

StreamBox

Eugenics in California and the World: Race, Class,
Gender/Sexuality, and Disability

Friday, June 4, 2021

Female Speaker: Hi everyone.

Female Speaker: I don't have video option and Cynthia doesn't have audio or video options. We need the interpreter window. We'll take a break after opening. Let me pull up my schedule.

Welcome from 1-115, then we'll break for 15 minutes, then start at 1:30. We'll have other speakers and we'll be out of the picture.

Female Speaker: If I could get my video on, that would be good.

Both Joe and Katie are here. I went on Zoom's main page and tried to do that. Nobody has the options. I want to click on 3 little dots, there's no option for other people sharing videos.

Male Speaker: I can do it. I'm so sorry guys.

Female Speaker: You mean videos to be seen?

I can't be seen or heard at this point. Katie's suggesting the interpreters [unclear]

We do that with pinning at the top of Katie's box. The interpreter should be spot-lit for the entire time.

I'm making them a panelist right now. Can we explain how closed captioning is available? Just wait one minute and we'll get this going.

Female Speaker: The host has stopped the camera is the message I'm getting.

Female Speaker: Hi this is Katie. I'll try linking in this way and come back using that. Could somebody try the link besides the one I just got? Are you using an ID and password? It's just a zoom link. I'll be back.

I'm trying to figure out how to make Kate and Joe share

video.

Female Speaker: How about under video? It may be in your zoom settings, not this meeting settings.

Male Speaker: I'll share my screen so you can see what I'm doing. I'm here, then settings.

When I exited out, I went there and changed the options. For whatever reason.

Female Speaker: Try going to settings. Scroll down.

Male Speaker: It may be because the meeting is running. Maybe we can close it down and start again.

Female Speaker: Let's get the meeting started. You and me are virtual selves.

We'll start the recording. Can you spotlight Katie now? Click on her box on the right hand side, there should be various options.

Male Speaker: I think we'll have to change that on the break. It doesn't give me the option for video besides me and Miro.

Female Speaker: Are we in webinar format? There should be a way to advance us to panelists, then we would be spotlit.

That would allow the public to see us. Every 20 minutes, we'll be switching off. Joe begins, then my camera will come back on when I'm about to take over. At a break, she'll hand it to me and you will spotlight me.

Female Speaker: I think that's necessary because everyone should hear the introductions. Let's announce in Q&A that we are going to figure it out.

Why don't you say we're going to shut the meeting down and reconfigure. Let's include them and make them a host. I'll tell everyone we'll meet back at 1:15.

Male Speaker: So we're signing off, right?

Female Speaker: We're good.

[Signing off until 1:15]

Female Speaker: Is there anybody in IT who could give you a hand? I could ask a coordinator here. Would that be helpful to you guys? I don't want to throw too many irons in the fire. I'll mute until I hear back.

I can make Katie an attendee. We want to spotlight her.

People who need ASL interpretation can pin, but the right thing to do would be to spotlight.

Female Speaker: Hey everybody. I have a friend on campus who is with IHC who is willing to talk you through her department has worked through these events.

Female Speaker: Hi everyone. I can name a few things that

might help. If the webinar is already broadcasting, you can promote Katie to a panelist.

Male Speaker: We did that.

Female Speaker: Once you're showing as a panelist, the attendees have to be manipulated. Whoever is the host, look to find the settings the attendees are seeing. Choose follow host view. Make sure you're watching in gallery so that projects to other people. If people are watching on a mobile device, they won't see Katie. If they're on a desktop, they should be able to see other people.

Female Speaker: Thank you.

Female Speaker: These settings on the left side, there's settings. Are you in the webinar settings?

Male Speaker: Once I click on webinar, I can't edit the webinar because it's live.

Female Speaker: Let me think about where that would be. If you look at all your video settings, make sure you're watching it in gallery and you have defaulted that the audience can select what they want.

Make sure you're watching in gallery and mention that to the viewers as well.

The little screen on the bottom, the 37 participants, it says invite.

