



**Portland
City Auditor**

Archives & Records Management

City of Portland Oral History Program

Police Accountability and the Independent Police Review Oral History

Rev. Dr. Leroy Haynes
Transcript
2023

CONTENT WARNING: This interview discusses sensitive subjects including police violence and death. Statements made in this interview are the recollections and views of the interviewee, not the City of Portland Archives.

City of Portland Oral History Program

Reverend Dr. LeRoy Haynes, Jr. Oral History Transcript

Interviewee: Reverend Dr. LeRoy Haynes, Jr.

Interviewer: Morgen Young

Date: April 27, 2023

Location: City of Portland Archives and Records Center, Portland, Oregon

Transcribed by: Teresa Bergen

Morgen Young: My name is Morgen Young. I'm with Devin Busby. We are interviewing Reverend Dr. LeRoy Haynes, Jr. for the City of Portland Oral History Program. It is April 27, 2023. And we are in the Portland Archives and Record Center in downtown Portland. Thanks for being with us this afternoon.

LeRoy Haynes, Jr.: I'm happy to come and participate. I am a historian myself for my trade and graduate school. And so, it's something I believe in. Yeah.

MY: Wonderful. I want you to start with telling me about what first brought you to Portland. You're not from here originally, I believe?

LH: No. I'm a native Texan. I'm from southeast Texas, a city called Beaumont, Texas. And where I grew up with, southeast Texas, most of the slave population in Texas was in that particular area. Plus, it was a deeply Mississippi segregated city. So, from my childhood on up I have been battling racism and violence from White supremacy. In my early years of my life, at the age of thirteen, I joined the Southern Christian Leadership Conference under the director Dr. Martin Luther King. We had an affiliate organization that my pastor was head of the organization, William B. Oliver, III. So, he would take me on demonstrations and we would also participate in the desegregation of restaurants and other public facilities in Beaumont, Texas. We would get arrested every other weekend. So, we would stay in jail Friday and Saturday. Sunday, we bonded out. And because education was so important to our parents, we had to go to school on Monday, okay. But we were able to break down the walls of segregation. And Beaumont has, what happened in the, throughout the South.

And when on to college in Austin, Texas, in a joint program at Huston-Tillotson, a historical Black college and the University of Texas was just desegregating at the time. And joined SNCC, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, under the leadership of John Lewis, Congressman Lewis later on and Stokely Carmichael, you know.

MY: Incredible things that you got involved in at such a young age.

LH: Yeah. Yes. Mm hmm.

MY: And so how did you find yourself entering the ministry and then coming to Oregon?

LH: I actually got my call into the ministry. I was heading, SNCC had, 1968, SNCC had a merger with the Black Panther Party. Stokely Carmichael became prime minister of the party, and H. Rap Brown became minister of defense. The merger didn't last too long. But I stayed on in the Black Panther Party and organized throughout the state of Texas for the Black Panther Party. With the supervision of Geronimo Pratt, who was a supervisor on the central committee of the national Black Panther Party. And it was all of that that I got my call to the ministry and went on from undergraduate school to seminary.

MY: About what year did you move to Portland?

LH: I've been in Portland now some twenty-five years, okay? I'm part of the Methodist Church, the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church. I'm a senior pastor out on Temple CME Church in Northeast Portland. But I'm also the regional superintendent over Oregon, Washington, and the state of Alaska. So, I cover three states.

MY: What was it like when you moved to the Northwest?

LH: It was culture shock, okay? Being deeply Southern in the Deep South, which is more of a bible tradition type of college, even the movement was more traditional and Southern style cultural type of thing like that. It was an adjustment of where you're in a kind of region, the Northwest, completely where it's not too friendly to institutional churches. And so, to be able to make that adjustment took a little while, though. Maybe a year or two.

MY: And did you continue your, you continued your ministry and your social justice work when you came to Oregon?

LH: Oh, yeah. Yeah. It's a calling on me, the ministry first and then the, sometime you have a calling onto social justice, like Dr. King and so many others. I consider that part of my holistic concept of ministry is social justice to help transform the injustices that is this, not only with Black people, but people of all colors and people that are oppressed and exploited everywhere. Yeah.

MY: Talk to me a little bit about what the relationship was like between Portland police and community members when you first arrived.

