

Weber Shandwick

Kellogg Conference

Plenary Session

“Unconscious Bias and Race”

Moderator:

**Maria Hinojosa,
Anchor and Managing Editor,
NPR's Latino USA**

Panelists:

**Rachel Godsil,
Director of Research,
American Values Institute;**

**Phillip Goff,
Assistant Professor,
Department of Psychology, University of California, Los Angeles;**

**John Powell,
Director,
Haas Center for Diversity and Inclusion and Robert D. Haas Chancellor's
Chair in Equity and Inclusion, University of California, Berkeley;**

**David Williams,
Professor of African and African American Studies,
Harvard University**

Location:

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

Time: 8:30 a.m. CST

Date: Wednesday, April 25, 2012

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

MS. : (In progress) – open and free to do that.

The principle of gratitude: to be thankful for the things that others have to say and the fact that you're here with one another and to be thankful for what other people can contribute to your journey as we look towards healing.

And the last one is an interesting one, and we try to encourage this. When you're talking to one another, speak from your own space, as opposed to attributing to somebody else's. So speak from a place of "I" as opposed to a place of "you."

So those are just some of the things that we'd like to encourage as you have your conversations. For some of the other sessions that you'll go into, there will be some other things to help you along the way, to help frame and to shape your conversations. So we'll be learning those as we go along throughout the day.

Please note that the staff of the conference have a black staff badge attached – ribbon attached to their badges. They're here to help you, so feel free to approach them and ask them for anything that you need. And you know, we're all doing our best to make sure that we can be as responsive as possible.

Again, for those of you on Twitter – and I know I had fun with some folks last night helping them sign up, so to the newbies, get your tweet on today – the hashtag for the conference, if you are on Twitter, is hashtag #racialequity. And it was very interesting, because last night I was able to search via the hashtag and see the comments that were being made throughout the evening, as well as into the movie portion, which was great. So please feel free to continue to tweet.

Related to that, photography – we do have professional photographers, and there's some videography going on in the room. We would like to ask that you refrain from flash photography during the sessions, as that may interfere with the video or the professional photography that's taking place.

A couple of other reminder is that on the second floor, in the second floor foyer, there are "Healing History" kiosks that are set up for you to explore. We encourage you to make your way there whenever time permits.

Also on the second floor, there's a resource area for those of you that have brought materials you'd like to share.

Do note that we will be evaluating all of the sessions, so you should have seen evaluations pages on your tables when you arrived. Our staff will be putting those out and collecting those throughout the meeting.

A gentle reminder – again, Gail said last night you might hear this every 20 minutes; hopefully not – but this is a proposal-free zone, so we'd like to encourage you remember that and to be respectful of that.

There is another survey that's taking place, and in light of the current political climate, we're going to ask that you participate in taking a one-page survey to assess the racial context of your community and the country. This information will help to guide the foundation's racial equity work. Eileen Coe (sp) has the survey available at the table that's next to registration out in the foyer. Once you've completed that survey, please return it to her or to a member of the CommonHealth ACTION staff or anybody else with a staff badge, and we'll make sure that we get the completed surveys where they need to be. But it is an important survey, and we do hope to hear from you. So take a moment to stop out there and to pick that up.

With that, I would like to go ahead and to hand off and invite Dr. Vincent LaFronza, who is my counterpart and also president of CommonHealth ACTION, and what he's going to do is explain to you a bit about the open space sessions that will be held on Thursday afternoon.

So, Vinnie.

VINCENT LAFRONZA: Thank you, Natalie (sp).

Good morning, everyone.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Good morning.

MR. LAFRONZA: Is Queen Chief Warhorse in the house? Well, I wanted to acknowledge the tribe and say good morning in Choctaw, which would be – (speaks in Choctaw) – but I wanted to know how well did.

Q: (Off mic.)

DR. LAFRONZA: So 44 years ago this month, actually, we lost one of the world's greatest leaders. One of my favorite quotes from this leader which I think is a pearl of wisdom inspires our open space sessions in this conference. Dr. King said, "We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one destiny affects all indirectly." Isn't that true? Isn't that beautiful?

As part of our network of mutuality, and based on your feedback from the Asheville conference in 2011 – and it's a pleasure to see so many of you back – we've designed a new session format to accommodate this participant-driven interactive learning. It's an open space session that will take place on Thursday from 2:45 to 4:15. This time will provide an informal space for attendees to share emerging strategies in the field and opportunities to advance racial healing and racial equity in the communities that we work in. It is our own hybrid of open space technology. It is informal, and it is focused on these emerging opportunities and strategies. It's a learning experience for participants to discuss any issues that are not formally covered.

(To staff.) We have – there we go. We have sort of rotating slides there.

We would hope that this session will build on your knowledge of the work that you do, build on your knowledge that – of the work that you do, build on your knowledge that you gain from the actual conference experience, and to share your expertise and experience with others and, of course, to network throughout this great conference.

Each session, we will need some core components. We will need a thought leader, which is essentially the person who is the originator or the framer of the topic. And it's OK if the originator does elect another facilitator. So you can originate a session even if you're not going to facilitate it. In most cases, you probably will be the facilitator.

We would need you to go to the registration area if you're going to propose a session and collect a registration form, a session form and essentially two to three sentences that describes the topic focus. And each thought leader should find a volunteer to serve as a thought keeper, which is the same as a note taker, but we want that person to capture the themes and the discussion points, and we will provide some flip charts.

If you do need any A/V, we will try our best to accommodate, but we cannot assure that every session will have A/V, so let us know ahead of time.

And we will also ask that the thought leaders attend a brief debriefing session on Thursday afternoon at 4:15. It will probably run about an hour. And if you – if your session is selected, you'll – we'll give you more information about this.

So how do we do this? If you're going to submit a session idea, again, go to the registration area and get the form. We would like you to complete the form no later than 6 p.m. today, OK? So that gives you all day to think about this and submit your form. And there are already about 10 sessions that have been proposed that are up on the bulletin board outside of the registration area.

You can vote at the registration area – so what we're going to do is ask the community that's here to vote on the topics that you'd like to join. And we need to do this, because obviously, we have some limitations on how many breakout rooms we have, and we need to make sure there is some balance on – in the open space.

So for a topic to be selected for a session, we would need roughly about 30 participants in favor of voting for that particular – or at least a priority for their – for their session. And so because space is limited, you may want to encourage folks to know about – people in your network to know about the session that you're proposing so they may support you. And then by Thursday morning – well, as the sessions come in, we'll post them, but by Thursday morning, we will have all of the sessions up for voting. But you can vote anytime throughout the day or tomorrow morning.

And so you will have two votes. We'll have a priority – your first priority and your second priority. And we are asking that you vote for your choices by 10 a.m. tomorrow morning, which is Thursday.

OK, at 10 a.m. we will remove the sessions and we will figure out how many we actually can offer, and then we will let you know by 1:00 tomorrow precisely which sessions there are going to be – we're going to hold. Additionally, if you are a proposer of a session, we ask for your cellphone number so you will get a text message or a phone call from one of the staff to let you know that your session, in fact, was selected, so you'll know ahead of time before at 1:00 tomorrow.

We are, of course, in a special location, so – I understand the traditional colors of Mardi Gras are purple, green and gold, so we've used a color coding system out there. So green will be your first choice – votes. And you'll get push pins – everybody'll get two push pins. If you want to vote for your first choice, it's green paper, and then the second choice is yellow.

So again, just a real quick overview: If you want to submit a topic session, you get the topic session form at the registration desk. Two to three sentence description. You submit those forms to the registration staff. And we definitely need your cellphone so we can contact you. And we definitely need a thought leader, facilitator and also a thought keeper.

So in closing, these open-space sessions are yet another opportunity for us to work together to create this single garment of our destiny. And we thank you for your participation and leadership, we thank you for being here on this important journey, and we look forward to the rest of the day. And I'll bring Dr. Christopher back up. (Applause.)

GAIL CHRISTOPHER: Good morning.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Good morning.

MS. CHRISTOPHER: All right. Thank you for that response. I hope everyone had a good night's sleep, a long night's sleep. For me, it ended at about 3 a.m. (Chuckles.)

Your enthusiasm and your presence yesterday at the opening, the powerful energy that was experienced was just so meaningful for all of us, so I really want to thank everyone for that. As we move into the formal – more formalized part of our program today and tomorrow, we thought we should start the day out in a sacred space.

And this minister needs no introduction. Whenever we've called, he has indeed responded and been a partner with us at the Kellogg Foundation for many years in our work on behalf of vulnerable children and families. Reverend James Forbes is the senior emeritus minister of Riverside Church. And if you've been in the movement for many, many years or decades, you know what that means and how much of an important role that institution, and he as an institution, has played in our collective development and growth. And he has graciously agreed to provide the reflection for us this morning. So join me in giving a very warm America Healing welcome to Reverend James Forbes. (Applause.)

REVEREND JAMES FORBES: Thank you so very much, Gail, for your introduction and for our continuing struggle together for the day of justice and freedom, compassion and peace.

I'd like to say to the Kellogg Foundation, when we kids were playing years ago, sometimes we would act and everybody knew we were acting, but sometimes it got real. And at that point, somebody would say, I ain't playing, y'all.

The Kellogg Foundation ain't playing, y'all. (Laughter, applause.)

There was no way that you would know, Gail, that the dates chosen for this event have special meaning, at least for somebody like me, for when you speak of April 24 through 27, I'm just amazed that those same dates were days when voting was going on in South Africa towards a nonracial society. And our conference will end on the climactic day, April 27th, 1994, when there was a new South Africa. I would like to celebrate that. (Applause.)

And I want to begin my talk at that very same point. As they were moving to that grand election in 1994, a problem developed. There were some missionaries from the United States who were going around the townships asking people not to vote for anyone from the ANC but to do a write-in vote for Jesus. And some people were beginning to think that that was an expression of righteousness. So they invited me to come to go around to some of the townships and to indicate that there was a different perspective on that issue.

I went invited by the Independent Electoral Commission and went from Soweto to – then I went down to Alexandria and Victoria, down to Cape Town, over to Durban, et cetera. And I had one major message. The message was that I had had a conversation with Jesus – (laughter) – and that he had said, if nominated, he would not run, and if elected – (laughter, applause) – he would not serve. And the reason was that he was already in charge of a vast domain. (Laughter, applause.) It was a very exciting time and it led up to the election. And all of us know how exciting it was during that time.

I want you to know that I was traveling with a woman, Sandra Parker (sp) from Chicago, who had been given to take me around. And on our last trip before the big day of election I was coming back from Durban to Cape Town and then into Johannesburg. And we ran into a problem. Sandra Parker (sp), was supposed to sit in the middle seat – I had the aisle – the woman in the window seat was a white Afrikaner returning back home in anticipation of this election. And she was not very happy.