Female Speaker: This happened to Joe, it tells me I'm not allowed to start my video.

Female Speaker: The host will have to request that you turn the video off. The host has to ask the participants to turn it on again.

Male Speaker: I have chat, pin, make a host, etc.

Female Speaker: Make Katie voice host.

Male Speaker: I don't think that will change.

Female Speaker: Be sure to make sure Katie and Joe are panelists.

Female Speaker: Plan B.

Female Speaker: We'll call upon you if we have other questions. Isidro does not have the options.

Female Speaker: Benedict is watching. He can only see me.

Female Speaker: I think you're pinned. It's just the icon.

Cynthia: I have another seminar I need to log into in 3 minutes. I sadly have to be at another webinar.

Female Speaker: On the right hand side, there should be for the host, the dropdown menu to turn on video.

Male Speaker: I'm on video. Can you make AJ host?

Female Speaker: I owe you flowers.

AJ: Let me check on a couple things. Who's presenting now?

Female Speaker: Susan, Alexander, Paul, David.

Paul: Hey AJ.

AJ: Who would like to speak now? Miroslava?

Male Speaker: We still need the ASL speakers.

Male Speaker: It's Joe and Katie. Panelists can now unmute themselves and start video.

Female Speaker: The livestream is starting.

Miro: Hello everyone. Welcome to the meeting today. My pronouns are she/her/hers. I'd like to introduce Susan Schweik. ASL interpreters and the link to live captioning is in the chat. The captioner is Kristin.

The recordings will be available so you can watch them in realtime. If you are interested in live captioning, interpretations, etc., they will be in the chat. Attendees can use the Q&A option. Here is the website.

On behalf of my colleagues, we would like to take this opportunity on the work we do here and how it affects the lands we work on.

UCHRI provided the support. Susan has been invaluable with ideas. Thank you. A big thank you to the scholars, educators and activists. If interested in joining, email myself. Thank you for everyone's patience. Later, we will have a second panel. We will have a session, close out, then come back.

I turn it over to my colleague, Sue.

Susan: We will have 15 minutes breaks in between to give everyone a break. To the interpreters, captioners, thank you. We need some time to slow down and breathe before we come back.

The picture on our poster is from a 1971 action by welfare mothers who were forced to be sterilized or lose all welfare benefits. These women were amazing. Mrs. Ellis began to try to talk directly in her testimony to the man who had proposed the bill, Mr. Bates. If he can propose a bill for my life, I can question that. They closed down the whole testimony. The women you saw in that picture said "when we come real, they can't deal with that reality."

Please come real and ask as many questions as possible in the Q&A.

I'll turn it over to our first panel. Alexandra Stern about reparations, Paul on renaming state parks, and [unclear]

Alex: I want to give thanks to all the people who came in to get this up and running. I am a professor at UofM. My pronouns are she/her. I'm not going to show a powerpoint or images, but lay out a picture of primarily memory and history in regards to neugenics. The importance of amnesia and nugenics history, how to de-eugenicize institutions where we teach.

How do we remember eugenics? The dominance are that they were a bad chapter of the past that should never be repeated. Our understanding cannot stop there. The impulses have longer afterlives that spill into the present. We want to critically explore eugenics and foreground those with disability studies, through the lenses of queer theories. This is a collective work. Dominant narratives have been about what and who is normal. These can have inequalities. I'd like to offer a few examples of how this has happened. Many of the presenters will push back against these narratives.

Carrie Buck is the most commonly involuntary sterilization in the US. What happened to her was awful. It included institutionalization, her sterilization based on the larger than life role in the Buck versus Bell case. The way her story is told has some problems.

Claims are made that she should not be sterilized because she was normal. It repeats the individual labeling that was intrinsic to labeling itself. White privilege allowed for this sterilization. African Americans were so invisible and neglected, while white bodies were embodied in poverty. Carrie Buck was inventing her disabilities while privileging white bodies.

This is closely connected to policing gender and sexuality. My point is not that we shouldn't remember this case, but that story has become a problem with eugenics.

