting in 2012 will never have voted before.

MS. : That's right.

MR. OGLETREE: I'm not just talking about because they're young; because many people (are?) just not interested. And we have to make sure that we re-educate people about the struggle, what our parents and grandparents went through – you know, the coded ballots, the voting tax, all these issues – whether you're black or brown or male or female, you had burdens.

And that history has to be pointed – voting is not a luxury. Right? It's a necessity to – and I remember – I teach a lot about Brown versus Board of Education, 1954 decision integrating the public schools. What's interesting in that is that on behalf of the majority of the Supreme Court, Chief Justice Earl Warren talked about how important education was. He said it's as important as citizenship.

MS. : Amen.

MR. OGLETREE: And that's what we're facing right now, because if you can't vote, they're saying you're not a citizen.

MS. : That's right.

MR. OGLETREE: That's what it's all about.

MS. : Thank you.

MR. OGLETREE: How do we convey to communities who are asked the Reagan question – are you better off now, 2012, than you were in 2008? They might say no. They might say, what's the change? What has happened to me? I see more laws trying to make me – allow me to – force me to be deported. I see more laws that are forced to make me proclaim that I'm a citizen even though it's obvious I'm a citizen. They can look at my address and say or my language and say that I'm not. I see more laws that saying that (vet ?) ID's not good. It might work for a white student at Georgia Tech, but not for a black student at Morehouse or Spelman in the state of Georgia, right, government-issued IDs.

So what do we say – what do we say to the millions who are waiting for some help? We're going church to church, we're going city to city, we're going to go talk about, you know, the voter laws. But what's your message to these organizations which represent literally millions of people about what they can do at the local level? What can someone working at the battered woman shelter and someone working with young people, someone working at a public school, someone working on the environment – what can they do? The obvious is that they have to tell people are you – are you registered to vote. And 80 percent of people will lie about that, right? The embarrassment of – they'll say yes when it's not true. How do we get through that to make people understand, whether they're 18, whether they're unemployed, whether they speak two languages, how do we make them realize that voting – whoever they vote for – voting is important? What do we do?

MS. BRAZILE: Well, I would believe that you got to always localize things because we – we're under this impression that we have to wait for people at the top to tell us what to do.

MR. : Yup.

MS. BRAZILE: It's all about empowering people where they live, where they work, where they play and where they pray, because if you – if you keep it at the top, that's where all of the confusion, because let's – first of all, nobody really knows what President Obama has accomplished.

MS. : Right.

MS. BRAZILE: Now we all should know because when he came into office, we were hemorrhaging jobs. And yes, we've had 26 months of consecutive job growth and of course it's not enough; everybody want to have more than enough, but the truth is is that we haven't even told that story. I'm the one who said all the time, I am so happy we finally got a health care law passed in this country.

MS. : Amen. (Cheers, applause.)

MS. BRAZILE: I mean, it's – I mean, to be a child who grew up in the Gulf with no health insurance, with your parents telling you to come in from outside because we couldn't afford to get sick. Come on. That is something we should all applaud. Every child in America will be able to be fully covered, to have a healthy start in life. We need to go out there and tell our story and be proud of it and say, you know what: And when we finish in four more years, we're going to have more job creation, more people with health care. We're going to finally bring our troops home from Afghanistan and that \$2 billion we're spending at every (week ?), we going to spend it here and make sure our troops have some place to come home to so they're not homeless. I mean, we need to be bold, back in their faces.

The other night I heard Mitt Romney – I couldn't go on TV, because I said I can't lie after 9 o'clock like that. That's just – really, I can't do that. (Laughter.) He was talking about fairness, now hitting the twin pillars of what I call – of the message and it's going to be the president's a failure so that's going to dampen enthusiasm and it has already.

MR. : Mmm hmm.