LH: I was surprised that the, I didn't know too much about the history of Portland. I didn't know that it was a period of segregation just as the South was segregated. But the antagonism and the history between the Black community and the Portland Police Bureau was very similar to what it was when I lived in Beaumont, Texas and the Deep South. So, you know, it was not too much of a change in that aspect, you know.

MY: I noticed that as a historian. I moved here from South Carolina. And you could see segregation—

LH: Oh, yes.

MY: —in the neighborhoods, in the architecture. Talk to me about, if you were familiar at all with the Independent Police Review as a division within the city.

LH: I immediately got engaged in the city when I first got here. As a pastor, I took on a case of a killing by a White supremacist in the downtown area of Portland. And helped organize a rally on the steps of the federal court there in reference to the district attorney had not picked up the case. He was, had released the White supremacist. And we had a rally questioning whether Black blood was less than White blood. And he reviewed the case afterwards and decided to indict the White supremacist. That was, I believe, around 1997, 1998, up in that area.

MY: So that would have been close to when you first arrived. Pretty early on?

LH: Yes. Yeah. So, I jumped right into it.

MY: Yeah. And how, who were some of the folks you were working with who had already been in Portland?

LH: Primarily it was people like Bishop A. A. Wells of Emmanuel Pentecostal Church, who is the former president of the Albina Ministerial Alliance. And then there were an important organizing group that was based with the Catholic Church called POP and they were doing a lot of community organizing at the same time. But it was primarily through the Albina Ministerial Alliance, which I later became president of. And the Portland Organizing Committee.

MY: So, talk to me a little bit about the Albina Ministerial Alliance.

LH: Well, Albina Ministerial Alliance is presently seventy-five years old. It's one of the oldest ministerial alliances in the city of Portland. Was birthed in those times of coming out of segregation and developed a kind of a agenda of religious teaching, education, and social justice advocacy, you know. And so, when, and the African American community is a little different than a White community. People look for their pastors to be advocates in the community. When injustice takes place, the first place, even sometimes more than NAACP, people call on their pastors to engage the injustices. And that is part of the historical tradition that historically. See, you'd hear [Abraham] Lincoln talk about the Black church, predominantly Black church, and E. Franklin Frazier, the great sociologist, also written much about it as well as Dr. Benjamin Mays. But this was the key area even in what we call the invisible church during the time of slavery. And all the way after the Civil War to the times of Reconstruction. And in fact, many of the legislators in Congress, there were some eleven congressmen, two Black senators. A good half of them were pastors that emerged in the Reconstruction period. And then from the time of the founding of the NAACP on into the modern-day civil rights movement that we talk about, the Montgomery Improvement Association, that later became, in 1955 the Southern Christian Leadership Conference that was organized in New Orleans, Louisiana. So that emerged what we call the modern-day civil rights movement. So that's part of the rich prophetic tradition that we see. And historians say that the predominantly Black church continued to carry on in contrast to the predominantly White church.

MY: There's also the Albina Ministerial Alliance Coalition for Justice and Police Reform.

LH: Yes.

MY: So, talk to me a bit about that.

LH: Well, that started around 2008 when the Kendra James [case] took place. A young Black woman was shot by the Portland police officers. And it's out of that case that we began to organize. Bishop A. A. Wells at Emmanuel Pentecostal Church was president of AME during that time. And we began to realize that we needed a broader base than just ministers. And so, we began to speak in terms of putting together a coalition. And being an SELC organizer and a SNCC organizer, I automatically was trained in what to do, how to go into a city and organize a city and organize a coalition. So, I was pivotal in the organization increasing. So, we began to bring about Urban League and NAACP, Copwatch, Women Voters League, the ACLU, and many White community activists and put them together. And about twenty-five organizations are now with many just community activists that put together the coalition. And so, we were able to have a broader impact on the City of Portland. It was not just the Black community speaking, but it was a broad-based coalition of organizations that were active in social justice.

MY: And how, what was it like working with the City? Or was the City receptive to this coalition and what—

LH: Well, yes and no. It was yes and no. Yes, because many of the former leaders of the Albina Minister Alliance had previous relationships with City Council people and other people. And of course, you know, when it comes for elections and everything, the first place that they go in the Black community is to the church. Okay, they help get elected. Okay. So that were relationships that had developed. But that was the yes part.