She put her bags in the middle seat, then she saw Sandra (sp) coming. Sandra's (sp) a black woman. And she would not move her bags. Sandra was going to help move the bags – (laughter) – but it became a tussling match. And the stewardess finally came over and said, oh – managed to give Sandra a seat in the – in another section just to keep peace. After we took off, I leaned over and asked this woman: Ma'am, are you all right?

And she says, no, I'm not all right. They're getting ready to have an election and they're going to vote us out of power. And they don't even know what to do with this country. She was really upset. I'm coming back. I live in Portugal now. I'm coming back just to protect my property as this election goes on. Oh, she was very upset. Seeing that that was a difficult moment for her, but I had experienced it before.

During my travel I was at the downtown Methodist church that Sunday when that big bomb explosion went off. And it rattled the building; it was just a little distance away from where I was preaching. But more than that, coming back from Cape Town on my way back home that last day a bomb went off. And I had come that very direction, but it was a little earlier, but I was able to see it on TV.

So it was very clear to me that if there was going to be a new South Africa, there would be a need for a whole lot of healing – deep down healing. That night, the 27th of April, Charlayne Hunter-Gault – you remember from PBS, MacNeil/Lehrer show – and Danny Glover and I were upstairs in Hotel Carlton getting something to eat as we watched the returns. It was a happy moment.

Oh, people were shown on TV throughout the day. Some of them would put in their vote and then hold their hands on the ballot box as if it were the Arc of the Covenant. Others would have their kids on their shoulders and they danced a – (inaudible) – out into the streets. It was a happy moment. But from what I had experienced, I knew that even if the victory had to be announced later that evening, there needed to be a lot of healing.

So I went home that night after it was all over and this is what I wrote for the new South Africa, but there's a relevance to why we're here in it. These words: Oh, how precious is the freedom which through struggle has been won, sweeter yet the celebration when true healing has begun. First the healing of the spirit of a people torn apart, tattered ties, a friendship mended, trust restored in every heart. Reconnect us, ancient spirit, bring forgiveness love and power. Teach us how to be one people. Bring us through this birthing hour. Bid us reach across the chasm, tribe and culture, class and race. Help us see in hearts of others hopes and dreams we all embrace. From the evils of oppression, Lord deliver and redeem. When we yearn for retribution, cleanse us with your love supreme. Trust requires a true confession, how our sins have maimed us so. Hope inspires a new direction, reaching out to friend and foe. As we dream and build together, heart-to-heart and hand-to-hand, we'll uncover hidden treasure lavished on our blessed land. None alone can reap the harvest. All our stories hold a key to the age of hope and healing, peaceful, just, secure and free.

And you can tell by now that the cadence and the rhythm would fit “Ode to Joy”:

Oh, how precious is the freedom which through struggle has been won. Sweeter yet the celebration when true healing has begun. By God's grace we lift our voices; many tongues will sing one song. Once divided now united, lo a nation free and strong.

Well, that was in '94. In 1995, a delegation came to the Riverside Church where I was pastoring then, seeking wisdom about how to be a truly nonracial democratic society. I acknowledged to them that our qualification to teach them was being severely challenged by the developments in my own country. We had just passed through – remember 1994, we had passed through a colossal obfuscation in regards to health care legislation. And the Contract with America on it was still in the air. Deep divisions, mean-spiritedness was spreading across the land.

And I, too, had passed through some wranglings in my own church situation. I had mistaken the near unanimous election to that position as the first African-American pastor at the Riverside Church. And the – only one lady stood up at the end when they voted and voted against me, and they said she didn't know what she was doing. So it was almost unanimous. And the – and the installation was glorious, just wonderful. I thought this is a relationship, a marriage made in heaven. But the day or two after, I began to get the impression that folks can vote for stuff and then hate themselves for doing it afterwards. It was clear to me that race was a factor. And it was a liberal church. And it felt good to them. We did it. We say are beyond race, except it's different when you experience it in living color. (Laughter, applause.)

Oh, let me tell you, I had been subpoenaed by a powerful commission in our church shortly after my arrival to come and show cause why I should not be dismissed from my post as senior minister. Oh, it was a kangaroo court. They brought up all sorts of stuff designed to establish my inadequacy for the position. It was one tough night. It was so difficult that during that meeting I wished that I had had a button that I could push so I could disappear out of their midst.

But there was a good outcome. I don't want this to get too heavy, so let me tell you one good outcome and then at the end I'll tell you another one. And the first one was that one woman had heard about this awful new pastor that didn't really have the dedication that William Sloane Coffin had and that he really, really shouldn't be our pastor. And she came all the way from Princeton. Her name was Elise Goldman (sp) – she doesn't mind me mentioning her name – just to hear, well, what is this new pastor doing – while black. (Laughter.)

Well, anyway, just to lighten things up before I get a little heavier, Elise (sp) liked what I said that day. And afterwards, she sent me a letter saying: I came all the way down to see what you were doing. And I thought maybe it was going to be a very short tenure for you, but I like what you said. Please find a check for \$50,000 to support your first efforts in this work. I just wanted to put that in there, you know. (Applause.)

But what I learned is that racism is a sickness. It is a moral and spiritual malaise. By the time I left 18 years later from that church, that same group was alive and well that had plagued my ministry all the while. In fact, one of them had just told a friend, just before I retired, that he couldn't wait until I was under the ground. That's serious talk, isn't it?

But I want you to know, not all things are bad. See, I want them to get some perspective on this. Yeah, I had some tough times, but I shouldn't complain. I mean, the most glorious moment in the whole career, 18 years, was when Mandiba (sp) was released from prison and came, and the first church where he came was the Riverside Church – (applause) – and they danced the tartar (ph) with Baba Olatunji playing the drums. Listen, I don't know – if I get to heaven, I'll be comparing whether it's as glorious as that. It was a glorious moment.

But the point I'm really trying to make is that a small group of malevolent, vociferous folks can actually be a metastasizing malignancy making the whole body sick. And it happened in the church, and it's happening in our society. Right now we are experiencing the same thing.

And I – because I’m supposed to be prophetic, I see stuff, and I do not always wait – (not ?) always wait for the analysis so as to be able to give verification of the kind of claims I’m making, that – I’m a – I’m a strange guy.

So when I see stuff happening in Sanford, Florida, and then stuff breaks out in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and then stuff happens in Detroit, where somebody else is either going to be in jail or dead or whatever before another election takes place, I say, brothers and sisters, America is in serious need of healing in regards even to the issue of race. Racism is alive and well. And I am happy that you’ve invited me to be here with you, Brother Starks (ph), today, because I am a minister. And usually these things are considered civil rights and, you know, racial justice and economic equity and all of this. But there’s a religious dimension to racism that folks need to know about.

That – I think – really, let me explain this to you. Race, as a matter of fact, is a religion in a sense – George Kelsey (sp), my professor in seminary, wrote a book on racism and the Christian understanding of man. He’d update it to be more inclusive today. But there are two kinds of religion, and race has both kinds. One is what I call the gospel of racial exceptionalism. That’s a religion. So you start fighting against racism, you understand you’re fighting against a religion.

The gospel of racial exceptionalism says that racial characteristics of the in group are the characteristics and attributes of God, and that the sovereign power of God is conferred upon the in group. Notice how I’m using my language nicely. (Laughter.) The – and the burden of the in group is to maintain the hierarchical difference indicated by their being closer to God than anybody else. And they must reduce any of the destabilizing dynamics which would call into question the verity of the white supremacist ideology. And they must also somehow make sure that what they do has in a sense the sanctification – even if it’s a lie, if it’s a white lie, it’s a better lie – (applause) – than it would have been otherwise.

And they must by all means find a way to lessen the other breed. My friend James Washington calls it “pseudosubspeciation,” which is his way of talking about how all of us are the same species, homo sapiens; but with racism that there is a certain tendency to make certain other people the lesser breed within the specie itself. That’s “pseudosubspeciation,” called racism. Well, all of that is a religion. So if we going to fight it, you need to know you’re fighting (also ?) a religion.

Now there’s another religious perspective, which by the way is designed to help you during this week to decide which side you really are on. The other gospel –

(END)

So if we’re going to fight it, you need to know you’re fighting off of religion.

Now, there’s another religious perspective – which, by the way, is designed to help you during this week to decide which side you really are on – the other gospel is the gospel of human race equality of being. It is not based on all of – all of us have the same intelligence or all of us have the same character level or all of us have the same numbers of gifts. It’s based on the fact that our identity is based on the justice and love of the Creator, who loves each and every one of

us the same. And if we're going to be children of that great God, we must view people through the eyes of God. And the Spirit seeks to recruit all of us into the beloved communities. And the Spirit (does ?) the work to help each one of us find our place in regards to the Lord's larger plan. And when that happens, you've got a relationship where all the people sing in the choir. Some sing low and some sing higher. But we're all in the choir. Dr. King called it the world house, (or else he ?) spoke of it as the beloved community. Now, we've got to make up our mind which side we're on.

Now, my – the purpose for standing here – and I must watch, because everything happens efficiently on this (kind of time ?) – this is not a talk conference unless it's talking that's walking. If it ain't walking, then have to cut off the talking. So the reality is – (applause) – that the reason you are here is because there is a sense that the illness is too serious to continue to allow to experience benign neglect from the rest of us.

So let me explain to you. For those of us that have been on the trail a long time, sometimes we get tired. I mean, my brother told me the other day that he charges a lot of money when people come to ask him to talk about race. He's been talking about it for 30 years. He's tired now. I think we are here in order to get a second wind – with gale force. I just threw that in. (Cheers, applause.)

So I have – I have in my time left – give me how much time do I have left, because I don't want to lose – I got that much, all right. I have – I have – I have three levels, I think, that this whole conference is designed to move toward. The first is – well, I'm going to – a preacher got three points, you know – the first one is in – it's enlistment. And the second is enlightenment. And the third is empowerment. This meeting, if you did not know it, is designed to enlist the brightest and best and proven leaders capable of being a positive minority, attempting to impact the direction, the consciousness and the political policies and economic outcomes of the whole nation.

This conference – well, Professor Lumus (ph) said it this way: A little – a little boy was in the restaurant with his mother and father and his big sister. And the waiter took the order, says, now let's – you all ready to order? Yes, the mother said.

The waiter says: I'll start with this little fellow. What do you want, sir? And the fellow said, she'll order for me, because that's what she always did. But he says: Oh, no. He must order for himself. What do you want, he said.

And he looked at her: A hamburger.

How do you want it? Well, or medium, or rare?

He didn't much know. He said: Well, well.

OK, fine. And what do you want on it?

Mustard and ketchup and – uh huh.