MS. BRAZILE: And the other one is, well, they're not fair. No. I couldn't even believe he used the word fairness. But he did. I mean, we have to go out there and boldly tell our story. And my friends, once again, 85 percent of the coverage has been anti-Obama, two studies. Don't quote me. I could tell you, I know that for a fact. And some nights I have to go on with two Republicans. I said, why do I have to snag two of them? (Laughter.) Jesus Christ.

So we have to be proactive in telling our story, remind the people the things that we have done together as a country. Bring back civility. We don't have to take the course language of the opposition to get our points across. We need to use the language of hope and inclusionness – inclusiveness so that people know that we're all in this together, because, by the way, we can't win with just the black-brown coalition. We need some whites, too. (Laughter.)

MS. : That's right.

MS. BRAZILE: And we need to show them that we are about reforming government, making government better so it serves the needs of all the people, not just the privileged few – and the middle class is squeezing. We need to talk about how to ensure that the middle class have a path to the American dream. There is so much we could talk about –

MS. : Yeah.

MS. : -- but if we don't tell our story, the other side will.

MR. OGLETREE: Exactly right. Let me say a word before the others respond. I'd – I was just thinking about that. And for the last year, every time someone asked me about – people use the word "Obamacare"; I've adopted the phrase "Obamacares." And whoever's in social media, start spreading that around, right?

MS. : That's – (inaudible) –

MR. OGLETREE: Obamacares.

MS. : Right. Mmm hmm.

MR. OGLETREE: Put an S on it. It changes the dynamic. We can't let the word game become who wins and who loses.

MS. : Absolutely.

MR. OGLETREE: Obama cares – that's what health care's about.

MS. : That's right.

MR. OGLETREE: Barbara?

MS. ARNWINE: Yes. I was going to suggest – you know, there's – our folks respond very powerfully to the notion of somebody trying to take away something that they're entitled to. And they respond very powerfully to the idea that they can make a difference, because they're told every day they can't. And so the power to vote is so important. And what I want to lift up is what people are doing, because people aren't just sitting back being quiet at the local level.

In Tennessee they're organizing what they call get ID movements. In Wisconsin, they're organizing get ID movements. In Florida they're fighting the bad, you know, laws there. We've been suing all over the place regarding their attempts to stop third-party registration groups and a whole lot of other bad stuff they're doing in Florida. Groups are doing this work.

Yesterday in Houston a very important protest happened. And what the protest was is that there's a group in this country of, you know, everything from the tea party patriots to the American majority – they have put out a call for 1 million poll counters – 1 million poll counters throughout the country that tally our voters, do not send them to white polling places, they send them to campuses and they're going to send them to minority communities.

So yesterday in Houston, where the tea party patriots are located, there was a protest – black elderly, black youth, white students, Latinos, everybody came out and they protested this through the vote rally. So I think it's important for us to remember that part of this is lifting it up.

I also wanted to say that Color of Change – I want to give them a great call out because of what they did – (applause) – by taking ALEC on, straight up, and saying: This is the enemy. They're behind these "Stand Your Ground" laws. They're behind these voter suppression laws. We've got to identify them so that people understand who they're fighting against, because see in Pennsylvania where they passed this – a voter ID law just a month ago, guess what it says?

It says that in order to get a voter ID from the state of Pennsylvania, you must have a birth certificate. In order to get a birth certificate, you got to have a voter ID issued by the state. It's insane. And this is the loop they have our people in. And what they're counting on is that we're going to be quiet. They're counting on that nobody's going to tell voters, give voters their IDs, because they're hoping that people will show up at early voting, if they have it, at the earliest to find out that they got a problem. And at that point, there's nothing they can do because they're going to not have enough time to get the ID, to get the birth certificate. They're counting on this.

And the only way we can fight that is by being proactive right now. So we're working to create all kinds of movement strategies, awareness strategies. And the last thing I want to say about what Obama has done. I want everybody to be very clear about one thing I love about what the administration just did yesterday that most of us don't know about.