The no part is that they had not been challenged on that massive scale level before, you know. Yes, there had been some pickets and some demonstrations. But we were able to organize as a, use the training that I had in the movement to help organize and strategize for a more effective coalition of doing, like in the Kendra James march in 2008. Well, 5,000 people were brought together to march on that. And one time one of the biggest earliest marches in the city of Portland, yeah, you know. And we began to learn how to leverage. And then we also did our own investigation of the case. While the police detectives were investigating, we were also investigating, talking to witnesses and other things. And so, we were able to pull together and show different contradictions between the script that the accident report that the police filed compared to the information that we have and be able to point out contradiction.

It's interesting that one of the things in that case that a lot of policy changes came out of that like in terms of how do you encounter a person in a moving car. Do you stand in front of the car and shoot through the window, you know, putting yourself in jeopardy in that type of situation? We began to, one of the things realize that sometime the police officers had two weeks to get their story together, with their lies. And then the morning news has had, along with other people, reported that the officers that were involved in the case had met at Applebee's. They were so carefree they met at Applebee's and put their stories together what to say. So out of that came other policies and corrections in that process of, I think that was one of the pivotal cases that really helped put pressure on the city.

There were other cases that were key. One of those cases was the Aaron Campbell case, which Aaron Campbell was shot by a police sniper in the back while he was giving up with his hands in the back of his neck. And that was a pivotal case that rocked this city.

And James Chasse case, a White brother that was beaten to death by the police officers on the streets of Portland. That case. Those were some key cases that set in motion the police accountability movement and the coalition movement that began to intensify.

MY: Was there a protest organized after the murder of Aaron Campbell as well?

LH: Oh, certainly. Yeah. That was 10,000 people. Not only was it protest, that was a series of protests that took place.

MY: I've mentioned this to other people that it's easy to forget pre-2020, because it seems like—

LH: Yeah. It's so far away.

MY: Everyone has now cameras on their cellphones that they can record.

LH: But you didn't have that back then.

MY: Right. Exactly. And to organize something like that to gather the evidence.

LH: Yeah, yeah, yeah. It took a skill, organizing. And that's one of the things I can say about SNCC. When John Lewis and Farmer and others and Stokely, we were trained to go into a Southern town or city with two people and organize, help this city to organize what we called our ten-ten-ten program, where you recruit ten people and you train them in organize. Send them out to recruit ten more people, train them and organize. And then send them out to recruit ten more. And then you have a cadre of thirty people. And with a cadres of thirty people, SNCC always believed we could effectively organize in a town or city, even where the Klan was. Yeah.

MY: Well talk to me a little bit about the actions that led to the US Department of Justice coming to town.

LH: Well, yes. That was a, it was a buildup, you see. And you're very correct that a lot of people, even in the Black alliance movement, they really don't have the history. They think that all of this just started with them, the George Floyd thing. But there was a lot of work, a lot of foundation, a lot of sacrifice and organizing that took place out there. Those series of cases that took place, and particularly the Aaron Campbell case and then James Chasse case that hit close by, we decided that we need to somehow impact a more national organization and leverage to impact Portland, you know, that it was going to take some other means.

And then we decided to use the legal leveraging. You see, one of the things people don't understand about this civil rights movement is there was never just marches, you know. There was economic boycott. That's what the Montgomery, it was always, we were always in court, in federal court or what, following suits or things. And so, you had the mobilization and organizing of people. But you also had legal action that was going on parallel to that. And you had also economic boycotts and other things going on.

And so, we decided that somehow, we were going to bring the Justice Department in. And so, we had enough information with these. There was a series of shootings that took place in Portland and particular persons that were mentally stressed. And they were back-to-back, back-to-back, a series of shootings that took place. And out of that we decided to invite the, get the two senators in Oregon to co-sponsor a letter to invite the Department of Justice to come in. Mayor

[Sam] Adams, at first he was kind of leery about that. Then he got on board along with [Dan] Saltzman. Because during that period of time, Mayor Adams had allowed Saltzman to be the commissioner over the police department. And Saltzman was also a supporter of that. They thought it was going to be just a regular investigation on a controversial issue. And the FBI comes in and investigate. And then they never release anything, because they keep whatever they have, you know. And so, they thought it was going to be.

But the difference, the distinguishing difference, we did not only ask for a federal investigation, but we asked for an audit. See, people don't understand the difference from an investigation and an audit. An audit mean that you investigate every component of the police department from recruitment to investigation to training to policy and to what, all in all, to compliance. And how do you, and terms, discipline, you know. And so, the audit was the key right there.