Well, he says: One hamburger, well-done, with mustard and ketchup.

And then he took the other orders. And after the waiter went away, the little boy turned to his mother and said, he thinks I'm real.

Everyone invited to a Kellogg – (word inaudible) – somebody thinks you're real. (Applause.) Somebody thinks you have the power, demonstrated by what you've done before you got here, that if inspiration is linked to enlightenment and empowerment, that you would be enlisted as a part of a fresh movement not yet named, but the world will know that you were here. And that's the first thing: enlistment.

Many of us have grown weary, and many of us are not even sure it's worth working for, like me as a pastor. I used to talk to divorcing couples. They were getting ready to get divorced. And I would talk to them and say, I think maybe I can help you all; let's talk this thing through. But then when he got up to go to the bathroom, she said, don't help us; I don't want this thing to be helped. (Laughter.) Some folks are – some folks don't – not even necessarily want us to be together. But the Lord God who made us wants us together whether you want to or not and will not stop until we find our way together.

So that's about enlightenment – enlistment. We hope that as a result of this conference, people will say, count me in, and not only tell us that or either put it on the evaluation, but when you pray, if you pray – and if you don't pray, when you meditate, or either if you don't do much meditating, even when you're just taking your regular exercise, promise the universe, if that's who you talk to, that I'm going to do something about this.

The second is enlightenment. And I want to give you one piece of enlightenment from a theological perspective. You are working to eliminate racism; you need to know something about its origins. One of my professors named Ryan Holiber (ph) said, at the heart of human (centralness ?) is our unwillingness to accept the security God offers, which is to say human existence tends to have a case of what I call "insecurititis." And in the midst of insecurititis, we look around. And the thing about race up until now – before long, it's going to be more difficult – you can look around, and you can tell he's different from her and that race provides a way for folks with insecurity to find themselves a blanket, a blanket of their own race. But the problem with those blankets, like you know with kids dragging them around, that their bacteria and the mess – and that blanket just keeps being pulled around. It carries a certain contamination. And it messes up the one who's carrying the blanket and the mother that's trying to get the blanket off as well.

So the reality is that our insecurity is one of the things that allows us to reach out and think that this blanket called whiteness is going to do it. And of course, in reaction, my blanket of blackness is going to do it. The blacker the berry, the sweeter the juice. But what happens now is this thing of a blanket to secure me has gotten mixed up with economics. And the – and so it's class, and it's race, and it's ideology. It's a (deuced ?) mixture. It includes all of Dr. King: militarism, materialism and racism. And it's got a – it's a – it's a malignancy inside of us that if this nation is challenged in a serious way by either environment – and it looks like we're headed that way – or by terror – and sometimes that comes – it's possible that we, having diminished the life outcomes of a significant portion of God's people, will not have the genius

we are needing to deal with how we cope with the problematics that we must face. The time is coming when if we're going to face it, we're going to have to do it together.

Well, I want to close this way: I want to close – it's not just about enlightenment; it's about empowerment. Now, I'd like to let you know that this is – and I'm coming in the home stretch. They've lifted up the fact that you got to cut it off. But I didn't want to cut it off without the power thing coming. So I'm going to do the power, and then I'm going to do the light, and then I'm through.

You who sit here today need to know that this is God's intention that we all be one, not that we all be the same, but that we be one people under God. And I want to make it very clear to you that you have power that you don't even know about. So out of this list, I hope you can say amen to facts that one or the other of these belongs to you. I am a preacher, so the Holy Ghost has gotten on me. So the anointing makes the difference. But then there is also the power of connectiveness. I am because we are. There is also the power of finally finding your place in God's plan. I mean, you have been a misfit all these years and, at long last, you find your place. That's power there.

There is the power, not only of that, finding your place, but there's a power of lamentation. If you can't do anything else, the prophet says you need to cry out. If – I mean, if there's some good criers in here, you thought your disposition was a disadvantage. We might even need some (mad ?) folks before it's all over – the crying out against injustice.

There is the power of song and dance. And in churches where I preach now, I warn them that when I get through, I'm likely to ask the folks to come up front and (not to ?) shout, but to join the "Electric Slide" – (laughter, scattered applause) – the "Electric Slide," because there's power in the dance.

There's power in clarity about your project. There's power in the problem. I'm so glad it's getting clear all over again that racism did not go hibernating; it is alive and walking around. There is a power in clear analysis. There's power in partnership – the power of hope, the power of leadership, the power of resistance, the power of prayer, the power of vision, the power of self-esteem, the power of love, the power of compassion, the power of success. To do something good one time makes you think I just might be able to do it again.

Now, then, let me close this way. Here's our – here's my closing.

You remember that night I told you I was at my church, and they were trying to have this kangaroo court against me and I got to 50,000? That was wonderful. But more important than the 50,000 was that, when I was called to the ministry, the Lord made me learn Psalm 27. There's that 27 again. The Psalm 27 – (reading) – it says: "The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?"

That night the Lord says you started preaching in 1956. This is now 40 years later. You need to know that the reason I gave you that psalm is I knew that you'd reach a space in life

where you needed a word that was stronger than the atmosphere and the environment and the charges and the claims against you. Now I want you to use it.

So here I am sitting at the – at the table with the whole – all (them ?) folks out there, doing their thing. And I could not look down. Sometimes you're in the battle, you can't look down. You know, you can't let them see you blink. So what I did is I just sat there and, although I could not say it aloud, in my heart, I was saying, "The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?"

And I'll tell you what happened. They said, all of a sudden, they noticed that my countenance changed because when you think that the cause you're committed to is the cause that is resident in the heart and mind of the Creator, that gives you a little strength, that sustains you in the midst of the problem. I preached that and told my folks that that's what brought me through.

So a lady who had just died – no, her husband had just died – found that her electric bill was going up because she kept her light on every night, all through the house. But she heard that sermon, and she told me what we need to know. We're getting ready to watch those who have died amongst us; we stand on their shoulders, but sometimes it's get bleak without them. But she said what she decided to do is – after hearing this sermon, decided to let the Lord be her night-light. She turned the lights off and enjoyed the fact that, "The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life." And in this struggle for racial justice, for economic equity, for a world where we all respect each other as children of God, I am going to say it may be light or it may be dark, and death may come to us. We will not all see the fulfillment before we get there. But if we can join in the spirit of those who have passed on, perhaps we can be sure that we will be victorious because we're going to let our little light shine everywhere we go. (Applause.)

MS. : Thank you, Reverend Forbes. One of the things that we have tried to do in designing this experience is to honor all the generations as well as all the people. And so, we're going to take moment now to be reminded of all of those brave, courageous, determined leaders upon whose shoulders we stand as we move our country toward healing. So thank you.

(Music plays.)

MS. : We recognize that that list could have been longer and more expansive. And we certainly invite your contributions to add to that list when we convene in the future. Now we're going to move into a different segment of the program. Our hearts are open, and hopefully our minds are too. One of the "a-has" for us so far in this work is the recognition of the role of unconscious or implicit bias. Part of that cancer that you described, Reverend, that malignancy often goes unseen without careful, careful or powerful tools to diagnose or magnify.

And so it is – it is our nature as human beings to take some of the knowledge that we gain through experience, be it positive or negative – to take some of that knowledge and codify it, if you will, in an – so that it becomes implicit knowledge. You may remember when you learned how to ride a bike. At first you had to think about every time you pushed those pedals down.

You had to think about the muscles you were using to maintain balance. You had to remember that if you didn't you would fall, because you fell before.

And then all of a sudden, you didn't have to think about any of those things. You just got on that bike and you just rode because the knowledge that you needed for riding that bike was now implicit. It was buried in your consciousness and you could call on it, just like that. And we've come to understand that so much of what is racialized in this society has become like that – like riding a bike. It is implicit and we call on it, just like that, over and over again.

And so the next panel – we are so honored and we really responded to feedback that asked us to bring this panel to the forefront of the conference – will begin to delve into the depths and offer us more insights into understanding how this implicit bias process is working and, perhaps most importantly, what might be done about it. How might we use this understanding as a tool to help us be more effective in our work?

We are very honored to have a distinguished moderator, Maria Hinojosa. For 25 years she has helped tell America the untold stories and brought to light unsung heroes in America and abroad. She is the anchor and managing editor of NPR's Latino USA. Join me in welcoming Maria Hinojosa and the panelists. (Applause.)

MARIA HINOJOSA: Hi, everyone. Oh, I'm so glad I don't have to stand at the podium because, you know, I really am tiny. Everybody's like, oh, it's so nice to meet you Maria. Oh, you're so short. (Laughter.) That's where the six-inch heels come in. You can come and look at them later, they're really cool. (Laughter.) I wanted – (chuckles) – what a great place to be this morning. Thank you so much for having me, and thank you to my panelists. Do we have our order? Yes? David, Rachel, Phil, John.

(In Spanish.)

AUDIENCE: (In Spanish.)

MS. HINOJOSA: Wow. That's deep. It's almost like we need like a second to like, whoa. You all have your packets in front of you, so you know that I'm joined by an amazing panel. And to all my panelists – I got them this morning and I was like, OK, we got to get into it. So make your presentations short. And they were like, what? No.

We have a lot of information that we're going to give to you, but also as you know it's so important about bringing it home, bringing it real, telling the story. So we also are going to be collecting your questions that come up on cards on your table – tables. And so people will be coming around to get them.

With me on the panel is the rock star David Williams from Harvard University. People were just, like, coming up and wanting autographs and wanting to just get a moment with David. Next, Rachel Godsil of the American Values Institute. Good to see you, Rachael. To my left is John Powell, who saw me in the elevator this morning. He already caught me. He was, like, you

were in a huff about the elevator. I was, like, oh no. So you saw me, John, who is with the University of California Berkeley – oh, I’m sorry – yes. And David. No, David.

PHILLIP GOFF: No.

PHILLIP GOFF: David?

MR. GOFF: Phil.

MS. HINOJOSA: Phil! (Laughter.)

MR. GOFF: (Off mic.)

MS. HINOJOSA: Oh, you guys. That wasn’t nice. (Laughter.) I thought we had a safe space. (Laughter.) I’m sorry, Phil, who is with the University of California-Los Angeles and who did not see me losing it on the plane – on the train or on the elevator this morning.

All right, so a few quick thoughts that I just want to share with you. It is exhausting, Reverend. It is exhausting. We are all so tired. But I have to share with you something that somebody said to me recently. And it was disturbing, because they said – when I said about coming to this conference, they said, I’m not ready to heal right now; I’m trying to understand all my anger, and I’m trying to understand this fear and this sadness. So what do we do with that? Because we know everybody has all of those emotions.