You see, under the Clinton administration, under both Bush administrations, we have been fighting for years to update the EEOC guidance on the use and abuse of arrest records and criminal conviction records. Yesterday, the EEOC passed an updated, brand-new EEOC guidance on the banning – which bans the improper use of arrest records and conviction records. (Applause.) It is huge. It is singularly the biggest victory for racial justice in this country since the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act in 2006. It is huge, and these are the things we got to tell people then, because that means millions of people who haven't been able to get employed will now have an opportunity because it's state – it's nationwide, it supersedes all state and local laws. So let's be very clear – thank you. (Applause.)

MR. OGLETREE: Ian, there's a lot of expression on television – the word “illegal aliens,” as you mentioned, is used repeatedly, never “undocumented workers.” How do we change the culture? Because on the one hand, people are critical of this diverse country. On the other hand, we see white farmers in places like Alabama and Georgia saying, wait a minute. You've just destroyed my productivity by these horrific laws. Business leaders, farmers are saying, this is not – you know, we didn't intend this. We didn't know this is what you're doing. How do we get this sanity back into the process of democracy?

MS. ARNWINE (?): That's a great question. I want to start by answering it in a slightly different way. Yes, right now I think all of our energy needs to be poured into the election of 2012. Let's say – let's hope Obama wins. Then, as a social justice community, where are we? I think (the thing ?) that Obama's doing that is beautiful but that he did in 2008 is that he has really come back to the language of social welfare, of a society that takes responsibility for each other. He's counterposed (ph) it to a go-it-your-own society. He's counterposed (ph) it to social Darwinism. I think he needs to be encouraged to use that language to tell people the story of what's happened to them.

But what he hasn't done is he hasn't connected that up with race. Instead he's adopted a sort of a post-racial strategy. And his hope is that he can promote universal solutions rather than targeted solutions, thinking that targeted solutions are too divisive but not understanding that the so-called universal solutions have already been racialized as per the dark people by the right.

The right has already racialized universal solutions like education, like health care, like welfare – those are already racial terms. And Obama needs to start addressing race.

How does this deal – how does this relate to illegal aliens and undocumented immigrants? The Obama administration right now is deporting 400,000 people a year. This administration is deporting people at a level unparalleled in American history, even if you go back to mass deportation campaigns like Operation Wetback in the '50s and the mass deportations or the mass expulsions of Latinos in the 1930s. Why? Because he, A, hopes to build credibility with the right by showing that he's tough on enforcement, so as to subsequently have a chip with which to negotiate reform; and B, because he's afraid to name the actual dynamic that's going on with this growing xenophobia about Latinos.

That's racism. And he needs to name racism and not be afraid to say, this is unworthy of America; this is racist, rather than to say – (applause) – rather than to say, the federal government understands your concerns. We're militarizing the border, and we're kicking out as many of them as we can too, right? And so I really do think – now I don't think that Obama needs to change his racial discourse in the next few months. But if he gets re-elected, he needs to change that racial discourse. And we need to put pressure on him to say – (applause) – we're always talking about race – or the right's always talking about race; now it's time for the left to start talking about racial justice. (Applause.)

MR. : Thank you.

MR. OGLETREE: Let me go to Peggy and then (with ?) Donna. And then, Mark (sp), I'm going to show that little video about the four-year-old before we go to questions. In your sense – and everybody here is speaking on – from their own point of view – represent organizations – as individuals, not on behalf of the Kellogg Foundation. (Laughter.)

MS. : No, no, I – (inaudible).

MR. OGLETREE: Oh, no, no, no, no, no, no, no. It's not –

MS. : Oh no, I'm not – (inaudible). (Laughter.)

MR. OGLETREE: Because I know someone's going to show that clip of Donna talk about naked voting – I just know that's going to be – (laughter) – (inaudible) – you know? That's a progressive idea, guys. Come on. (Laughter.) (Jesus ?).

I'm sorry – Peggy.