And so, when we asked for the audit, with the support of the senators and the support of Saltzman, they came in and investigated. Now we originally brought them in to investigate the cases on the base of racial injustice, okay. But they saw a pattern that was stronger with the mentally ill or with persons with mental illness. And they felt with the evidence, the amount of evidence that they could really push the issue. And so, the federal Department of Justice, not the state, but the federal Department of Justice came in, did the audit. And they came back with the statement that the Portland Police Bureau had used unnecessary and excessive force, both in terms of arresting and using deadly force with the mentally ill persons, whether they were Black or White. Most of those at the time were Black.

And so, this set-in motion, they filed that in the federal court. And Judge Michael Simon, the Honorable Judge Michael Simon ended up being placed over the case. And that set in motion this suit. And the City really didn't know what they were getting into with that suit. Because what it is, once you open that door with the federal government, it's a continual process.

Now we did something different than most cities. Most cities have what is called a federal decree. We ended up doing a settlement agreement. The decree is where the federal judge would appoint a monitor to whatever the findings are, to go on and correct the findings. And the city and the police department has to present a proposal of how they going to correct the issue.

Ours was a settlement agreement. Okay, I mean that the City complied immediately and said they would rather be on a settlement agreement than a decree. In other words, like a suit or something like that. We will work together with the Department of Justice and with the union. The union didn't come in until later, the police union. They came in.

And then something interesting happened there. For the first time, and it will be written in legal constitutional law classes in the future, we were not only given an amicus curiae; we were given enhanced amicus curiae. That mean that every day that the parties participated in, we had to participate in. And so, we were able to set into motion what things that you just usually file an amicus brief and then the parties take over. But we were engaged at every level.

And later, MHA, Mental Health Association, came in. But that was much later in that. And so, the former supreme court justice, I'm trying to think of his name, Hispanic judge, he was appointed to help mediate us into the settlement agreement. And it was back and forth, back and forth, yes and no. And it took some time. It took some time until we end with something that each of us, even the amicus had to compromise on. And we came up with an agreement. And that agreement eventually changed several different times, you know, over the period of time. Because the City began to realize what they were onto. And they were, decided several times they wanted to take Judge Michael Simon out of the picture because they felt he was too, maybe, sensitive and compassionate to the community on what was taking place. And so they were filing an appeal with this circuit court. And I believe it's the Ninth Circuit Court in California.

But when it got time, once you file that appeal, the way the jurisprudence work, you have to have a mediation process. And so, they would always end up backing out of going forward with the appeal. And then we'd end up doing some mediation. And the City did that twice. That's why I say yes, they were on board, and then no, they were not. So, they were constantly trying to get out of the settlement agreement during that period of time, you know. They began to realize on this that this thing is for real. And that it's going to require some transformation within the Police Bureau.

MY: Do you recall some details of what the community wanted?

LH: Well, the community wanted, and we have forums and stuff like that. They wanted also in terms of a special grand jury to be called in controversial police cases. And that a judge or DA be appointed outside of the county to handle those case. We wanted also to change the state statute giving generality to if I felt my life threatened, that's the usual thing that the police always say to get from out under an unjust shooting. And we also felt that the grand jury transcripts should be released. Because we never did fully trust the DA. Because there still today in Portland there has never been an indictment of a police officer for an unjust shooting, of either a person of color or a mentally ill person. So, those were some of them.

And then the chief one, we wanted an independent police review oversight committee that had the power to compel testimony. And to compel, that was key now. To compel testimony and to recommend discipline of the officer. We just got that with the 80 percent referendum, 82 percent of voters with the independent review board. So that was the key. We knew that it had to go beyond the DA. Even if you had a good DA. And it had to go beyond the grand jury. And so, and the issue right now we were able to kind of jump in a little bit. We were able to get the ballot measure passed, Measure 114, I believe that it was. And also get the state legislature to have more flexibility in its case in terms of giving the authority of the independent oversight committee to compel testimony and then also to investigate officers.

And the problem we had with the fine person, Mary Jo and the independent audit, is that they could not investigate police shootings until two years after they have happened. Two years after it had happened, could they only investigate. Well, you know, there's not too much you can do in that process. So, we knew that the key was it has to be an immediate process of an investigation and determination of, did the officer break the policy and was he supported in using a firearm or using excessive force. Those sort of things were critically important and especially after the cases that we have dealt with and seen so much abuse.