But on the day that we are talking about this, you all know that another conversation is being had in the Supreme Court today around Arizona’s S.B. 1070 law, which could not be any clearer than the state saying it is OK to racially profile people and that there is a class of people that we can identify and call “illegals.” What has happened in our country is that we have basically dehumanized another population, and it is happening in our midst. And we all do it unconsciously. We all live it unconsciously.

So I’m asking you to take what the reverend and what Gail has said one step forward, which is that it is beyond black and white, mis amigos. It is profoundly beyond black and white. The brown in our country, the only demographic group that is growing exponentially in our country – 43 percent demographic growth of the Latino population; that means it almost doubled in the last 10 years, which means it will go beyond doubling. And that is not from recent immigrants the way anti-immigration activists would like it to be known. No, it is from Latinos being born here.

And before I pass it off to my panelists, I will tell you this: In the conundrum of emotion that is happening within all of us, and specifically in the Latino community that feels very directly targeted and so needs the love and support of all of us, Latina teenagers have the highest rate of attempted suicide in our country. They are our future, and they’re trying to kill themselves and not succeeding. They want to live, and they need all of us. They need all of us.

So I'm sorry to get so emotional because I know that it's not supposed to be emotional when we're talking about academics. And that's why David Williams is going to start us off, because he's from Harvard. (Laughter, applause.)

DAVID WILLIAMS: It's really good to be here with you today and to take part in this historic moment that the Kellogg Foundation has created for us all. My task today is to talk to you about the research on unconscious discrimination and its consequences for health.

There are large racial-ethnic inequalities in the quality of intensive care. And there's evidence that suggests that unconscious discrimination contributes to that. In 2003 the Institute of Medicine instituted a study entitled "Unequal Treatment." This study found that across virtually every therapeutic intervention in the United States, from the most simplest to the most complex, minorities receive fewer procedures and poorer quality of care than whites. These differences persist even after you take into account the stage and severity of the disease, the type of insurance, the type of (core current ?) illnesses that an individual has.

Let me make this concrete by giving you an example of one of the over 200 studies that the Institute of Medicine looked at. Dr. Knox Todd was an emergency room physician at a UCLA medical center. And he asked a very simple question: When a patient comes into the UCLA emergency room with a long-bone fracture, a broken bone in the arm or leg, is there a difference by ethnicity whether the patient receives pain medication? The patient has a broken leg or – does the ethnicity make a difference as to whether they receive pain medication or not?

Dr. Todd found that 55 percent of Hispanic patients did not receive pain medication, compared to 26 percent of non-Hispanic whites. Dr. Todd was a good researcher, so he decided to statistically adjust for everything else that he thought might contribute to this pattern. But after considering every other potential explanation, the single biggest predictor of whether a patient received pain medication or not was that they were Latino.

Dr. Todd said, could it be that the Latinos have a cultural way in expressing pain that physicians are just not cluing in on? (Laughter.) And so he did a second study and asked patients to rate the pain they were in and asked doctors to rate the pain they thought the patients were in and found that doctors could equally well rate the severity of pain among Latino patients and non-Latino patients but was prescribing less pain medication to Latino patients.

Dr. Todd moved from UCLA to Emory University in Atlanta and repeated the same study at three large emergency rooms in Atlanta, focusing on black and white patients, and found exactly the same thing. A black person with a broken bone in the arm or leg goes into the emergency room in Atlanta, is less likely to receive pain medication than a white patient.

How on earth do we make sense of this? How is it possible for the best-trained medical workforce in the world to produce a pattern of care that appears to be so discriminatory? The answer: unconscious discrimination, because the research shows that when one holds a negative stereotype about a group and meets someone from that group, without their conscious awareness – it's an unconscious process, and it's automatic – they will treat that person differently and honestly not know that they did it.

Now, the average person says, I would never do that; that's not the kind of person I am. It's true. Welcome to the human race. It's a normal process of how all of us process information. And the problem about our society is that the levels of negative stereotypes are very high. The General Social Survey, a national social indicators study, found in 1990 that 44 percent of whites believe that blacks are lazy; 56 percent of whites believe that blacks prefer to live off welfare; 51 percent of whites believe that blacks are prone to violence; and 29 percent of whites believe that blacks are unintelligent. Not only are blacks viewed negatively, they're viewed markedly more negatively than whites view themselves.

Not only do whites view blacks negatively, 1-in-5 (for ?) whites or fewer are willing to say that blacks are hardworking, prefer to be self-supporting, are not prone to violence or are intelligent. And the GSS, General Social Survey, documented a hierarchy across the racial-ethnic group that the respondents – national study of persons were asked about. Blacks were viewed the most negatively. All minority populations were viewed more negatively than whites, with Hispanics viewed twice as negatively as Asians, with southern whites viewed more negatively than whites in general and Jews viewed more positively than whites in general.

And some (would say ?), Professor, that's 1990; things have changed. Well, two of the stereotypes have been asked consistently since then, and I want to show you what they've found. On the stereotype that blacks are lazy, you can see 44 percent in 1990; in 2003 it's 33 percent, so you would say we've made progress. Not so fast. If you look at the positive end of the stereotype, 17 percent of whites believed that blacks were hardworking in 1990; only 16 percent in 2006. All that has happened is more people have shifted to the middle, saying, I don't know the answer to that question; I'm not touching that one with a 10-foot pole.

Where do these stereotypes come from? Recently researchers have put together a database of American culture, all of the texts, all of the books, all of the magazine articles that someone will read after – the average college-educated American would read over the course of their lifetime. And colleagues are now mining that database of American culture and looking at associations that exist within that database. And what they have found is when the word “black” appears in American culture, the most commonly associated word with blacks is “poor” and then “violent” and then “religious” and then “lazy” and then “cheerful” and then “dangerous.” You see some of the common stereotypes, negative stereotypes of violent, lazy, dangerous, are deeply embedded in American culture. People are not being mean; they're just being normal Americans.

What's associated with “white” in American culture? Wealthy, progressive, conventional, stubborn, successful, educated. Just for the fun of it, what's associated with females? Distant, warm, gentle and passive. With males: dominant, leader, logical, strong. These are the stereotypes that we have been fed, and then they've become a part of who we are and shape our behavior in powerful ways. These negative racial stereotypes lead to societal discrimination.

Some of the most compelling evidence of discrimination comes from (all these ?) studies done by Devah Pager of Princeton University. She shows, when you send a black and a white to

apply for a job – and she threw a wrinkle into this study, had one of the blacks and one of the whites said they served an 18-month prison sentence of – for cocaine possession – she found that it was easier for a white male with a criminal record to get a callback for a job than a black male whose record was clean. Their résumés were identical. And she repeated the study in New York City looking at African-Americans, whites and Latinos, and the white felon gets more callbacks for a job than an African-American or Latino male with a clean record: the persistence of discrimination in America.

And my research is focused on what are the consequences it has for health. I developed the Everyday Discrimination Scale, today one of the most widely used studies – scales in the study of discrimination in health. I'll give you an example of one recent study from Tené Lewis at Yale University looking at the relationship between everyday discrimination and visceral fat. Visceral fat is that deeply embedded abdominal fat, not the subcutaneous fat but a visceral fat that predicts high risk of diabetes and heart disease and so on. And what she finds is that the higher the level of everyday discrimination, the higher the level of visceral fat. Discrimination is literally killing (us ?).

There are other studies showing that discrimination is – it leads to higher levels of inflammation, higher levels of – (inaudible) – calcification, higher levels of cancer, breast cancer, of fibroids, of subclinical artery disease. We not just talking about people feeling; we talking about deeply embedded subclinical processes in the body that are driven by discrimination.

Negative stereotypes also drive residential segregation, what I have argued is the fundamental cause of racial inequality and the racial disparities in health in the United States. Now I have data to back it up. Maria Krysan and colleagues did a study looking at blacks and whites in metropolitan Detroit and Chicago, showed them a video of a neighborhood. The neighborhoods were all identical; they just varied (whether ?) a black person or a white person was evident in the neighborhood. And what they found was that the presence of a black person in the neighborhood led whites to rate the neighborhood as lower in quality on all desirable aspects of neighborhood life.

What does segregation have to do with health? The way you live determines your access to education. It determine the access to employment opportunities. It determines the quality of neighborhood and housing environment. It determines the – whether it's easy or not to live a healthy lifestyle. It determines the quality of medical care you have access to.

A study by David Cossel (sp), an economist at Harvard University, found that if we could eliminate residential segregation in America, we would completely wipe out racial differences in income, education and unemployment, and reduce racial differences in single motherhood by two-thirds – all of that driven by residential segregation, which is beneath the radar screen of most Americans but a fundamental issue we need to address to accomplish racial equality in this country.

Another way in which stereotypes matter is, some people – members of minority populations – buy into and accept as true the negative stereotypes about their group. So if you

go back to the stereotype data, a lot of African-Americans believe that blacks are lazy and that they prefer to live off welfare and that they are violence-prone and they are unintelligent. Jerome Taylor at Pittsburgh University (sic; University of Pittsburgh) has shown that high levels of internalized racism is linked to high levels of mental health problems and substance abuse problems.

What can we do about this problem? We're talking about unconscious bias. There's a wonderful paper I don't have time to describe by Diana Burgess, Michelle van Ryn and others that shows there's a lot we have learned to address unconscious bias. We first have to begin by acknowledging that it could be us. We are part of the human family, and we may process information that way. And then we need to focus on individuation instead of categorization, looking at each person as an individual and not as a member of a group. The implicit association test, implicit.harvard.edu/implicit (sic; implicit.harvard.edu/implicit), is one way where we can go and learn what we can do.

What is the needed action we need as a group today? We need to develop coordinated and sustained efforts, including mass media, to help to redefine race in American culture and get at the source of unconscious bias at its source. We need to raise awareness of discrimination in all its forms and identify feasible and optimal strategies to combat it. And we need to create the political will and support to dismantle institutional racism in our society. Martin Luther King, Jr. said, "Of all the forms of inequality, injustice in health care is the most shocking and inhumane." I hope you have committed to work to dismantle it in all its forms. Thank you. (Applause.)

MS. HINOJOSA: You know, it's fascinating because the reverend brought up the dates that we are living through. And reverend, there's one that you missed, April 19th. We are very lucky that on April 19th passed this year with no major tumbles. This was of course Oklahoma City – the bombing of Oklahoma City, Waco. I believe it's Hitler's birthday, which is why it is such a tumultuous date, but we made it through. But a part of what happens is, as Brother David just said, it's the media. The media create the images. And until we really diversify the media, we're going to have a problem.

But for now, to bring us to research says from the American Values Institute, please welcome Rachel Godsil. (Applause.)