Better babies contests find them harmless and amusing. Years ago, I studied this, where breeding better stock was used. They relied on measurements to see which baby was the best. These contests focused on children and baby care while idealizing white norms. These increased the reproduction of fit and unfit.

If sterilization, marriage laws were used to find the unfit, then better baby contests were the inverse. Positive eugenics always has an insidious of heteronormativity. The same can have said that Paul [unclear] a zealous

proponent of sterilization. People think it ended in the 1960-1970s. The term itself became a flashpoint yet eugenics remains a force in the US. Eugenics brought trauma and pain. It has brought sterilization injustice.

We also see eugenics enacted in the Shin-Jan Province.

About 2 million people are being held in camps and slow genicide by sterilization is hysterectomies. We can see

health and wellness used today. There is a continuous threat and ableism. The demographic anxieties of the

eugenics era is the same type as white supremacy today.

There are bridges that some of the participants in this study are posing. The pioneer fund that directly links the racism in

the 1920s to the American renaissance foundation. White

liberalism is part of the problem. This dynamic

encompasses white supremacism.

Women with savior complexes who elevate their stature. I

will throw out some examples. Why did it take planned

Parenthood so long to recognize that eugenics was integral

to birth control policies. Our institutions were predicated

on supremacist functions now.

Renaming, un naming buildings, etc. I'll close that I

appreciate this was started with a land requirement.

Thinking about the past, the land, the issues around the

patriarchal impotences. I'll link Stanford symbol, the California

redwood which represented a superior species that needed

to be promoted by eugenesis in the past.

I'm happy to elaborate on anything I mentioned.

Female Speaker: Next is David McIntosh.

David: I study race and I'm interested in how ideas get

transmitted to an audience. A month before my PhD exam, I

decided to take a trip to northern California. A couple things

happened on that trip. It rained the whole time and couldn't

fish. I tore my ACL. I remember listening to my audio notes.

Madison Grant was one thing I looked for. I found his name.

I had a mythological idea that was shocking. Madison was

born after the Civil War to extremely wealthy parents. Went

to Columbia Law. He didn't need to practice law to provide

for himself. He did a lot of hunting. When Grant joined, he

became an influential member of [unclear]

He continued his hunting trips and noticed the big game

was disappearing. He published an article about the moose

status in upstate NY. His lobbying got an Adirondack deer

law. He was interested in being a lobbyist. He could take

complicated ideas and explain them. It was Grant's idea to create a zoo where animals could roam and interact with other animals. He was power behind the power. In 1905, with Grant's support and knowledge, the director of the zoo urged a man to enter a cage alongside primates and monkeys. This caused controversy.

Today Grant's name is not recognized at any of those zoos. With his friend, Teddy Roosevelt, he made sure the bison, elk, moose were protected across the US. Grant's efforts were to be enjoyed by the future white race. Along with others, the eugenic movement was changed.

He published a book about eugenics and ideas that he had recycled from other authors, he warned that white Americans of northern European origin were going to be swamped by people from around the globe. The most noble was the Nordics. He thought it would dilute the US people. Grant had misguided ideas. He wrote that slavery was a blessing to the enslaved, those deemed unfit to reproduce should be sterilized and they were smarter than dark people. He saw Jews were ruthless.

Grant cofounded the eugenics society. The book he wrote was the inspiration for the immigration acts which cut immigration from anywhere except northwestern Europe. He was behind many antimasogenistic laws. Grant had a huge effect on the Nazi party. Hitler went as far as to write a fan letter and got an autographed copy of the book.

During the Nuremberg trials, Grant's book was entered as defense. Two California state parks ignoring this racist man. Grant did make some good contribution, the Bronx Zoo, Save the Redwood Leagues, Glacier National Parks. He wanted to save big animals and white Americans.

In 1948, the state of California dedicated the Elk and Forest Refuse to Grant. If you look behind me, here is the Madison Grant rock. [On screen.]

Very few people seem to know who Grant is. His teachings are in the form of the White Performance Theory. The picture was taken on my visit in January 2019. I sent this to Paul, who forwarded it to 300 of his closest friends.