MS. MCINTOSH: Well, I think the right fears the young people, the youth vote, for a reason. Why? They have a sense – a well-earned sense of what's wrong with this culture. And one reason education doesn't (poll ?) the young – their experiences of education, is grown-ups I think are afraid of what the kids will say. They will see school isn't working. And they see that government isn't working and that the whole U.S. system – set of systems is not working.

So I think schools can't lobby for individual candidates, but they can tell the students, and they should tell the students: Vote! People died to get you that right. People are in prison for working for that right. Vote. And then, I think we can depend on the youth to go for Obama. I think they know the sickness – all the Occupy movements show it – the sickness of the rich get richer and the poor get poorer system.

And in there – I was born in Brooklyn overlooking Wall Street across the way, and taught to admire all those big buildings and all that money and to depend on it. I wasn't taught to Occupy Wall Street – (laughter) – but the Occupy – as Harry Belafonte said so wonderfully, and thank you for your way of conducting that conversation so that he just hit all the balls right out of the park – I feel that occupying Wall Street is the right thing to do now. And it was the youth who did it. So I would depend on them. But the school's responsibility to – is to say to the kids: You must vote. You must use this ability you were given by the sacrifice of other people in the past. You must use the power.

MR. OGLETREE: And, Donna – thank you. Donna, young people are different. I mean, they're independent. They have – they make up their own mind. And I'm going to show this clip in just a minute that mischaracterizes a young person. But the whole idea about how do you get this generation that's so attached to social media to see that voting, not just texting, not just emailing, not just tweeting, but actually going into a – you have to go into a booth. You can't do it with your BlackBerry or iPhone.

How do you get young people to think it is relevant, because it's hard for them to see that it's anything other than just another imposition imposed by the elders on young, creative, independent-minded, fresh-thinking youth? So what do we do to make them think that it's important as well – whatever they – however they vote?

MS. BRAZILE: Well, we have to remind them of the power that they had back in 2008 to change the direction of this country, and to remind them that their power still belongs to them. I mean, you just mentioned, Peggy, the Occupy Wall Street movement. I mean, one of the offshoots is now we have shareholders going into these meetings demanding to see the pay of the executives and setting down – (inaudible).

MS. MCINTOSH: Right.

MS. BRAZILE: I mean, that's another, what I call – that's a great product of the Occupy Wall Street movement, to hold these corporations accountable. Likewise, they are now demanding that these corporations 'fess up on all of this anonymous giving. So I think that we need to – first of all, I always like to lead people from where they are, not try to force them to go in a different direction. They're already using these social networking tools. I have 194,000 twitter followers. I'm a twitter-holic. (Laughter.) I've already tweeted about this moment and I will tweet more.

But one of the reasons why I got in – I fell in love with tweeting – not Facebook yet, I'm getting there – all these things that Al Gore invented when he created the Internet. (Laughter, applause.) But one of the reasons why I'm into it is because of my students and young people. I

mean, if you want to communicate with them, well, this is one means. We need to start having messages that they can send out. And this whole student loan concern, they're worried that their loans will double. And so they have taken to the Internet to alert other young people, alert other young people.

And now Mitt Romney has shifted his position and he's come out against the House Republicans. He want(s) to see this program continue to accelerate. So we need to let them lead the way. In many ways, they're out there but we need to give them targets, visible targets so that they can – and on this whole issue of voting, once again, it's about utilizing the tools at our disposal. And voting is one of the most essential ingredients in a democracy. And then once we give them this issue, give it to them.

And see, I think so often we hold our stuff in our headquarters. Give it to them. They are ready to fly. And I think we can just give them this power that they already have and let them know they have the power to change, and that no one's going to prevent them from voting because they're going to arm themselves with information on how to get through all of the barriers that they may face.

See, the one thing that we have to do in our language is to ensure that by talking about all these voter suppression laws and voter – we cannot discourage people from voting. We've just go to tell them that they can still get there. Remember that's the power.

MR. : Right. Thank you very much.