RACHEL GODSIL: Good morning. I'm extraordinarily grateful to have been invited to participate in this panel. I see many friends from last year's Kellogg healing event, people from my healing circle. I'm surrounded by colleagues, friends, mentors. And I'm excited to present the research that the American Values Institute has begun to do exactly to address where David ended, which is how do we create the political will, how do we change the national cultural dialogue around race.

So this image will obviously be completely familiar to all of us. And I intentionally linked the picture of Trayvon Martin or actually found the link with Emmett Till, because I think for many of us when Trayvon Martin was murdered, it brought back an extraordinarily painful memory, either a personal memory or historical memory of that horrible moment in our culture. And I think it was something we didn't think we'd experience again, where a young man would

be murdered and someone would go unarrested for that murder. And again, a very painful memory for mothers of black men, for wives and teachers and friends and sisters and everyone who cares about young black men. This was a traumatic, traumatic event.

And what's interesting is and one thing that was different in 2012 than when Emmett Till was murdered is 77 percent of whites in that initial moment when that picture was shown throughout our country thought that the man who murdered Trayvon Martin should be arrested – 77 percent of whites. And so it seemed as though there was generally unanimity. I mean, we have that 15 percent that, frankly, we know they're off somewhere, we're not going to reach them. So that 15 percent I can't really think about because it's too depressing, that the malignancy there is too deep.

But 77 percent – and often the number goes a little bit higher – agreed that this was an injustice that should not be tolerated. Now the – a more recent CNN poll shows that that number has dipped down to 58 percent for whites. It stayed very quite high for African-Americans and other racial groups as well, although I will note that the polls have been very binary, so to go back to something Maria said earlier, between black and white as though other groups in this country don't exist.

Another fact is that a month or so after the coverage began, 43 percent of whites said they'd heard enough. Even if they thought George Zimmerman should be arrested, they just didn't want to hear about it anymore. And so part of the question is why the racial divide? Is it that whites don't care? Is it the – sort of an attitudinal problem? Well, actually in general and, again, David's statistics were powerful and very disheartening, but there are some attitudinal sort of improvements that I think we may find heartening.

And I focus specifically on the percentage of people who think it's either a good thing or perfectly fine and they don't care whether or not people of different races marry each other. Because even as recent as 1987, as this says, 48 percent of Americans thought blacks and whites shouldn't date. By 2010, 75 percent, again, say it's either fine or why is it my business? We've got that 15 percent that, again, we should write off. So many express racial attitudes have actually become quite positive. And there are many others that I could cite.

So again, why the divide?

Or why is it my business? We've got that 16 percent that, again, we should write off.

So many expressed racial attitudes have actually become quite positive. And there are many others that I could cite. So again, why the divide? Is it that whites are hiding their real attitudes when they're asked these questions? Is there a much larger group of whites who are actually kind of covert racists, who sort of think we should go back to some earlier era where whites were the only ones? I actually don't think so, and I don't think the research supports it. And we'll be hearing more from that from Phil and John.

Most Americans, at 85 percent, believe that racial discrimination is deeply, deeply wrong. In fact, in the United States, to be considered racist is actually more immoral than to be a drunk driver. It is literally considered immoral to be racist. The vast majority of Americans want to

believe that our country is fair and that we've moved past the shameful of our – (inaudible) – racist days.

However, those attitudes, that desire to believe that we're fair, in some sense becomes part of the problem. Because for many whites, what the culture has told us, what the right has successfully convinced us of, is racial equality equals color blindness, that to be nonracist means not to talk about nor even to notice race. And so those of you who are Stephen Colbert fans, we're just not supposed to be able to see it, right? I don't know that I'm white. I don't see that. And as we know, that's an illusion. And it's actually not something certainly – and all of you can tell me this – that people of color are looking for, for sort of somehow me to pretend that when I'm look around, everything looks strangely pink. And we also know from the research that not talking about race allows those precise, implicit biases, those negative stereotypes that our toxic culture feeds us to actually continue to grow and metastasize and to affect our behavior.

Now, as racial justice advocates, we know that we've not reached the post-racial euphoria that some tell us we have. We know the racial disparities exist. We know they're linked to historical wrongs. We have a great deal of information about all that we need to overcome. And for us, that leads to a sense of moral urgency about what policy changes ought to be made, as to where we ought to devote our energies. And therefore, when we talk in the media, when we write op-eds, when we teach our students, that's what we talk about. We talk about and emphasize the disparities. We link those disparities – again, as they should be linked – to historical practices. And that seems as though it should be the appropriate way to communicate. It's rational, it's logical, and frankly, it's true.

The problem is that for a large majority of whites in that middle section, the ones who want to be nonracist, hearing that information literally causes avoidance. They duck their heads. They may have moments of guilt and that's what causes them to duck their heads, or they may think, you know, my ancestors came over here in 1940 and I was from Eastern Europe or I was from Ireland or I was from some other place – it's not my fault. Why are you telling me about history? So either guilt or a sense of lack of responsibility lead the traditional ways that we communicate not to lead to the moral urgency that it triggers in us, but rather to avoidance or a sort of lack of understanding about why we're focusing on the past.

And in fact in – we've done a study showing that 15 percent of whites stop reading if we start with disparities. And to go back to David's point, talking about the disparities may run the risk, and in fact I think does run the risk, of actually – (word inaudible) – the negative stereotypes that we want to get and need to get beyond. So what we've been working on at ABI (ph) is to try and understand a different way of talking about race that will lead to the moral urgency, that will overcome the racial polarization and that will lead to the changes that we seek.

And I have to actually move very quickly now. We see two causes, in addition to the implicit bias, that are profoundly linked to the sort of continued role race plays. One is what we call racial anxiety. Whites fear enormously the possibility that they will be called racist. As I said, to be racist is to be immoral. And what that anxiety causes – and Phil will talk more about this later – what that anxiety can cause is the same sort of distancing, awkwardness and literally diminishment of cognitive capacity. Literally, your brain shuts down if you fear that someone's going to think you're a racist. So undoubtedly you do this stupid thing that causes them, of

course, to think you're a racist. They also fear the acknowledgment that the status quo isn't fair, because that challenges their conception of what their world ought to be.

And I'll switch it now quickly to what I would imagine – again, people in this room can tell me if I'm wrong – I think the obverse of that white fear, that white racial anxiety, is precisely the fear, as a person of color, that you will be the object of racism. So these anxieties kind of collide in catastrophic ways.

There's also an empathy gap, where cognitively, if you have intergroup difference, you empathize less – and I have a hand up there because there was a study done showing a needle going into a hand, and you empathize less with the hand of a person who's not from your group if there's a culture of difference.

OK. Now I'm going to move really quickly now. What I'd like to show very briefly – and I hope I can have an extra two minutes if it's OK – is a test that we're now running at AVI to determine whether empathy levels are – the degree of empathy difference, and then I'll show you a quick clip to show you how we want to see if we can actually elicit that empathy.

(Begin video clip.)

OFFICER: Sir, please step away from the vehicle.

MAN: Officer, this is my car. The door's stuck. I've been trying to get in for –

OFFICER: Sir, I need to see proof of valid identification now.

MAN: My wallet is in the car. I have my credit card. You can –

OFFICER: (Inaudible) – any vehicle identification –

MAN: Well, I have my credit card. You –

OFFICER: Hey, get your hands out of your pocket!

MAN: Whoa! Well, why are you treating me like this? I told you this is my car.

OFFICER: There have been multiple break-ins in this area. You're coming with me.

MAN: You're handcuffing me?!

OFFICER: Let's go.

MAN: Why are you treating me like a criminal? I told you this is my car.

(End video clip.)

(Begin video clip.)

OFFICER: Sir, please step away from the vehicle.

MAN: Hey, Officer. My door's been stuck here for a couple minutes now. I've been trying –

OFFICER: Sir, I need some identification.

MAN: My wallet's inside my car, but I have my credit card –

OFFICER: Do you have valid proof of U.S. citizenship on you?

MAN: Yeah. I'm an American citizen.

OFFICER: Sir, keep your hands out of your pockets.

MAN: Whoa, whoa, whoa. Why am I being treated like this? I told you my wallet's inside car! I got my credit card in my pocket. You can check – you can check my name.

OFFICER: Sir, there's been multiple break-ins in this area. You're coming with me to the station now. Let's go.

MAN: Why am I being treated like a criminal?!

OFFICER: Let's go!

MAN: Wow, I can't believe this flap. I'm an American citizen.

(End video clip.)

(Begin video clip.)

OFFICER: Sir, please step away from the vehicle.

MAN: This is my car. I've been stuck here for a couple of –

OFFICER: Sir, I did to see valid identification now.

MAN: Yeah, my wallet is in the car, and I have my credit card on me.

OFFICER: Sir, please provide me with proof of identification.

MAN: My credit card –

OFFICER: Get your hands away from – (inaudible).

MAN: Whoa, whoa, whoa. Why are you treating me like this?

OFFICER: There's been multiple break-ins in this area. You're coming with me.

MAN: Why are you handcuffing me? I told you this is my car.

OFFICER: Let's go.

(End video clip.)

MS. GODSIL: So if I can have one more minute, I'll show you how we're hoping to, after testing whether empathy levels are different -- as you can see, those were identical. So if people feel like the police officer was somehow appropriate in some circumstances and not in others, that can only be the result of race or ethnicity. But here's how we're hoping to alter that.

(Begin video clip.)

MS. : We've been talking a lot about the recent arrest of Michael Carson. The police responded to a 9/11 call, and even though Mr. Carson presented identification, he was still taken into custody after police say he began to exhibit loud and erratic behavior. Mr. Carson charged that his arrest was the result of racial profiling and that he would not have been taken into custody had he been white.

Here in our studio today, we have Professor Tom Peterson, here to discuss the arrest. Mr. Peterson?

TOM PETERSON: Police officers and security guards bring with them all of the prejudices that they have, and we have to be aware of this. When they make decisions, these prejudices can influence how they react. Racial profiling remains a serious problem with law enforcement in the United States. The larger lesson here is that the police treat blacks differently than they do whites.

(End video clip.)

(Begin video clip.)

MS. : Here in our studio today we have Professor Tom Peterson, here to discuss the arrest. Mr. Peterson?

TOM PETERSON: Police officers and security guards, like the rest of us, often have to make snap decisions. When we do, we are guided by our instincts, which are influenced by the stereotypes we have whether we know it or not. Police are just human beings, after all. The larger lesson here is that they need to be trained a little bit differently in dealing with people who may be at their worst moment.

(End video clip.)

(Begin video clip.)

MS. : Here in our studio today, we have Professor Tom Lopez here to discuss the arrest. Mr. Lopez?

TOM LOPEZ: The rule is, you mess with the bull you get the horns. When you're dealing with a police officer you show them the respect they want, otherwise you can get arrested. Mr. Carson overreacted, used the race card, and should apologize to the officer who was only responded to a citizen's call for help.

