

SESSION SIX: LOOKING FORWARD: FORGING THE PATH, BUILDING THE MOVEMENT

LANI GUINIER: It's my pleasure to welcome you to the final roundtable of the day. I want to introduce Jennifer Gordon, who is the founder and former executive director of the Workplace Project in New York, a nationally-recognized grassroots worker center.

We also have with us Urvashi Vaid, an attorney and organizer who has worked in social justice organizations for the last two decades. As deputy director of the Governance and Civil Society Unit of the Ford Foundation, she works to strengthen organizing capacity and foster greater connectivity within the social justice sector of U.S. civil society.

And finally, we have Sofía Quintero, an activist, trainer, teacher, writer, speaker, and comedian who strives to apply her creative abilities in popular media to promote social justice. She is on the Board of Directors of many organizations, including We Interrupt This Message, the Advocacy Institute, and the Brecht Forum, where she teaches a course on the politics of hip-hop for youth.

SALLY KOHN (SYMPOSIUM ORGANIZER): What we want to do is have all our panelists speak for five minutes about what they saw as the key points or principles that came out of this day, as well as key questions that have gone unanswered. Then they'll make proposals for how we can work to address these questions in our future conversations and work.

JENNIFER GORDON: I was very excited to hear Eric Tang talking about alternative citizenship. After fifteen years of working with and organizing with undocumented immigrants, it's clear to me that we need an alternative concept of citizenship. But at some point, I started to get worried, particularly when somebody who works for a newspaper for people who live in projects in Chicago stood up and talked about how important it was—and he's right—that people whose lives are being affected by systemic problems have a voice in the solutions. He talked about how Harold Washington was moved to run for mayor by the words of these people. Voice is critically important; it's the critically important starting point. But I started to worry that we're going to start to think that voice alone is alternative citizenship. It's not enough.

The conversation we started today is the beginning of the conversation we need to have about how we can build from voice and culture to engagement with

power. Voice is a starting point but it's just a starting point. It gets us to where people can come together to talk about their problems. Voice doesn't mean you're going to have a fundamental critique—just because people are talking doesn't mean they're going to be critiquing society in a fundamental way. Even if they start critiquing society in a fundamental way, that doesn't mean the process they use to run an organization that they build from is going to be democratic; it doesn't mean that the organization is really going to draw from and grow into the community; it doesn't mean that what looks like participation is going to be real participation. And even if you have all these things—and it's hard to get all these things—there's still no guarantee you're going to be engaged in effective challenges to structural power. If we're going to be going anywhere with the idea of political race, we have to go from a starting point of building multiracial movements that are participatory and democratic internally.

How do you do that? That's the question. Here are a few thoughts on the answer. One of them Phil Thompson said earlier today—you have to have the resources. It's not just a matter of wishing it would happen. Effecting social change takes money, and when that money comes from sources that put strings on what you can do, or if there's a lot of competition for that money, or—although I've never had the pleasure or the difficulty of asking for money from them given that I work with undocumented immigrants—if the money comes from the government, there are limits on what you're able to achieve.

Secondly, you need to reconceptualize the role of lawyers and other professionals into support rather than leadership roles. And the third thing we really need is to look at the structures that bridge those gaps from voice to democracy to effective challenges to “power over,” because it's not going to happen by magic, even though some parts of the process feel magical.

There's a story in *The Miner's Canary* about how “power-with” can be expressed as a sandcastle competition where groups work together to come up with the most creative, most gorgeous sandcastle and in that process, build “power-with.”¹ What I'm saying is that in that process, the builders of homes in the sand are not going to end homelessness unless there's a lot of structural links between the building of the “power-with” and the frontal challenge to structures of power. And that's what's not happening currently; that's what is not getting the close attention and study that it needs. We need to turn voice into internal power, and to turn internal power into a challenge to external power, so that what we end up building is an alternative citizenship that poses a real challenge to the mainstream conception of citizenship. When we start to do that, we're really going to be doing the concept of political race justice.

URVASHI VAID: My comments are grouped in two sets of observations. First, I want to thank the organizers of this conference, and Gerald and Lani for

1. LANI GUINIER & GERALD TORRES, *THE MINER'S CANARY: ENLISTING RACE, RESISTING POWER, TRANSFORMING DEMOCRACY* 140–41 (2002).

the incredible intervention that this book represents. This is a major intervention in a series of stuck issues and into a very reactionary characterization of race with which we have been living. In a sense, you have written a new Operating System for which everybody in the room has to write the applications, the new Windows operating system and each of us has to write the applications to take it to the next level.