Mark, I'm going to show this video. This is of a 4-year-old in Chicago. And where's Ms. Maynard from the Maynard – stand up – discovered by Ms. Maynard who is the head of the Maynard Institute in Oakland on – stand up – on – (laughter) – journalistic ethics. And I want you to watch this, if we can show it, Mark, the two different sides. And he's going to stop it through the first report of this 4-year-old being involved in and concerned about gang violence. Can we show it?

(Video clip begins.)

MR. : (Inaudible) – more gunfire – (inaudible) – busy night in the city, including the shooting death of a 16-year-old boy.

MS. : And that gunman remains on the loose right now. This shooting happened just before 10:00 in the 3700 block of South Albany. Police say a 16-year-old boy was shot to death in a drive-by. The victim's identity has not yet been released.

MR. : In the meantime, two teenagers are wounded on the city's south side. It happened at East 74th (ph). There's an 18-year-old man and 16-year-old girl who were hit while standing on the sidewalk. The male's in good condition, while the girl's expected to recover. And kids on the street as young as four were there to see it all unfold and had disturbing reactions.

CHILD: No, I'm not scared of nothing.

MR. : When you get older, you're going to stay away from all these guns?

CHILD: No.

MR. : No?

CHILD: No.

MR. : What do you want to do when you get older?

CHILD: I'm going to have me a gun, because I live right here and I don't want none of my family members to get shot.

MR. : That is very scary indeed. So far, no suspects are in custody.

(Video clip ends.)

MR. : Stop it right there. That's what was on the news in Chicago just recently, right? And what does it show? A 4-year-old kid talking about getting himself a gun. And so the public reaction has said, oh my God – the Chicago reaction – look at what's happening to us in the 21st century? This is news. This is brand-new news. And you talk about journalist ethics? Let's watch what the 4-year-old kid actually said that night that was never aired to the public in Chicago when this came up a few months ago.

(Video clip begins.)

MR. : (Inaudible) – you ain't scared of nothing. Damn. When you get older, are you going to stay away from all these guns?

CHILD: No.

MR. : No?

CHILD: No.

MR. : What do you want to do when you get older?

CHILD: I'm going to have me a gun.

MR. : You are? Why do you want to do that? Do you know what –

CHILD: I'm going to be the police.

MR. : OK, well, then you can have one.

MR. : My first question is whether they had the parents' permission. And then to hear that the boy aspires to be a police officer and that's what he meant when he said I'm going to have me a gun and that they didn't include that is disturbing. As someone who is a former journalist – like many past presidents of the NAACP – it's important to tell the whole truth, because when you tell half the truth, you're, in effect, lying.

(Video clip ends.)

MR. : Now, think about that: the difference between those two scenarios. How could a journalist show this and not have this 4-year – one, interview them in the middle of the night without a parent there; two, use language like “damn” to a 4-year-old; and three, not to air his full story?

MS. : Right, right.

MR. : And I don't know what harm was done to that 4-year-old. But I thank the Maynard Institute for finding that information, putting it out. (Applause.) And they've done so much more, because it's so important. I hope you all will talk with her. The website's www.mije.org. And they've talked about Trayvon Martin, a lot of other issues – a lot of information there that we would not have known if it hadn't happen.

That's the one we found out about. How many more did we not found (ph) out about. And when Donna talks about all the tricks and campaigns, people are going to say before you go to vote, go to the police station to report your record. People won't go. Oh, the Democrats are going to win, so you don't have to show up. Or the election's Wednesday's when it's Tuesday. All that – that has happened every year in the 21st century, every election year. And so we have to be aware of that and have our troops out – whoever you're going to vote for – to make sure people do that.

Before we take a couple of quick questions, why don't you thank my panel for their wonderful comments today? (Applause.)

So we'll take a question on my right. Is there a microphone over here? OK, where is it? OK. Who's got a question? Quickly. Eight words. (Laughter.)

Q: It's been said several times we need to have messages, messages, over and over. What succinctly are the messages?