(End video clip.)

MS. GODSIL: So I'll end now, but what we're hoping to learn with this test is, first, again, a baseline difference of empathy and to what degree, and second, as you can see, there were three different messages there. The first was taken actually from the arrest of Professor Gates (sp) a few years ago. And it was the way that we, as racial justice advocates, would traditionally talk about racial profiling.

The second was a script that we devised, with the help of John Powell among others, to try and see whether the empathy with the police officer as a human being, but recognizing that he holds stereotypes he may not know about, will lead people to be able to think about the role of race in ways that they might not otherwise be able to do – whites I'm talking primarily – because they're worried that if that police officer is being considered racist, so might they. So will that empathy that our commentator showed actually lead us to have a better conversation about race?

And the third is actually literally language taken from the arrest of Professor Gates (sp). And having each of our messengers want to take the bull by the horns was really a challenge in filming. The other aspect of the test is each of those messages will be seen delivered by a different messenger. So we're very interested to see whether a different race, ethnicity of the messenger will alter how people hear the message.

Now, my own hypothesis is that having an African-American messenger giving the empathic story will be more effective and hopefully lead to this better conversation than a white messenger. And similarly, having a Latino messenger eliciting empathy for the police officer will lead to this better conversation because the notion will be, if this person who I – the white person – so fear will consider me a racist can see me as a human being, then it is my obligation to broaden my circle of human concerns and see the young man who was harassed by the police as a human being.

Thank you so much. (Applause.)

MS. HINOJOSA: I'm actually stuck on one part of the second arrest moment where he's saying, but I'm an American citizen. Why are you handcuffing me? And again, I ask you to

think, so then therefore, if he was an immigrant, then it would be OK? If he was an immigrant, it would be OK. This is very deep into the kind of stuff that we're talking about.

MS. GODSIL: Can I explain?

MS. HINOJOSA: No, we can talk about it in a second.

MS. GODSIL: All right.

MS. HINOJOSA: But first, we're going to hear from Philip Goff who is with the Department of Psychology at the University of California, Los Angeles, UCLA. Philip. (Applause.)

MR. GOFF: Forgive me while we switch up our technology here for just a moment. All right, wonderful. So thank you, panelists and fellow conveners. Thanks to Alvin (sp) and to Gail for having me here. And actually we're on the – yeah, there we go.

So I've been asked, as the most nerdy of us professional nerds, to come in and speak. I'll warn you, though I am not in the black church traditional currently, I am of the black church tradition. So you may feel the need to say "amen" but at the very least, when I call, I hope you'll respond. (Laughter.) Specifically, I've been asked, as we're talking about unconscious bias, right, to talk about how we psychologists, slaves to the religion of the mind, right, study this in the lab and then translate it to the field.

I wear two hats, one is as a psychologist; the other is that I'm the director of the Consortium for Police Leadership and Equity. What that means is I study the mind of law enforcement. So I'm busy, OK? (Laughter.) So when we're going to – if we're going to talk about how psychologists study contemporary bias, we have to talk about what's contemporary about contemporary bias.

I'm going to depart a little bit from my colleague David in terms of talking about the general social survey, as opposed to what we call the Princeton trilogy. I assume we call it the Princeton trilogy because there's five of them. These are the attitudes of white college students towards blacks, right? You can see, we've got a little Stevie Wonder here in terms of the negative stereotypes at the top, all the way down to stupid. And from 1930 to 2000, the numbers have gotten better. Some of them are hiding their true feelings. Some of them have learned to be polite in public. And some of it is just good news. Some things have changed; that's part of what's contemporary about contemporary bias.

That said, the more things change, the more they stay the same, OK? These – this is racial inequality, all right? That means if a black child were to die in infancy as frequently as a white child, these bars would be at one, where the white line is. You can see the inequality is both high, persistent; and in most cases, if you follow it over time, it's actually increasing.

So how do we make sense of declining prejudice and persistent or increasing inequality? Well, we call the mind scientists up, OK. So I'll tell you two of our dirty little secrets as mind

scientists. The first is we've known bigotry was not the whole story since 1929; sorry we didn't tell you, OK? In fact, attitudes only predict about 10 percent of behaviors, right? So (where ?) we've been still looking for the other 90 percent since 1929. So the goal of this talk in the 10 minutes that I've been allotted is to introduce you to some new language for that 90 percent and to show you some specific examples.

The language I'm going to use is the language of identity traps – OK, I'm hoping that's going to make sense to you shortly – the label or frame for contemporary bias that myself and some colleagues have been using to talk about tendencies of the human mind to take shortcuts, tendencies of the human mind to get preoccupied with things. And it ends badly for everyone, particularly when it comes to issues of identity: gender, race, sexual orientation and the like. And we're going to talk about two traps in particular, fast traps and slow traps. OK, you guys with me so far? OK.

Fast traps: They are automatic, they're uncontrolled and they're hard to prevent, because they happen fast, right? Not thinking brings them out. Oh, I just wasn't thinking; that's why I locked my wallet in the car. I just wasn't thinking; that's why I forgot our anniversary. I wasn't thinking; that's why I called you a – right. So when we talk about implicit bias, these are the fast traps that we're talking about.

Slow traps, on the other hand, are something I think we don't talk enough about. They are conscious. They tend to be self-directed where fast traps are other-directed. They're ruminative. They're negotiated over time, over relationships, right? Things like concern that someone's going to see me as racist; things like concern that someone's not going to see me as man enough because I'm wearing all this purple, OK?

Now it's funny for me, the Prince fanatic that I am; it's less funny in one of our police jurisdictions, where 82 percent of the use of deadly force incidents were immediately preceded by a man flirting with a male officer, or a man or a woman referring to an officer by a sexual-orientation slur. "Fag" is a deadly word. The idea that officers are so concerned that they demonstrate their manhood – they're not able to properly assess whether or not an individual is a threat. (Right ?). (Laughter.)

That's what I mean by slow – OK, fine, I got five minutes, we going to go (into ?) fast traps fast. What I'm about to show you is an example of a particular fast trap. These are clips taken from 911 calls between dispatchers and officers in L.A. County in the early '90s. Let's read them out together. We got "Gorilla in the Mist," West Hollywood, stopped on suspicion. "Gorilla in the Mist," Simi Valley, any 911 calls. Evidence of break-in and sexual assault, suspect likely "Gorilla in the Mist." Victim found DOA, NHI, body is cold, NHI on altercation, negative on engaging. Let's see if there's a body count. Suspect died in altercation, NHI.

Now many of you – I see some crinkled foreheads. Let me explain. To understand this, you need to understand two things. First is that "Gorilla in the Mist" is a metaphor. It's a metaphor for young black males in a majority-white area. NHI is a euphemism and a metaphor, right – euphemism and an acronym, I should say. It's a euphemism for blacks of any kind, and it stands for "no humans involved."

It's what the philosopher Tommy Lott refers to as the Negro-ape metaphor, right? It is practiced within law enforcement; at least it was in Southern California in the early '90s, OK – practiced so much, perhaps it got into the heads of the officers, so much so that it could – it could predict an event like Emmett Till or Trayvon Martin. And that's what we wanted to study.

So we brought 60 sworn officers in. I'm not telling you where from. They completed a measure of explicit prejudice – “I don't like black people,” seven. “I really like black people,” one. OK. Also measures of implicit bias and implicit dehumanization, the degree to which they associated black children with apes. Then they made age judgments; they just guessed how old a child was. OK, that's what I'm going to show you.

So they saw children that looked like this. In your mind, make a note: How old are these kids? So we had people who were high in associating blackness with apeness and people who were low. So for the people that were high in associating blackness with apeness, they tended to think: Oh, that child – that white child is too young to have done that. But we are not afforded the same courtesies on the other side.

I want you to know that's five years. It's not an average (of general ?) five – it's five years. That means that this child here, the black child, OK, is actually 13 years old – he's 18 in the minds of those (dehumanizers ?). That child's a child, that child's an adult, and we know what happens with that – (inaudible).

All right. I'm going to ask the cameras to turn off. All right, can I get OK on that? Yes? I got OK on that? All right. For the (slow traps ?), the reason why I'm doing that is we have some protected materials I'm going to show you, OK? This is with regard to that masculinity threat that I was talking about earlier. We brought 63 patrol officers in. Fifty-seven of them are male. That's its own study, OK? We divided them into high and low masculinity threat concern with demonstrating their manhood. All of our female officers? Low masculinity threat.

And they saw either white, Latino or black suspects. And then our measure, what we cared about was aggression. You'll see what I mean by aggression, OK?

So this guy who comes in I'm going to show you first, he's high on macho but low on prejudice, both explicit and implicit. I'm sorry, the first one is high on prejudice, low on macho. I apologize, right? He doesn't like black people, right? But he's secure in his manhood. Let's see how he responds to this, in this case to a black suspect.

(Begin video clip.)

MR. : What are you doing? Yeah? You like that? Well, you like sticks? You know, that ain't nice to say, huh? Well, you know, people are getting scared because you're waving that stick around and banging on stuff. Well, other people don't like it. What do you think?

(End video clip.)

MR. : That's the racist, OK.

This next guy, he's actually low on racism on every way we measure it, high on macho, OK? And again, with (slow traps ?), that question of "am I man enough?" takes up so much of your brain space, you can't properly assess the threat. He's responding to the exact same video as this guy just was. This guy's low on racism, high on macho.

(Begin video clip.)

MR. : (Denver ?) Police, drop the fucking stick right now! Drop the fucking stick!
(Denver ?) Police, drop the – drop the stick, asshole! Drop it! Drop the stick.

(End video clip.)

MR. : We can turn the video back on. What you just witnessed was two in the head and two in the chest. That officer shot and killed that suspect. This is in their use of deadly force training facility. For the nerds among you, it's like the X-Men's danger room. For those of you who are not so – and all of you are telling on yourselves – for those of you who are not so nerdy (ph), it is a place like this where an entire wall is a video projection screen, and they're used to training there. That's a real 9mm retrofitted with a laser pointer, OK? That's real for them. All right? We were also able to correlate that to what they do on the streets. And both that dehumanization and that masculinity threat predicts what they do on the street.

Let's take a look at racial differences on that macho factor. All right, we've got high masculinity threat, low masculinity threat for whites, Latinos and blacks. Why would it predict racial disparities, if I've got to prove my manhood? Well, if I'm interested in being macho, I'm more interested in doing that for individuals who I stereotype as hypermasculine. And in case you've been missing it, blacks and Latinos stereotyped as hypermasculine, though (I'm ?) evidence to the contrary every day, OK?