And still an item we continue to work on is the arbitration system. Which is a failure here. And this idea of the mayor or the City Council the right to fire an officer, okay. You know. And so, because the arbitration usually put officers back on the force itself in terms of stuff of sexual harassment and things of domestic violence and those kind of cases. But when it comes down to using excessive force against communities of color, the mentally ill, they're usually put back on the force, you know. Even if the mayor and the council fire them or the chief of police fire them in that process. And so that's one of the keys why the oversight committee is critically important, even though it's not going to be a panacea. Because you still have to deal with the culture of the blue. It's a culture that will cover up for each other. It's a culture that splits the community, them against us. And so, until we find strategic programs to transform that culture, we're going to still have issues that develop between the community, and we realize that most of this is between the community of colors as well as in terms, the mentally ill community, you know.

MY: I want to talk a bit about the new system and the ballot measure.

LH: Yeah.

MY: But first I want to get a better understanding if the Independent Police Review Division, which was under the City Auditor's Office, if their staff did direct outreach to Albina Ministerial Alliance, to the coalition, to you individually, which would have been through Mary-Beth Baptista or Constantin Severe. Did you have any type of working relationship?

LH: Well, we had working relationships that were on a formal level. And then some of the investigators were friends of pastors or were members of different churches in the community. But you have to go beyond the personal dynamics when you're dealing with systemic issues, you know. And the systemic issue that IPR didn't have the power, even the auditor had to have a police ranking officer in the room with her before she could ask what the person under the investigation questions. And the officer did not have to answer the questions if there was not a ranking officer there. As well as the whole two-year process of investigating. So, it was a systemic issue. I think she was a good auditor, you know, but she didn't have any power that was needed to help transform the system.

MY: So, talk me through the work to get this ballot measure in front of voters to establish what's now the Police Accountability Commission.

LH: Grassroots organizing. Grassroots. Not only me, but Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty. A lot of people don't know her history. She came out of AMAC coalition. Okay, and so she was one of the activists. In fact, she was on the executive steering committee of AMAC before she ran for City Council. Once she became a political leader, we asked her to resign from the AMAC, okay. And so, she was an outstanding organizer herself. But you had other organizers that were there. And everybody was working from their particular base in the community. But you had also the factor at national cases that were creating awareness at this time. Beginning before, there was leading up to the woke movement and the Black Lives [Matter], that was building over a historical process. People don't always understand that things don't just evolve instantly. There's usually a historical evolution of things that have been building up. Same thing in Montgomery, you know. There were things that were building up with Emmett Till in 1954 before Rosa Parks sat down, you know. The Scottsboro cases, you know, the boys in Scottsboro. And these things evolve until you get what we call down here that historical moment where things, the history makes a shift in that. And so, the buildup was evolving in that process before the woke movement became national. Before the Black Lives. Because the national cases begin to hit one after another, you know, in that process. And that's just evolved.

And then Portland, you know, I've been in the movement all my life. And it even started with what was happening. And the White community of getting woke putting the dots together. And when I would see elderly Whites in the Southwest and they, East Portland as well as Northeast Portland, on the corners of streets with their own signs, and began to take its own initiative in that process, you know. And support. So, it was what we called a movement that had emerged at that time. As a historical moment that takes place in history sometime and makes that transformation. It's not going to stay there, because there's always a counter movement to the movement, just like there was a counter movement to the civil rights movement that took place. Same thing happened with the Black Lives movement and the woke movement, you know. So, you have to move legislation and stuff through that period of time quickly because you know that's going to be a counter reactionary movement that takes away.

MY: And so, the ballot measure was a piece of legislation.

LH: Yes. And one of the things that the new movement with the Black Lives movement, it was just wonderful to see the multiracial, multiculture that even more than we had in the civil rights movement, you know. Because there were Whites that got arrested with me and Whites that got beaten with me. And in Freedom Summer, when White youth came out of the colleges and for the voter registration drive by SNCC, you know. And from across, from colleges in California, across the country, you know, and put their lives on the line for voter registration, you know. And that was about the biggest movement of participation of Whites in civil rights until the woke movement, the Black Lives movement, you know. But I had never seen something even as a historian of the movement and participant, such massive participation from the White community.

MY: And what did you say, was 82 percent of voters approved—

LH: Eighty-two percent. The largest ballot measure in the history of Portland at that time.

MY: So, what is different about this new system that's in place, versus what had existed?