A second observation is that people today reminded me that there are multiple race projects actually happening at the same time. Building racial solidarities across Asian communities, for example, is one kind of race project that's happening; Native American to Indigenous race projects; Black solidarities within Black communities; projects within immigrant Black communities—Jamaicans to Africans to African Americans. There's are all sorts of race dynamics there. There's a Latino race project—Salvadorans, Cubans, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans in this country developing cross-racial solidarity or a sense of people as raced. Of course the missing race project—white identity as a race—still needs to be developed. Right now, it's at a very tentative and academic stage.

I also realized once again, listening throughout the day, about both the strengths and weaknesses of identities and identity politics. I spent most of my organizing life working in the gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered movement. For the last twenty-plus years, I've worked out of identity politics, and I'm completely at the place, and have been for many years, of realizing both enormous strengths and enormous limits of identity-based organizing. The strengths include the sense of belonging, the sense of inclusion, and a way of organizing, a way to be recognized, a way to assert a claim. Identity works really brilliantly in the American political system because it's effective interest group politics. Its weaknesses are that you never move beyond inclusion, the politics of recognition, the politics of visibility. It is hard to get to the larger question of what kind of society you are trying to create, larger questions of "Equality to what?" What are you seeking to become equal to in an unjust system? Many other weaknesses have been articulated in the book.

But this conversation about identity and race that we've had today didn't go deeply into some of these other obstacles to social justice movement building, and those include a lack of a shared definition of social justice: What does social justice include? How broad is it? Do all of us have shared ideas about what we mean when we say social justice? To me it means economic, racial and social justice. Is that the same for everybody? Another problem is the lack of a shared policy agenda that we can articulate. There certainly is a policy agenda that exists in think-tanks, in academic institutions, in the minds of people in this room and beyond, but the ability of an activist working in a neighborhood organizing project, to know what the best options are on charter schools, for example, that doesn't yet exist adequately enough. That translation, that dissemination of the knowledge is lacking. A third problem is that the infrastructure of progressive movements in this country is weak, weak, weak.

The ground for them is fertile, the activism is huge, but the capacity and connectivity across organizing strategies, organizing issues, is very weak.

So I feel like there are multiple levels of next steps. One is simply for funders to build the capacity of social justice infrastructure. What does that mean? It means building the capacity of groups that do community organizing. It means building the capacity of progressive media projects, so you can get a different voice out into the debate. It means building up the ability of people to mobilize electorally, as imperfect as that is. It means building basic infrastructure for social justice action. There are people organizing voters and doing incredibly important work in immigrant communities and communities of color all over this country.

I think the second set of strategies has to be around bridging. How do we bridge people who are working, who are progressive, in racial justice or GLBT work, with people who are progressive and are working on other issues? *The Miner's Canary* is a really important framework to help build that bridge.

Now I agree with the premise that in America, slavery and its legacies are the central paradigms that define race for all other people—white, immigrant, everybody. Therefore a political race project which is rooted in the experience of African Americans is essential as a way forward. To understand race in America requires us to understand the centrality of African American experience.

But I also said to Lani during the break that I think there will be a lot of criticism of this premise because people will feel that their histories are erased. “What about my specificity and location as an Indian immigrant or non-African American?” But I think what Lani and Gerald are trying to say is that it’s not about erasing those histories, those other political race projects, but identifying that there is a fundamental link between them and the African American racial experience in America.

Jennifer touched on a number of things so I won’t repeat what she said, but one of the biggest challenges we face is the lack of a clear platform around which to organize, unlike the right wing, which has forged a coalition around a clear agenda. They have created a very diverse coalition—ultra right-wingers, moderate right-wingers, libertarian right-wingers, all different gradations of the right—around an agenda which marries economic conservatism with a cultural conservatism, and they were able to come up with simple messages: “What do we believe in? We believe in smaller government, less taxes, and family values.” Coming up with our version of such an agenda is a key challenge for progressives.