So here's the key point for that. If we're looking for the racist, we bench the first guy and we miss the second one. I'm interested in getting the people that kill black people off the streets. So we need to have different districts. We need to have different avenues to getting – different routes to getting to what causes racial disparities.

When I'm thinking about racism, I don't care about the racist nearly as much as I care about the racism, right? I don't want my racism, my conceptions of racism to be racist, meaning I only care about the perpetrator. I care about the victim. I care about the survivors. So the benefits of this framework is that it foregrounds context over individuals. It's not about the character of George Zimmerman, right? It's about the survival tactics of Trayvon Martin and his parents, OK. It also – it allows us multiple routes to talk about discrimination. Yes, you can have bigots, but you also have people who have traps in their brains around race and gender and sexual orientation, and that idea of traps allows a language for broad accountability. I can set a trap for myself, but mostly we set traps for other people. Bosses set traps for their employees, departments – police departments set traps for their officers, and we all set traps for each other.

We have a language for that. We're better prepared for talking about it, rather than having the conversation devolve into "Yes, you are," "No, you're not."

So that's the language of contemporary racial bias I want to leave you with today. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

MS. HINOJOSA: Thank you, Phillip.

We're going to continue now with the fabulous John Powell, who is at the University of California at Berkeley, the Haas Center for Diversity and Inclusion, and Robert D. Haas Chancellor's Chair in Equity and Inclusion. I want that! Amazing title.

So, John.

JOHN POWELL: (To staff.) So with a little help – there it is.

So first of all, thank you, and thank Gail and Kellogg and all of you for the work you're doing and for a chance to share with you some thoughts this morning.

So what I'm going to try to do is sort of tie some of the things together that you heard today and talk more generally about the way the mind works and implicit bias.

(To staff.) I'll go back – yeah, I can't go back. So if you could just – OK, here we go. Thank you.

So basically we're not talking about just what you think but how you think. And really the mind is very different than what we thought growing up, and our children and grandchildren will have a very different understanding of the mind. And the unconscious plays a much larger role. So when you look at this vase or this face, you notice – you see a vase or you see a face. You don't see both. The mind flips back and forth. Which is it? It depends. OK.

So I want you to describe just to yourself what's happening – (to staff) – if you could show the video clip.

(Video plays.)

Just jot down what you see happening. Jot it down on a piece of paper, if you don't mind.

OK. So because of time, I won't – normally I would ask you, but because of time, I won't ask you right now. The vast majority, probably 95 percent of the people, see the big triangle being aggressive to the little triangle. Any of you have that impression? OK. That's what you attributed to the scenario.

Triangles aren't aggressive. (Laughter.) Right? It's that we're bringing something to this and then we interpret it. It's basically our schemas sort of telling us how to interpret this behavior.

And so go back and take a look at it more carefully. And so when we're thinking about this in terms about the conscious or the unconscious, and there's some disagreement on it, but basically the unconscious is the major player. It's the star of the show. The conscious is very small. That only represents somewhere in the neighborhood of 2 percent, and Timothy Wilson argues that it's less than 2 percent, that out of – we process approximately 11 million bits of information a second. Every second you're processing 11 million bits of information and less of 40 of it can you be conscious of. So 11 million bits of information's going on, and you're conscious of 40. Which of those 40 you're conscious of? You have some selectivity – not complete but some. But it means that most of the things that's going on in fact is unconscious. And we make these associations at this unconscious level. And Phil already talked about fast traps and slow traps, so the unconscious mind is very fast. The conscious mind is slow – elegant, but slow and quite – (inaudible). So we have to make snap decisions. The quicker the decisions, the more likely they will happen at an implicit level and not at a conscious level.

So some of you've seen this before, so I'll go through this very quickly. I want you just to, as I – as you see the colors, to say out the colors. Forget the letters, just the colors, right, OK? So I'll just – I'll show it to you and you say – you shout it out and then we'll go to the next one.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (Off mic.)

MR. : Yeah, pretty good. All right, it's a(n) exceptional group, I can tell. (Laughter.) OK, we're going to do this one more time. Now that you know the drill, you – I'm sure you'll do much better, even faster. So here we go. Ready?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (Off mic.) (Laughter.)

MR. : Hey, no laughing. Keep going.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (Off mic.)

MR. : Black, you sure? OK, so what's happening here is that – what's happening with your conscious and unconscious during conflict. And what happens is that slows you down. This is basically a speed test. It's done often. So sometimes we have conscious beliefs or feelings and then we have unconscious beliefs or feelings and they conflict. And the mind goes – and they do this when they shift to race or gender, so they have a positive word and a black face.

And it's harder to identify those positive words when you see a black face because we have social stereotypes – not individual – social schemas that has negative associations with black and it causes themselves to slow down. Because they're social, all of us have them. Now in terms of race, whites have them at a much higher rate than blacks. The same is true in terms of gender. Men have more negative stereotypes at a higher level than women. But we all have them because they're social, they're not just individual.

So it means that we can't just solve these at the individual level. These unconscious associations are social and requires a social response. So I'm going to show you this. Some of you've seen this before, but I'll show it to you again. If we could have this clip.

(Video plays.)

MR. : OK. So a couple things. I take it by laughing, some of you didn't see the bear the first time? So let me tell you what happened. Basically you were primed. We're primed all the time. So you have 40 – you have 40 things you can notice consciously. And what the announcer basically said is, team in white, count. There's your 40. The bear is outside your 40, you don't notice him.

Now, some of you probably seen this before and probably saw the bear. My guess is if you saw the bear, because you've seen this before, you didn't do the counting. (Laughter.) So basically, you take your 40 and you can use it for some things and not other things. We're primed all the time. We're told what's important, what's not important to notice and what not to notice. And we also are given an evaluation of it. So read this right here and just remember it about Allen. We'll come back to Allen later.

So there are three ways of not knowing. One way of not knowing is we don't know something because it's beyond our count. You can't tell me how many neurons that fire in your brain, even if I ask you to think about it very hard. That's beyond our count.

There's certain things we don't know because they're not interesting to us. So if you drove to work on any given morning, the car that's behind you at the second stoplight, you don't know what color it is, OK? So on the way home you could say, I'm going to notice what color that car at the second stoplight. You just used some of your 40. You notice the car; you don't notice something else.

Then there's another kind of not knowing, where we don't know things because we don't want to know them. They're too threatening to us. We want to be racially fair, so when we have racial anxieties, even those that we could know, we don't want to know. It puts us in tension with ourselves. So those are three types of not knowing.

Now, Phil talked about this a little bit so I'm just going to mention it, and some of you who are – have been through some of the Kellogg trainings knows that there's a way in which – this is a test in terms of warmth and competency. And the important thing is the person that's in the far left corner, the despised out groups, don't show up as human in the brain. When we see someone in this despised group, they oftentimes don't show up as human.

They show up as gorillas. So a lot of black men show up as gorillas. Latinos oftentimes show up as insects. In the unconscious mind this is the association. They're not human. And so then we don't adopt the appropriate policies toward this group. This is the called – what I call the circle of human concern. And when someone's outside the circle, they're not extended human courtesy and human concern.

And this is what we're experiencing right now. When enough groups are pushed outside of the circle of human concern, the circle itself collapses and society no longer functions. We're no longer able to invest in public infrastructure and schools and other things. This is another – we're talking about that. We put them into what I call the nonpublic, nonprivate space. They don't have a public voice and they don't have some place they can retreat to and have basically individual freedom.

So this is Ben. Now remember Allen a little while ago? The question is, who do you like better – Ben or Allen? Any thoughts, quickly? OK. The vast majority of people like Allen better. The description of Allen and Ben is exactly the same. The difference is we start with Allen by saying Allen is intelligent, industrious, impulsive, critical, stubborn.

We start with Ben by saying Ben is envious, stubborn, critical impulsive, industrious and intelligent. The order matters in the sense you're primed by the first things you hear. And then the last things are not important, even though they're exactly the same thing. So how we – how things are represented to us actually matters.

I'm out of time, so I'm going to end by just saying, the fact that we have these deep, unconscious biases – and it's conflicted around race, they can be – we can be primed to be racially fair, we can be primed to be racially anxious – it doesn't make us a racist. Most of us have a conflict – 85 percent of us have a conflict. It makes us human. And if we're going to address it, we have to acknowledge that.

And we have to learn to talk to the unconscious. The unconscious doesn't like facts and figures. It doesn't like numbers. It doesn't like analysis. It likes metaphors; it likes stories. And sometimes we think – people talking to the unconscious are not very smart. I'll give you an example and I'll close with this. So take – some people say they don't trust President Obama because he had this fiery Christian minister named Minister Jeremiah Wright, who's a friend of mine – this fiery Christian minister. And then the same people would turn around and say they don't like Obama because he's a Muslim.

Now most Muslims I know don't have a fiery Christian minister. (Laughter.) But they – what they're really doing is talking to the unconscious. They're saying he's not one of us. They're saying he's not – (inaudible). They're not making a factual claim; they're making an emotional claim. And when we come back with factual refutation, we've missed the point. We're not talking to the unconscious. We're talking to the conscious and they're talking to the unconscious. And when there's a tension in large societies, the unconscious normally wins. So we have to become much more aware of the unconscious and learn how to talk to the unconscious. Thank you. (Applause.)

MS. HINOJOSA: All right. So one of the things that I – I've actually – before we throw it back into the audience – and we do have – now thankfully we have a couple of mikes. Those who are holding the mikes – (inaudible) – OK. So these are our two mic holders. If you have a question, raise your hand and we'll get one of the mic holders to come to you. So somebody right here in red has a question. And does somebody in the back have a question? And wait for

one second before you ask your question, ma'am. And I've been told to limit the questions to 20 seconds, and I will.

So there is a very conscious, I think – because the numbers make it irrefutable, what is happening in our country today – we are clearly becoming a more multicultural, multiracial, mixed country. That is the future. What about the very conscious awareness of that change, and that change then inspiring fear in front of the change?

And so there's an element of unconsciousness there, but there's also an element of consciousness which is saying – at this moment I'm in the world of being a non-Hispanic Anglo or whatever that term is – who is saying, I don't want to become a minority. I do not want to become a minority in the United States of America because I know how it goes for minorities. And I am fearful of losing that power. And that may be, again, conscious and unconscious.

And before we take your question, I just want to know if anybody wants to jump in, because that's kind of in the world. And by the way, I never use the term minority, ever, ever; never to my kids, never in the world, never in – I do not, because I do not see myself or my children or my family as a minority. (Applause.) Anybody?

MR. : I would just say that not all discrimination is unconscious. I mean, unconscious discrimination is an important phenomenon that we don't recognize, and it drives the behavior of people who even have good intentions and who don't – who aren't prejudiced on our traditional measures. But there is conscious and deliberate and calculated discrimination that still persists in our society where groups are trying to maximize their group interests.