MR. OGLETREE: Say that. OK. That's – first question. Second question? The left. Microphone. He was trying to point to the – right, he said – (inaudible). There she is. (Inaudible.)

Q: Given, Ms. Brazile, what you said about not needing to have just a black and brown coalition but also reaching the white mainstream, and, Professor Lopez, given the challenges of how dog whistle racism, combined with colorblindness and combined with what you call voting law white, what kind of messaging and framing do we need to do to reach the white mainstream, given that the good news, which is that white attitudes have progressed in the last 50 years – how do we take advantage of that given the other stuff coming from the right?

MR. OGLETREE: Great. OK. And so let's talk about message in general and then how do we get the white audience involved, the white voters sympathetic to this idea of voting and why it's important. Donna, do you want to start?

MS. BRAZILE: Well, one of the things that we try to do to – and I say we, the Voting Rights Institute – soon after the 2000 election, I thought it was important for us to figure out ways to at least solve the problems of 2000. Of course, the problem has gotten worse.

MS. : Yeah.

MS. BRAZILE: But in our research we've learned that we have to use language that is inclusive so that people don't feel that you're basically trying to pit one group against another. So for example, on the issue of voter education, voting rights, we need more Americans to have a say in their government, not just the special interests. That's why we should be taking down roadblocks to voting, not putting up new ones. This poll very high.

Another way is to – is to simply put this is about politics and we shouldn't be playing politics with something as important as voting. And another one, we've never solved anything in America with less democracy and we won't now. So I think if we find that inclusive language so that people understand that this is – not just happen to minorities or the elderly or students, but this is an impediment, this is a roadblock that we should – we shouldn't be changing the rules in the middle of the game. People get that language and they understand what they have at stake as well.

MR. OGLETREE: (Inaudible.) Barbara, Peggy and then Ian.

MS. ARWINE: So I think that –

MR. : Ian.

MS. ARWINE: -- those are really powerful messages. But I also think it's important to give people the sense of their individual power. I think that's why the mobile app is going to be so important, because will be able to have their own voter protection right in their hands. And they can make sure that all their friends, all their family members, everybody have that. And there would be messaging there.

I think Donna laid out some of the key points. I also think you have to tell people that this is about them, about their rights, their situations, their power to make and control their local government. I think it's really, really important to have that as part of the messaging. I think if we don't tell it's about them, then they're not going to vote. I think you have to enlist people as part of this.

And we've been – everybody, I want you to know that we're not just sitting back being quiet. And we're trying to figure out – you know, we're working on focus groups. We need to get better messages. We're looking at what motivates people. We're looking at all of these things. And I also wanted to point out that we need – between now and November, we need to recruit 50,000 people – 50,000 – who we train so that they can go to the polls on early voting and Election Day and be there to help people when they come to the polls and have these problems.

MR. OGLETREE: And let me just say three things. One, if Barbara, Donna and Peggy can give the websites where people can get information.

MS. ARWINE: Yes. Yes. www.lawyerscommittee.org. That is –

MR. OGLETREE: www.lawyerscommittee.org.

MS. ARWINE: Yes. www.lawyerscommittee.org. That is our portal. Election Protection is a coalition of just 150 state, national, local, regional organizations plus 200 law firms.

MR. OGLETREE: And nonpartisan.

MS. ARWINE: Totally nonpartisan. Please. (Laughter.) Please.

MS. BRAZILE: Because of that, I am – I believe that voting should be accessible to all Americans, regardless of who you plan on, intend to vote for.

MS. ARWINE: Right.

MS. BRAZILE: And therefore I will not give out my www.dnc.org/votingprotection one, because I really believe that – (laughter) – we should all go to these nonpartisan sites. (Laughter, applause.)

MR. OGLETREE: Now I – I'm glad you didn't give that out, Donna. It's very important.

MS. : (Inaudible.)

MS. BRAZILE: Nonpartisan.

MR. OGLETREE: And Peggy, don't give yours out either. (Laughter.)