Paul: I remember that call. Thank you for the organizers for asking me to be here.

If I can share my screen, I have a powerpoint. Purging the evils of yesteryear.

Madison Grant was a very bad guy who received 2

posthumus memorials as if he was a good guy.

I passed the information onto the group of about 160 scholars I know. David told me about this and I told them. Rena Heinrich was bothered by this and wouldn't let David and I let this go. We tried to make a presentation at a conference to get a petition and signatures. It was canceled due to Covid.

We spent a few weeks drafting a letter. We wanted to send it to the Governor and Lisa, the director of state parks. One of my former PhD students is the floor leader for Anthony Rendin, the speaker of the California state assembly. He suggested Jim Wood and Mike McGuire and Edwardo Garcia. We collected signatures for a letter. I had the email lists for more signatures. We added other experts on eurogenics.

We took all those signatures and sent them to Wood, Garcia and McGuire. We got no reply. Ultimately the committee staffers connected us with Leslie Hartzell. She's the chief of cultural resources who arranged a meeting with several people like Victor Bjelajac. He took ethnic studies courses. We had another meeting with him and Leslie and Armando Quintero. He said GO.

They had just initiated a program of reexamining our past. Victor went and organized a meeting to rethink their attitude around what they commemorated in their parks. We toughened up the language. There was no reason to commemorate him anymore. He's responsible for all kinds of white supremacist.

The rock and plaque will be taken away soon. I will be there for the removal as well as several leaders from the park systems. I am trying to get Jim Wheeler to come as well. There will be a new naming of the park. This is the outgoing rock, it's a big rock. This is the new sign that will go up. Let me read a little bit. [Reading screen]

Ongoing, at the request of California state parks, students at 3 schools around the country are looking into the history of the naming of other parks as well. They are making recommendations. At Columbia university, they're looking at 5 parks in California. They're looking at Falon Beach. He was one of the most vicious promoters of the [unclear] That's the process we went through which is ongoing. You can make a small difference if you keep on things. Thanks to Alex for helping with this.

Here's Madison Grant's friend, Teddy Roosevelt. This is at the east entrance of the museum in NY. They're in a colonized position. It's been quite controversial lately. I want to know who put Arnold Schwarzenegger's body on Teddy. Female Speaker: Thank you Paul. We do have a few questions in the Q&A.

James asks question in Q&A [reading screen]

I will turn this over to you 3.

Paul: As the resident of American studies, you want to take on that question?

Alex: I'm not able to answer that question with any depth. I believe that has Gothic nature to it. I would say there's a sedimentation of probes that feed into eugenic thinking. Looking for origins of particular ideologies can be quite reductionist. If you want to understand more about the mind set of Holmes, talk to Paul Lombardo.

Paul: I have no clue. I'll have to go read Schiller.

Female Speaker: Next question is Joy. [Reading screen.]

Paul: I just slapped a title on there. I withdraw it.

Female Speaker: For Alex, how to change academic disciplines . . . [reading screens]

Alex: I don't know how to answer the last part of the question. I would say that de-eugenicising requires structural change, concerted efforts and repeated tries until you can get a shift around certain things. Do you have a specific example? There is scholarly work that can be done by individuals. There's also collective information I've used with success if the stars are aligned. Hopefully this symposium can think about it collectively.

Female Speaker: Tony mentioned Charles [unclear] is also in a state park. He tried 10 years ago to get it removed. If you reach out to authorities, is it common for them to ignore it or delay the paperwork.

Paul: It is extremely common. Victor was hot to do this because he has a racial critique to give. He was grossed out at the notion of Grant's eugenicism. As it happens Armando was a guy who said we're going to do this. A lot of folks don't get it. There is the George Floyd moment. People have been calling for changes for a long time. There are people who think it's time to be reevaluating things.

Female Speaker: There are no pending questions right now.

Susan: There's another question embedded. [Reading question in Q.] How can we invite the public into this?