MS. HINOJOSA: Right. OK. (Applause.)

Phillip?

MR. GOFF: Yeah. So it's funny that you should ask that. I was just at a presentation of one of the graduate students I work with – I'll give a shout-out to Felix Danbold (ph) – who just completed a nationally representative sample. Whites actually already believe that they are no longer the majority group. And it's that perception of loss that is driving some of the behavior.

But again, as John said, they're wrong. 2010 census, there's still 66 percent of the population is non-Latino white, right? So it is that perception of losing it. And the Onion, news source that it is – (laughter) – has a wonderful headline, right, saying whites fear being minorities in our own damn country. (Laughter.) So I put it to us that the issue of ownership and what it means to participate in American democracy is part of what we need to be challenging as we move forward (with this ?).

MS. HINOJOSA: Right. Right. (John ?).

MR. POWELL (?): So this is actually a very important point. And it's complicated in some interesting ways. But first of all, it's not just a U.S. phenomena. The – Robert Putnam, Jeffrey Sachs, others have noticed that maybe the greatest threat facing the world today is the

diversification and how people deal with it. And you see growing anxiety. In Europe you just saw – in France they just had an election where the far right party came in third place, essentially a neo-Nazi party, calling for an end in immigration.

So part of it is really this really complicated thing around identity. But it's not just that. It doesn't – it could be a source of strength and embracing or a force of deep anxiety.

And part of that depends on how it's framed. It's not just given. And we have history of that. So for example, if you think about the United States in the 1940s or '30s, Americans – white Americans didn't identify as white Americans; they identified as Italian-Americans, Polish-Americans, German-Americans. They had separate neighborhoods, had separate schools, had separate churches. They didn't like each other. And something changed. And we sort of moved to a place where their ethnic minority became less important, their racial identity became more important. So it's not given.

And so part of the way – part of thing that's happened is that yes, it is a threat to white identity, but that could be a new identity that is ushered in that's inclusive. We haven't really had that discussion. But you're really right about that.

MS. HINOJOSA: Right. So how many have heard about a term, the “creative class?”

Fascinating. Oh, a few. OK. Because that might be – that is – that is, in fact, the possibility, right, that we – and thank you, Reverend, for the charge of being – continuing in this work – that we all do that, whether in the media, where I'm placed, or whether in academia or whether in the grassroots.

We'll take your question now. And – 20 seconds.

Q: Good morning, Maria. This is Rita (sp).

MS. HINOJOSA: Oh, hi, Rita. Oh, hi Rita. Sorry.

Q: (Chuckles.) I want to talk about media reaffirmation of the stereotypes very briefly. The New York Times and the Associated Press consistently use the expression “illegal immigrants,” although most of us use the term “undocumented.” What efforts have any of the panelists taken to change this practice?

MS. HINOJOSA: Do you want to go –

MS. GODSIL: Sure. One of the reasons – and Maria mentioned this – that we in our study included the reference to proof of citizenship is because the two researchers I'm working with from the University of Washington who I should give absolute credit to, Matt Barreto and Ben Gonzalez, are engaged in a study in trying to understand the degree to which this question of who is a citizen and who is not and whether or not being a noncitizen is somehow magically linked to being Latino as opposed to Irish, is sort of – how deeply embedded has that become. And so again, that was the reason for that reference is to see whether the sort of conscious

primings of whether or not a person is Latino is a noncitizen, even though the person is asserting their citizenship, leads to a decrease in empathy.

And one of the study – there is a – there is a – there are an array of studies that are being done right now by Drew Westen and others about trying to figure out the language that will speak to our unconscious on this question, because there is actually some research to support the idea that actually the phrase “undocumented worker” doesn’t speak to our unconscious in a way that we would like it to, that it’s not a phrase that – again, it speaks (to unconscious ?) – it’s – describes someone who’s here, who’s working. So again, it speaks to me, but I guess I’m not our prime audience. No one really cares what I think. So the question is how do we develop a narrative, how do we develop language to bring within that circle of human concerns sort of everyone who’s here to address that question of, you know, sort of the pushing out instinct that clearly some have.

And just to add to the – to the earlier questions, there is a phenomena that is sort of in between implicit bias and explicit bias or just – or sort of conscious discrimination, and it’s in-group preference. So someone can have in-group preference without out-group animus. And that can lead to some of the same problematic behaviors, frankly, that explicit animus does, but it’s a different phenomena. And again, I think – I agree entirely with John that in-group preference is fairly natural – like, we could divide this room into the people, you know, sort on the left side of the room, the lefties and the righties, and we could all have, like, a – you know, kind of a tug of war, and we might want our team to win, but the lefties and the righties would all be part of a big in-group. So it’s how you define the scope of the group that makes this either an insidious dangerous cognitive set of behaviors or one that can work for us to have us all care and desire to help each other in positive ways.

MR. : So John made a reference previously to research showing the link between Latinos and insects. I’m doing some of that work. And I wish that I could say it made a difference, labeling “illegal” or “undocumented.” To echo what Rachel’s saying, both get quickly associated with insects so long as the face on it is brown. If you put a white face on it, that association goes away.

So I think we’re going to need to have new language for it, because in the same way that “liberal” became a bad word, so we all started calling ourselves “progressives” – right – (laughter) – people don’t distinguish between progressives and communists. So we’re going to need a new word, and we’re going to need to reframe it a little harder next time on that. And it’s the same – it seems to be the same with that language around folks who are coming in the country.

MS. HINOJOSA: So I find it very interesting, Rita (sp), that you would ask this question, because my column – I write a syndicated column, and this week it’s devoted to, you know, what is it about the term “illegal” that you don’t understand, knowing that Sonia Sotomayor is the first person in history to actually use the term “undocumented worker” in the actual (roles ?) of the Supreme Court, which is extraordinary, not that she wanted to draw attention to that.

The issue of diversity in the media, of who is in the room and making those decisions, is central, as you know. And the media is the most resistant to change. I will tell you that a very powerful person in the media – will remain nameless – actually said to me – when I was screening my Frontline documentary, which I urge you to watch, said, well, but they're here illegally anyway, so what does it matter how they are treated? And this is somebody who has a tremendous amount of influence.

I have been told to end. I'm kind of, like, in a state of shock myself. Consciously and unconsciously, I'm in a state of shock right now. (Laughter.) So I'm a little upset because I think we all have a lot to add. But I guess we can't. So I'm really sad, especially because I was feeling a little bit bad about continuing to bring up the issue of Latinos and undocumented and illegality because I have to – because we have created a safe space; I'm like, maybe they're not going to like me because I keep on bringing this up. But I think it is such a core for who we are as a country – for who we are as a country.

And so in my column, I said, you know, I didn't learn to not use the term “illegal immigrant” from a radical Latino professor from Berkeley. (Laughter.)

MR. POWELL: Why are you looking at me? (Laughter.)

MS. HINOJOSA: I didn't. I learned it from Elie Wiesel, who could be no more different than me, who survived the Holocaust and who stood with me in the bureau at CNN in New York when I asked him, with tears in my eyes, what do I do about this? And he said, there is no such thing as an illegal human being, not one. (Applause.) The Nazis declared – the Nazis declared the Jews to be illegal, and that's how the Holocaust started.

And we African-Americans in this room have been declared an illegal people, and gay and lesbian folks and transgender folks have been declared an illegal people, and Latino people are declared an illegal people. And it is the beauty of this that there is a little bit of progress, and frankly, this conference here in this beautiful city that gives us the hope, right, but that it is so oftentimes who are we seeing, recognize – I love somebody who said the individuization. Was it you, David, who said that? And that is so powerful.

So as you today in this city that used to be once considered just black and white, and now we know post-Katrina, when the workers were brought in here to rebuild this city, it is much more than that, to look and see all of them who are cleaning your rooms, who are serving your food, and know that they have children who are going to high school, who we want them to succeed, who are going to college – they are, in fact, our future.

So see the invisible. And thank you so much for having me. And I'm so sad that we can't continue. But thank you so much to Sterling and to Gail and to Kellogg for doing this. (Applause.) Thank you to our panelists. Thank you.

(Pause.)

MS. : Excuse me, you all. We're not done. Gail is going to give a little bit of a frame for the healing session. So if you could please take your seats, and we'll be wrapping up over the next five minutes.

MS. CHRISTOPHER: One thing is for sure: With Natalie (sp) at the podium, we will be on time today, right? (Chuckles.)

I cannot adequately capture my appreciation for the depth, the brilliance and the efficiency of this wonderful panel – (chuckles) – and so much for us to think about.

You noticed when you arrived that we gave you this big black bag with books in it, and some you thought, I don't want to carry these books. (Chuckles.) But they were books that we feel are critical to the depth of our understanding of the work before us. And one of the books was called "A General Theory of Love." And if you take a moment to read it – it'll take more than a moment – (laughs) – but if you take some time to read it, you're going to hear a lot about the unconscious and the implicit dynamics of not just the brain, but of our hearts and of our whole beings, our bodies, if you will, our essence, and how much our early experiences and our daily experiences prime us and program us to the quality of our relationships or the lack thereof. But ultimately this work is about our relationships, and our capacity to be in relationship with one another in positive, loving ways.

And I think that's a nice segue to the rest – or at least the next segment of our day. Part of why – and I apologize to the panel for having had to make this so tight. But we do have not only our healing session today, but at the end of the day, you know, we're going to be blessed with the opportunity to honor and appreciate one of our icons in the – in the movement and that's Harry Belafonte. So we really have to kind of move things in a – in a special way today in terms of a timely way. So I apologize if you don't feel like you don't have a lot of leisure.

You are going into the sessions most – I'd say half you have been in the healing sessions with – last year, with this segment we did today, which ended by emphasizing the importance of metaphor and story. It becomes that much more significant for us to become more skilled at that art of communication and sharing and understanding the diversity and the power of our story. And that's what we're going to be doing for the rest – or for the next segment of today.

You will be in groups. You have – we have 40 seasoned volunteer facilitators that are going to help to guide you through that process and at – we're going to ask you to embody, if you will, the spirit that you did last year, which is sharing from your heart and bringing people into your circle of compassion and understanding. And that's really what the next segment is about.

In order to save time, Natalie (sp) has asked me to remind you to please complete your blue – light blue evaluation forms before you move into the next section. We listen to your feedback, and we take it to help design these experiences as we build this community of practice.

I am reminded that, in the midst of all this intellectual challenge that we face, I believe, Reverend, that the balm in Gilead here is our capacity to love ourselves and to love one another,

to extend that love to others. So please take that with you into your healing session, and we will see you back in this room this afternoon.

Join me in thanking our panel one more time. (Applause.)

(END)