MS. MCINTOSH: I wouldn't think of it. It's [www.wcwonline](http://www.wcwonline.org/SEED) – that means Wellesley Centers for Women Online – [.org/SEED](http://www.wcwonline.org/SEED). My message to teachers is, you have power you are not using. Empower your students to know in a democracy they have some say; use it. To students and young people I say, use the power you have been given. Use it. You have more power than school has been teaching you you have.

MR. OGLETREE: And one thing you can say – most people don't know what SEED stands for, which is very important.

MS. MCINTOSH: Ah. SEED stands for Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity. And it prepares teachers to lead their own year-long school-based monthly seminars on how to make the curriculum, the teaching methods and the whole climate of the school more gender-fair,

more multicultural and more inclusive of the well-being of every single student in their care, in the school's care, no matter what the backgrounds of those students are.

MR. OGLETREE: Thank you.

Ian.

MR. LOPEZ: So I think on the up side, I think a lot of you are working on positive messaging. So good government is for all of us; race is about all of us; that message of inclusion. I wonder, though, whether we might not also need to be clear that political reform is going to take a fight; that it's not going to be based on consensus; that it's not going to be achieved through right reason; that there are deep concentrations of power that are going to expend whatever power, whatever wealth they have to maintain their privilege and their position. And they will do so through a lot of mud-slinging, through a lot of dishonesty, through a lot of voter suppression.

And I wonder if it isn't important for us to say clearly, we're in this for a long, hard fight. And we need to be clear about who we're fighting against, these great concentrations of power, and also against those in the liberal or progressive community that have a sense that we're not in a fight and that we can just achieve this by voting in 2012 – because voting in 2012 is supremely important, but it's not going to change the fundamental dynamic of where we are in terms of the dismantling of liberal government.

MR. OGLETREE: Thank you very much. And let me just say this in conclusion, how great it was and is to have this panel of experts. When Barbara talked about the mobile app – young people are very skeptical and curious. And so you should talk to your son, niece, grandson, granddaughter, nephew, and ask if they've seen this, because they'll spread it around. They'll be much more efficient and effective and thorough than we are – debate about it.

They have never seen John Lewis being beaten across from the Edmund Pettus Bridge in 1965. They don't know about Viola Liuzzo being shot (for ?) taking some civil rights workers in the South and being killed because of this movement. They don't know about Schwerner, Goodman and Chaney. They just don't know that history. And they would be shocked when they see that. And when they don't know little kids being arrested in Alabama – (because ?) I have it on one of my book covers – people said, oh, that's the police escorting kids to school. No, those kids are going to jail.

MS. : Right.

MR. OGLETREE: Right? And we – they are so much 21st century that they have no idea that there was a 20th century. They weren't here. And it's up to us to make sure we use that application in a way that educates people about the right to vote; and show them that line in Soweto in 1994, the line of people who were 60, 70, 80, 90 years old and had never voted before, ever, and who had never been educated before. They knew five or six languages. But they had to vote based on a symbol for a party and a photograph of the person running.

And they voted for Nelson Mandela in 1994 not because he was the black candidate for the president of South Africa. He was the first democratically elected president of South Africa because every vote counted. And our message has to be, when we talk about these issues of privilege and power and democracy – it has to be that every – (inaudible) – must count in 2012 and beyond. Don't fall asleep, because it has to be forever. I want to see that 18-year-old vote, and I want to see that 35-year-old (say ?) I'm running for president next time.

MS. : Vote for Trayvon.

MR. OGLETREE: That's exactly right.

MS. : Vote for Trayvon.

MR. OGLETREE: He would be 18.

MS. : That's a powerful message to send resonating. Let's, you know, get that out there.

MR. OGLETREE: Thank you all, and thank our wonderful audience. (Applause.)

MR. : Well said. Vote for Trayvon. Well said. I like that.

MR. OGLETREE: I hope the mikes are off, because –

(END)