We have difficulty articulating an economic message. That’s why the globalization movement is so important. On some occasions, it articulates an anti-capitalist message, but not from the old left perspective. At other times, it articulates a critique and a need for a socially responsible capitalism. In effect globalization says we need a different form of economic system that will respect

workers and produce global trade policy in a different way. A lot of people are trying to articulate a complicated analysis that will allow us to create a different, fairer, economic system. That is a very useful intervention because what identity politics has been missing is an economic analysis. We've run away from it, in every movement that I've been a part of. (Applause.)

SOFÍA QUINTERO: I feel compelled to start off by commending the colloquium organizers for scheduling this final discussion between the art and the spirits. (Laughter.)

I found many things exhilarating about today's conversation, but there's three things in particular that stand out to me, three things that I always seek in conversations like these and that are very often missing: One is the consistent challenge to the presumption of scarcity. I really appreciate that, and I hope that we continue to challenge that presumption. When shit hits the fan, and things start to get tight, we can fall back into those old patterns, so I hope we will continue to make clear that there is enough for everyone in our vision and our analysis, that the issue is the way it's being distributed. We also need to not allow those who would use economics and the scarcity argument to divide us, because that happens often.

I'm a socialist, but I also consider myself a race woman—I don't believe in privileging race over class, or class over race, but I really do appreciate the conversation about leading with race. It's extremely important, especially in these post-9/11 "We Are the World" times; it's a radical thing to do. This is a book coming at a very important, very historic moment. *The Miner's Canary* might be the treatise to get us started.

The third thing I was exhilarated to hear throughout the day was an appreciation of the fluidity of identity and power and status, and the ramifications of that fluidity. I actually would like us to have even deeper conversations about what that means, and how it impacts things. In our sound bite society, it's very easy to get caught up in rhetoric and to not be willing to embrace the complexities and the paradoxes that exist in our work because what we're challenging is also very complex and paradoxical.

So where would I like this conversation to continue? What would I like us to discuss more? I would really like us to talk not only about using race as a tool for carrying out our agenda for justice, but before we even get there, let's talk about using race as a tool for recruiting to the movement, because I don't know about y'all, but I'm tired. (Laughter.) And we need help. We need to swell the ranks of the movement if we're really going to make change. And as I said, I do believe that there is a role for race right now because it's radical, especially now.

I also would like us to have a deeper conversation about how we can lead with race without privileging race. We get caught up with that problem all the time, and it has defeated us in certain ways. I'm thinking particularly of how internalized oppression comes to play within organizations, whether they are

student organizations, artists' collectives, community organizing groups, or whatever. We've all been in organizations doing kick-ass work that end up being very oppressive. We get into these pissing matches about who's a bigger victim, and who's more entitled. It plays into the scarcity mentality. When things get very difficult, we fall back into those patterns.

One thing I was very happy to hear was the conversation about safety. I would like to extend that—not only do we need to talk about where we're safe, but we need to be more safe within our own organizations. We need to be able to check our own privileges, to call each other out. Different groups have different abilities to do that and some don't at all.

We need to talk about healing, because if you're in a disenfranchised community, we have a serious, serious need for healing. We need to have the personal transformations on which social transformation is going to be built, and we need to talk about the way different kinds of oppression fracture us and impact us and have a negative effect on our practical agenda. These are not luxuries to talk about. We need to have the space to have these conversations.

I'm fond of asking folks, "Let's say the revolution went down tomorrow, and we won. Do you think"—and usually I'm talking to a group of other people of color, but sometimes it is other groups that have been marginalized in some way—"do you think we'd turn around and do the same thing to white people that they've done to us all these years?" Usually the response is, "Oh no, because we know what that's like. We would never do that." But I don't think that's true. I'm an idealist, but I don't think that's true because we have to shed ourselves of the same things that we've been experiencing, we have to purge amongst ourselves the very same things that we have been fighting against all these years. So as we talk about how we use political race for our external projects, we also have to talk about making an internal project within our organizations and communities.

Now with that said, I feel compelled to answer the question someone asked about whether there is a role for white middle-class people in progressive movements for social change. Of course there is a role for white middle-class people—if they are willing to give up being white and middle class. If you are willing to give up white privilege, if you are willing to give up class privilege, we have a job for you. And that job is in your own community, challenging other white middle-class people around privilege and making them see how, in giving up their immediate privileges around race and class, they gain tenfold in humanity. Those are very hard conversations to have and we need to have safe spaces to have them. Only when we can have the politics of visibility recognition and solidarity can we begin to build beyond that.