David: I think inviting the public is the word on the panel to be replaced. We went back and forth with several versions. Recognizing that not only was the rock there and removed, but why? It's a conscious choice on the state of California to erase Grant from these public spaces.

This rock is well off the beaten path so visitors won't be making a big deal about it. There are many places in the state that need to be attacked one by one. In addition to Jim Wheeler, we've heard other stories about getting rid of this. California seems to really want to make changes now.

Female Speaker: Question for Alex. In the past, you were instrumental in reparations of sterilizations, can you give us an update of all that work you've been doing?

Alex: Tomorrow the panel will discuss where things stand.

It's exciting. You need to come to the panel. This is the fourth attempt to pass a compensation bill. It brought together the historical survivors from the 20th century.

Those folks can share more tomorrow. It lists our lab as the repository dedicated to the survivors.

I wanted to go back to Milton's question. I would have a few different thoughts about that. It is striking that I spent 25 years in California. Michigan was the state that was the 4th highest sterilizer in the country. So few people actually know what happened in regards to sterilization. Clearly something is missing there.

In California, there's been a mandate to include some disability history, some LGBTQ history, that needs to be included in the resistance part of that story. People have been pushing for that for a long time. There are other teachers who will bring this into their curriculum.

There are materials such as the re-plaquing, the renarrativization of the story of Grant and the Redwoods. Any time a plaque can be put up or a plaque, you risk forgetting that history.

I would say I'm working on a digital archive about sterilizations. That is a platform that we want to use to engage the past and present of these histories. Whose histories are these? We need to be sensitive and thoughtful when we talk about these histories. Who harmed people? Who passed these bills? How can this history be protected? Thinking about the eugenics, Madison Grant is a favorite of white nationalists today. His ideas continue to harm people. Now my dog is barking, so I'm going to stop talking.

Susan: We have more questions in the Q&A.

Female Speaker: Thanks for the presentations. How to bring the concerns to the US environmental movement especially with the Sierra Club's [unclear] [Reading question from Q&A.]

Paul: I used to be a member of the Sierra Club until I found out about that past. I dress like a lumberjack, I'm wearing boots.

He went so far as to blame 911 on the fact that we didn't have a wall along our border with Mexico. I asked a question that got him shouting at me. He was saved by a guy from the Sierra Club who said there was only so much carrying capacity of the land. The environmental movement is problematic. All the founders were profoundly anti-immigrant and white supremacist. There are statements on these kind of issues. We know we have a past that troubles people a great deal.

It's fine to celebrate the fact that we have these big trees, but you can't get away from the central idea structure that Grant was pushing on us.

Alex: I would say things have shifted. I was doing research with save the redwoods records. They would not let me reproduce images because of the damage to the organization. The Sierra Club did come out about the racist origins. I would use the planned Parenthood about why the organization isn't coming to terms with it's roots. Parks should be more inclusive. They have also been about terror and fear to people.

Susan: I have a question. How do we make sure people know these histories? I was struck by the comment. Intro to biology have not heard about eugenics. It's important to make sure people know eugenics was and is here, how much the Nazis learned from these leaders in California. I've interested because I have now come into a collection of eugenics scrapbooks by Gatey [sp?]

How to find ways to tell these stories that don't give these men the microphone again. How do we do this in ways that don't bring their voices to the floor?

Male Speaker: That is our task.

Alex: My recent work has been on this. It's an ongoing question. In the contemporary moment, it involves social media. Who had the privilege of being archived? One of the aspects of eugenics is silence, marginalized. We need to

reconstruct these stories. Knowing work in critical black studies, LGBTQ studies, etc. through sources, through a femora, how do we tell those stories? We're trying to do this in the sterilization justice lab. It's very challenging and there are limits to what you can do. I'm on this constant campaign to tell the story of Sara Garcia. She did a lot of work to change the laws. That is the story that needs to be told. It speaks to the story of a widow who was fighting for one of her 9 children. It should be at the forefront instead of a side note.

These men did bad things, but there are ways of containing them.

Tony: Congratulations on getting rid of Madison Grant. I spent a lot of time in that part of California.