LH: Well, in the new system is that the issues that I was, first of all the right to compel testimony when officers come before the independent oversight committee, they have to testify. Administratively, they have to testify. The other second component of that is that we have a committee that can recommend, independently made of citizens, not police officers, but citizens that can recommend the discipline of officers for each individual case. Those are two key components there, you know. They would have, of course, a staff of investigators. And I believe that many of the, at least some of them have gone on whether by IPR or we're behind.

MY: Do you think that the City, aside from the new system that voters approved in 2020, how do you think that the City has served the community regarding police accountability?

LH: There have been moments in which the City has moved, and then go back to the routine, the status quo. But we have not had an institutionalized systemic process. Yes, we do advocacy. We've changed policies. But many of the policies now directly that have been changed by AMAC and other groups directly inside the police. And their training, we've changed some of their training by AMAC and the settlement lawsuit, you know. But we still have instances. Take, for example, there was a training film that instead of showing about de-escalation, that was used by one of the White officers in a training that showed the officers beating some White youth during the demonstrations and saying this is the way you police. Okay. They're giving this to recruits, okay? And when the Department of Justice asked for it, the City tried to hide it and until the federal judge order that they required to give it to him. But that's the kind of status quo type of thing. It's always in terms of preserving the institution. And even though you can't really do twenty-first [century] community policing, without the element of trust. The community, the Black community has always had to deal with two battles at the same time. We have to deal with police violence and then we have to deal with criminal violence in our own community. So, we're dealing with two battles we got up front and one on the back, okay? At the same time. But if we can ever transform and develop a trust relationship in the community, we can truly reunite in community policing with a base of dealing with—you know, people think watching these TV shows of how crime is solved. Well, 75 to 80 percent of crime is solved by citizens witnessing and coming in and testifying. Now if you, because you have such a culture and you have such a broken relationship, if you don't have citizens that are willing to testify because not just about fear of the criminal element, but fear that if they testify, they

may end up getting into an engagement with the police. And so, what they do, shut down. And so, crime is not solved. So, if you put a police person on every corner, you still not going to solve crime. It has to have community participation and trust. They have to trust that the officers are going to be fair and they're going to deal equally with people, not based upon race or class or poverty or mental illness or whatever. It's only when you create that kind of culture and atmosphere that you can lower crime. Because you have, it's not only the police doing their job, it's what the community's saying that enough is enough.

MY: It seems like work that will forever be in process.

LH: It's a process. One former chief of police told me it's in increments. It moves in inches sometimes.

MY: What do you tell young people who are coming up behind you who are doing grassroots organizing how not to burn out, how to keep up with the movement?

LH: It's a marathon. It's not a sprint. There's a lot of frustration out there now admitting that march over 200 or so days. They're very frustrated because they don't see the change, and that the system hasn't changed. Disappointed. But people don't look at it from a historical, it took us ten years, ten years of struggle against the '64 Public Accommodation Bill and '65 Voters Rights Bill and longer for the Fair Housing Bill. It's not about just marching. You use marching and mobilizing to create a consciousness in the citizens and the people. But the goal is to institutionalize and to change the system itself. And there's not always an overnight change. Yeah, you may win some small victory. But when you change a system, that's a transformation that takes place.

And then as Thomas Jefferson often said, you know, you still got to monitor the system, because it will change back quick.

MY: Those are the questions I had. Was there anything else that you wanted to make sure that we touched upon today?

LH: I think you pretty much captured it. I think we're at a crossroads right now. You know, our city and our nation, with the crime rate and violence going up. People will quickly say, "Free the police!" They don't have to do constitutional policing. Let them have their way to do the crime. But what you're going to do is you already have a lack of trust. You're going to have a greater lack of trust if that happen, in the community. And the disparity and the wedge is going to grow further.

But with twenty-first century community policing, you're trying to pull all of the parties together. All of the components of community towards what making a safe community where everyone can be treated fair and have equality of citizens. You know. We're in that counter historical period right now and that counter movement. And people want to be safe. But are you willing to give up all your constitutional rights? That's not a good trade.

And so, what we have to do is understand injustice is not going to go away. As long as there is injustice, it's going to create new people and new movements. Until justice is rendered. It's not going away. It's something innate within the human spirit that cries out for justice, from the beginning of civilization till the present. That's not going to change.

MY: We're going to end it right there. Thank you for talking with me. It was an honor.

LH: Yes, thank you for calling me to participate. I'm glad I could share.