The last thing I want to say, before we open this up for a conversation, is nobody is there yet. Getting there is a life-long process. Commit to that lifelong process. Sometimes you will relapse and you will fall back a few steps. But conversations like these are not luxuries. This is part of the work. I wish we

could have more conversations like this—we get so caught up in doing because the things that we’re facing are so immediate and so urgent, and sometimes these kinds of discussions and readings seem like luxuries. At the same time, I want us to recognize that we are all very privileged to be here because there are a lot of people that need to be in this room who are not here because they can not afford, not just economically but in many ways, to be in this room. Let us start moving forward, and let’s start talking about how we broaden this conversation. (Applause.)

PROFESSOR GUINIER: I would like to open this up to comments from the audience and also from other panelists who were speaking earlier in the day.

Q: I’m from the Progressive Media Project. I was wondering how September 11 Affects the political project discussed in your book, especially with regard to the Arab American community. I would like to have seen more Arab American panelists address this project and generally what impacts September 11 has had on this.

Q: I’ve done work in socially responsible capitalism. I have a question and a brief comment. We know in this country now that there is a greater and greater concentration of wealth in fewer and fewer hands. And often the issue is not strictly capitalism, the issue is that we have an oligarchy, and we witness this every day. What do you perceive as socially responsible capitalism?

MS. VAID: That is a great question, and I think that to me it means universal health care; it means fair wages for work; it means unionized environments without restrictions for union organizing; it means campaign finance reform; it means taxes which go to provide services that we all benefit from, whether its school loans, public education, community colleges, public universities, and on and on. The agenda to me for a society in which you have an economic system that is socially responsible would be many of the things that progressives pursue and don’t necessarily label as economic justice issues.

Q: I asked this question earlier, but my question wasn’t answered. How do you think the current state of the nation will influence our representative government around nationalism and social justice issues being that we are already a multiracial society? What can we do to inspire our government representatives to talk or do something about the ideals we’re here for?

MS. VAID: I think this ties a little into the post-9/11 question. Government representatives are influenced by the issues people have been raising in this room through the organizing and activism of the different groups—for example, people who have been working on welfare reform. The so-called “Welfare

Reform Bill” is up for reauthorization this year, and there is a large movement of welfare rights activists and people affected by the last round organizing to go to Washington. They’ve been going to Washington, they’ve been doing work at the state legislative level. Our elected officials are hearing about these issue of social justice and racial justice through the activism of people working though organizations.

PROFESSOR GUINIER: I have a tentative answer, which goes back to 1964. Martin Luther King Jr. and Andy Young met with Lyndon Johnson in December of that year, right after Dr. King returned from Oslo, where he had just been presented with the Noble Peace Prize. King broached the subject of a voter rights bill, but King’s pleas fell on deaf ears. President Johnson spent the entire session talking about what he was already doing, not recognizing the possibility that more needed to be done. After all, Congress had just passed the 1964 Civil Rights Act. King again met with President Johnson to discuss voting rights legislation early the next year. But it was not King’s visits to Washington or his meetings with Justice Department officials that finally convinced President Johnson to introduce voting rights legislation.

Instead, King and Andy Young went back to Selma, Alabama, where there were people already in motion challenging the structure of voting disenfranchisement at the local level. These people had been building a movement for years, and King and Young joined that movement. Those people were people of enormous courage—they put their lives on the line. Even after one of them, Jimmy Lee Jackson, a twenty-six-year-old pulp wood cutter, was killed by Alabama state troopers, there was still not a clear sense of what they could do to get President Johnson’s “attention.” A number of the local activists wanted to take Jimmy Lee Jackson’s body and carry it physically down to Montgomery, Alabama, and place the coffin on the foot of the capital steps to let the world know what was happening under the watchful gaze of George Wallace, then Governor of Alabama. But cooler heads prevailed. They said, “Bury Jimmy Lee Jackson, and we will march from Selma to Montgomery.” And march they did, in what became known as Bloody Sunday.

Martin Luther King Jr. wasn’t even there. This was a group of local activists who were courageous enough to go forward, to march to protest the state of permanent disenfranchisement and exclusion in terms of traditional citizenship, not even this alternative citizenship that Jennifer and others are trying to imagine. The state troopers fired on them with tear gas and went after them with billy clubs and it was all filmed. In some ways, the movement was able to enlist the national media as unpaid volunteers of the movement because they created activities that the media then covered. The media portrayed that scene on the bridge—they interrupted “Judgment at Nuremburg,” which was being playing on ABC Sunday Night Movies, to show the war that was happening right here in Alabama.