Name changes gets people engaged. This will get people curious to start reading and asking questions. It's a long way from removing a plaque to the lanback movement.

I was talking with someone who went up to the coast who felt uncomfortable there racially in the NW, you get up there and don't see a lot of people of color there.

Is the issue of the landscape carrying this racial information?

We'll take a break now and continue at 3 for more Q&A.

[Session break.]

Eugenics institutions in golden California. We have 4 speakers. I'll let them say their titles

If you're just coming in, let us know in chat or Q&A. We have a link for closed captioning if you don't already have it. Let's get started. Welcome Jess.

Jess: Hello everyone. I'm sharing a link where you can find an access copy to my talk. I am an assistant professor. Due to the short amount of time, I'll dive right into my talk. You can access the entire talk at that link.

Research life. A case study of how investments are a pathway to success. I'll be defining terms in a bit. Fernald's [sp?] research has a contradictory argument. Grace Maxwell Fernald [On screen.] She is an older white women with a patterned blouse. She's smiling at a young person. She received her PhD from Univeristy of Chicago in 1907.

[Reading screen]

She published a book that was in publication until the 1980s. Her early career work was in juvenile psychopathy in Chicago.

Not mentioned is that she brought that work to Los Angeles and collaborated with the California School for Girls opened in 1916. She conducted extensive examinations of at least 100 youth, up to 23 years old. I classify these as one of the states eugenics project to segregate unfit or defective people from normal society. That will become more apparent from her material.

Some of the material is from a 1916 report to the California legislature on the activities of the school. She describes how she used the [unclear] IQ test. Here are some of her conclusions from this study.

[Reading screen]

I want to point out that among professionals, Fernald is making judgment for permanent segregation. She called on the state to build a place for these feeble-minded people. Fernald was a compassionate person, she made a humanitarian argument that some were defective until their premature death. She wanted to determine which students should be segregated to save the state money.

She is still reproducing this line between normal and defective to actually cause the premature deaths of the defective class. Her work is also part of a larger movement in carceral [unclear] The way women have invested in carceral systems. She joined other white women in advocating segregating the defective class. She used psychological testing to develop and implement a tool to find who should be segregated.

Thousands of gender nonconforming women were remanded to California state custody.

I'm running out of time. I'll skip how her materials contain remnants of her work. Fernald did devote the bulk of her career to making reading accessible to people deemed unable to learn.

Female Speaker: Our next speaker is Tony Platt.

Tony: My thanks for organizing and bringing us together. I'm speaking to you from Berkley.

Misanthropology and eugenics at Berkeley.

For those of you who would like a longer document, email me at amplatt27@gmail.com.

I'll give examples of the arguments I'll be making. The U of C came to life in a difficult time. As Jim Harrison puts it, bone against metal. Several institutions have been forced to be part of eugenics. Berkeley has been able to evade scrutiny.

During its formative decades, the university was noncritical race theory. Many departments took an interest in the bodies of the native dead, living Mexican immigrants and African Americans. Their goal was to cleanse the body politic of racial impurities.

You can hear echos of this angst in right wing ideology. The universities were active in this enterprise.

Tomkins Brothers and Laconte brothers had an influential role in the universities curriculum. There might be some slim hope for the American negro. For the Indian, extermination is inevitable. To Laconte, science was racism.

[Reading from the link]

Susan: Our next speaker is Isidro Gonzalez.

Isidro: I'll share my screen.

Constructing the defective at Sonoma state Home. I study the disability of mental illness, a history of medicine. I focus around 1910-1940.

I'll talk about my questions, making professionals and defectives. In the background of the slide is a picture of Sonoma State Home.

[Reading screen]

Also to define mental illness and disability.

[Reading screen]

In some cases, the families themselves.

Let's get into making professionals. I'm looking at the aspect of creating this profession and the journal pages that came out of it. We have the Vineland Training School, the Eugenics Record Office. I also look at gender. Some think this is mens work or womens work. They had to administer the IQ tests. It was a conversation with the patient or even the parents. There was also looking at a photograph and see whether someone was deficient.