The post script is that that was early in March. On August 6, 1965, Lyndon Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act, and when he signed that bill, he turned around and looked at Martin Luther King Jr. and said, "You passed this bill." And he was talking about the collective "you" on that bridge, marching from Selma to Montgomery. The dramatic highpoint as well as the turning point of the Selma campaign for national voting rights legislation came when ordinary people did extraordinary things. (Applause.)

Q: I want to thank you for including undocumented immigrants in our country as part of this movement that we are trying to affect and push forward. How would you advise a young person who is trying to get to college to acquire that voice through these movements? How would you advise these students to get there if they don't have the paperwork, they don't have federal money to achieve a degree in higher education?

MS. GORDON: I think there's one real hard concrete wall, which you just described, and there is no advice individually around the wall, there is only advice collectively around the wall—if enough people organize to say that is not an acceptable barrier, you can take it down. But that's no answer to the one person who wants to know how to go to college.

I wish I had some magic advice beyond organize, organize, organize. I think that the restrictions on education are just criminal. Some undocumented kids were raised here, many since the age of two or earlier. You deport them back to El Salvador, yet they've never in conscious memory been in El Salvador.

PROFESSOR GUINIER: There are already groups on campuses organizing around these issues, and I would suggest that you organize the young people that you are working with and have them meet with some of these groups already on campuses. I think their biggest allies are some young people of color and low-income people who were born and raised in the United States who are fighting to go to college.

MS. GORDON: I was talking to Al Cortez at lunch, and he was talking about the 1982 *Plyler v. Doe* case, which held that Texas could not deny undocumented children a public education.² He talked about being in Texas in 1982 and knowing that those children were going to need to go to college, that a new challenge would be required. Many advocates have worked from then until now on that question and they still have not found the solution. But they are looking at what kind of organizing, what kind of legal strategies, what kind of changes in the public dialogue are going to work. Part of the reason our answers are vague is that in each state the response is particular to the situation. But the global

2. 457 U.S. 202 (1982).

answer is that there's a whole bunch of strategies, and you throw everything at the problem and you hope that before long, this is over.

PROFESSOR GUINIER: I think what Jennifer said when she talked about the concrete wall is really important—you've got to organize with other people who will link their fates and tear down that wall. It is not about getting individuals over the wall or through the wall or around the wall. You've got to tear down that wall metaphorically by challenging its foundational assumptions.

Q: I have a very specific question for Sofia. As I understand it, the theme of this conference is political race—to see the individual and their heritage as a person. Yet your words were for whites to not just give up privilege but their whiteness. If the theme is not to categorize by race, are you not defining them by their generalized race?

MS. QUINTERO: Whiteness is a political race. It is a race of privilege. If we are talking about building a multiracial movement for social justice, there have to be whites at the table; however, they have to be willing to give up the privileges that are endowed to them for no other reason than the fact that they're white.

PROFESSOR GUINIER: I am in a position of not exactly agreeing with either of you. One of the problems with talking about race is that we—all of us—share a very, very conventional notion of race as primarily about skin color. Gerald Torres and I are trying to disrupt that. So I disagree with Sofia that whiteness is necessarily a political race in the way Gerald and I use that term. Indeed, some working-class and poor whites are “raced black” or raced as “losers” and are excluded or disadvantaged as a result. These whites are in a dual racial position. On the one hand they are encouraged to believe they enjoy the privileges associated with being white but they also often are excluded from access to public resources along with middle-class and poor blacks. Their whiteness is visible but their exclusion is often invisible. Conventional uses of the idea of race do not recognize this dual status.

As a result, when assessing things like access to higher education, we don't tend to notice how poor and working-class whites are not being admitted. We don't notice because we lump them together with other whites who are doing just fine. And no one seems to notice, as Gerald said in connection with the Texas Ten Percent Plan, that 75% of the freshman slots at U.T. Austin were monopolized by affluent whites from 10% of the state's high schools. Only 150 high schools (out of 1500 in the state) were dominating the admission process at this publicly-funded university. This is unfair. It is unfair because it excludes people of color who do not attend the 150 primarily suburban or private schools. But it is also unfair because it excludes poor whites from rural West Texas

counties. It is unfair because access to the flagship schools represents access to future leadership positions in the state. It is unfair because access to the flagship schools is a state resource that should be distributed to people throughout the state and not just people in the suburbs. Noticing the way this resource was distributed came as a result of a phenomenon we call political race. The political race project helped people see how conventional uses of race obscured the ways in which people were in fact socially linked through patterns of distribution of educational resources. It is race functioning as a political and not just a moral or a fixed, single category.

On the other hand, I also disagree with the questioner that political race is purely or mainly about seeing people in terms of their individuality per se. It is true enough that people are individuals and any collective action must recognize dissent and provide room for dissension. People should be free to choose their own identity. We should respect people for who they tell us they are. Individual autonomy is crucial. And political race—as a process—does not coerce people into identifying with others. It is a dynamic, voluntary, and interactive process. But—and this is an important proviso—political race for us means mobilizing people based on what people are willing to *do*, not simply based on who they are or think they are. Identity is not politics; it is merely the point from which collective action proceeds. We have criticized identity politics to the extent that it prevents mobilization for change.

Identity is not irrelevant, however. After all, it was the black and Latino professors, activists, and legislators who first mobilized to challenge the test-based admissions processes at the flagship universities. They did the research; they designed the Ten Percent Plan. They needed allies to pass the plan; they got that support from the rural white and conservative legislators once those legislators realized their constituents would also benefit. But the crucial energy for initially developing the Plan came from blacks and Latinos who started with race as a diagnostic and motivational tool. Race was an important point of departure because it was the perception of exclusion around race that mobilized the initial efforts.

Political race tries to encourage people to notice injustice as it collects or converges around people of color. Political race as a project urges us to act collectively to remedy that injustice, which we notice because it directly and perhaps initially seems to affect people of color, and through that effect, becomes visible. But political race is also about finding ways for people to act collectively to remedy the ways that injustice disadvantages working-class and poor whites too. Thus the Texas Ten Percent Plan changed the way U.T. admitted *all* its applicants throughout the state.

This project is trying to take conventional notions of race and use them as an organizing tool to both diagnose larger problems and mobilize communities that have been racialized by power in the society. We are not trying to tell people how they must identify in terms of conventional ideas of race. What we are

saying is that however they identify, there is also a much more dynamic and interactive way that race functions as a meeting place for new kinds of coalitions because race not only tracks power, it helps us map power. Even as we try to make that move, people are still stuck in conventional ideas of race though. That makes it hard. But this is a book that asks hard questions; it does not provide all the answers. As Urvashi Vaid said, political race is like a computer operating system. It is up to those of you in the audience to provide the “software applications.” Nevertheless, a provisional answer emerges when some white folks link their fate with people who have been racialized in this society. Those folks begin to realize how the miners’ fate is linked to that of the canary. When this happens, the miners finally understand the ways in which their future rests with a shared vision not just of politics, but of fundamental transformation.

So it is not about giving up a racial identity or giving up a religious identity—people should be able to celebrate their culture, their religion. We are summoning people to act differently, not to become something that they’re not, but to act differently in different coalitions, to make different assumptions about who should lead and about who is in charge. Thank you all very much. (Applause.)

MS. KOHN: We just some final thanks and closing remarks to do. It has been a long day. But the road that this colloquium has paved promises to be even longer. On this path to social justice, we must apply ourselves as rigorously in action as we have today in thought. The models and ideals generated in our discussions must become more than words, more than ideas that have been contained within our hallowed walls and our sacred texts. We have to mold them into solid bricks, foundations not only for our path to social justice but for the paths of others.

When we planned this colloquium, the idea of trying to reconceptualize race and power within an institution that so often seems to reinforce our traditional notions of race and power seemed really weird, if not possibly self-destructive. Within the context of hierarchy and privilege that binds the law, we feared that certain voices would be ignored if not altogether not present. So we tried a radical experiment of bringing a range of panelists and performers and artists and activists and academics to engage in this conversation. But it doesn’t take much to tell that even still, some perspectives were left behind. The challenge of building a movement that includes everyone is the challenge that we began to engage in here today, but there is still much more success to be had. We’ve taken a step toward multiracial movement building. We must join with others, continuing to forge our path with thought and with action and together, walk the road to justice. Thanks.