This is one of the publications. [On screen.] I didn't find too many references to Beatrice. The descriptions from the families.

To give you an aspect of the subjective element of determining a field worker, [reading screen.]

This is an article on what the field work should be, but you can see what he's looking for in a man or a woman.

Making defectives. [On screen.] Here's a page from a case file. This could be a quick glance of looking at the other households around the patient's home. Very rowdy, very loud to determine why someone would be defective.

A lot of eugenics was about the biological hereditary aspects. You see aspects of racism as well.

Here are some sketches of the homes. [On screen.]

Note "probable feeble minded." It could have been told by the patient or a child.

Here are religious biases. [On screen.] Priest was something to be noted in this. Beatrice goes at length to describe her family worked.

Beatrice Lantz describes . . . [On screen.]

Here's an image like a voice. There are 4 different faces. I don't know the significance. These are photographs where you can still see clear eyes. I think this is because the photographer wanted these patients to look a certain way. If you have more questions, I'd love to talk about it more.

Female Speaker: Now Han Koehle.

Han: Sorry about the slight delay. I am the health equity advocate at UCSB. I work as staff and anywhere there are health promotion services needed, I work on these.

Recently I got involved with a committee to address use of police in mental health issues. I was hearing from people this perception that sometimes people are sick and don't want to be made better, so it's necessary to overcome their objection of force. I did not feel confident challenging that without really good evidence. I started generating some questions based on those assumptions. What's supposed to happen in psychiatric hospitalizations? What gives rise to various outcomes and what are the known outcomes? I've included a link in the chat to basically a living folder of what I've created on the research.

I am a public employee so what I spend time doing, I want highly available.

The first link is linked to that folder. My findings were that there's really not a strong evidence basis for [unclear] Every few years someone publishes something about this and nothing happens. I started looking behind it to see what's causing us to do this. That's what led me to eugenics and the mental health behind it.

The first thing is a timeline of the eugenics movement and psychogenic incarceration. We know it doesn't benefit patients. Patient outcomes are not really the point. Only a small portion of studies on inpatient care takes this into measurements. Most of it is based on rehospitalizations, arrest and money.

As I'm putting together this timeline to see what led to psychiatric incarceration. The answers are right in these moments of social crisis. They're based on sexuality, big pushes in colonial settlement. The first form of civil commitment in California is almost immediately after the California genocide. It's right near the same sex marriage. It's at the same moment as slave laws are put into effect. You have this moment of social crisis and a push towards social differences. At the same moment, our current structure 5150, starts in the 1960s and moving away from incarceration. We're in a different situation economically. We don't have to disrupt people's ability to participate in life.

There are a lot of people in California who have the authority to take you off the street anytime you wish and have you evaluated. How many people in California have a job that if they disappeared for 12-24 hours, wouldn't be fired? How many people could then keep their apartment. We have the ability to take anyone off the street anytime. Even if they aren't committed, the possibility of complete disruption is present. Not everyone knows about it.

I'm looking at the logics of eugenics as being so pervasive that they're not visible to us. I see this over and over again. It happened from 1910-1940. In my own clinical training, I wasn't told to question why we should hospitalize people against their will. I was told most of your patients will be involuntary. What do you mean? Don't people have the right to decide whether to get healthcare? Most social workers will take care of that. The idea was not to question it.

In my last classes, I asked what's the evidence for this? My professor said no. How did we get to a place where we can act as people who take away other's freedom by force and we haven't even checked if that's okay to do.

Through this fractured sense of responsibility, we don't even have a sense of tradition versus evidence. This discourages careful evaluation of the situation. We don't even know how much we're acting with eugenics in healthcare practices. I'm still towards the beginning of this research. I'm happy to be here. Thank you for bringing me in. I hope these resources are helpful to you.

Female Speaker: Thank you Han.

Miroslava: I hope I'll stay within my time. My current research is from the 1960s to 2000s.

[Captioner lost signal]
[Lost sound.]