Okay. So, welcome to everybody. Um, so Ellen and I are going to co-chair. Um, Ellen, do you want to introduce yourself first? So, my name is Ellen Clifford. I'm a disabled activist and a non-standing member of Disabled People Against Cuts. And I'm Suzy Croft and I'm a former palliative care social worker and now a welfare rights worker with uh older and disabled people. um working with them to get the benefits they're entitled to. So um we're very fortunate to have this chance to meet and discuss key current developments at this crucial time. Um and I think this is when increasing concerns are being expressed in parliament about the divisions and damage being done to our society by right-wing extremism, populism and division. Um and at the same time there is a concern to challenge these threats. Uh and I want to thank Ruth Listister for sponsoring the meeting from the House of Lords and to John McDonnell who hopefully will be coming for taking a leave from the House of Commons. So many groups have come under attack because of the developments that I've referred to. Refugees, asylum seekers, disabled people, trans people, and most currently disabled people. and that's influenced the shaping of today's discussion and today's event is supported by policy press uh the University of East Anglia and an user-led organization shaping our lives and today is the launch day for the antidote which sets out an alternative and how we might achieve it to the destructive ideology now damaging our lives which is neoliberalism. I think many groups feel under really hostile pressure and there is constant conflict, uncertainty and disability benefits reform is creating widespread anxiety and fear and making front page news. So today hopefully we can hear from people directly involved, check things out with them and hopefully impact this on our politicians.

Yeah. So speaking personally, it's such a pleasure to actually be here to support and promote the development of progressive ideas rather than just relentlessly fighting back against regressive laws and policies that are being put through parliament at the moment. So the outline for today is we've got until 2:30 p.m. We're going to have a number of speakers and then there will be time for discussion. Um this is Graham and he is going to start us off um with a poem written specially for today's event. Uh and it's Graham Price from Sandwell Visually Impaired. So over to you Graham. Welcome everyone. This is the first poem change please. Careing values seem to be held in such low esteem in a world where conflict and mayhem reign supreme. Where do we go from here? Is renewal of purpose the right thing? Let's start by adapting political stance and policy practice by giving peoplepad movements a rightful status and addressing the ever widening inequalities by any measure senseless. Valuing one another and the roles we perform is a helpful reaction as well as unlocking the discriminatory constraints imposed by political traction all achieving meaningful the antidote in action. Thank you.

Thanks Graham. So now straight over to Peter Berisford who is the author of the antidote who's going to introduce issues here today setting the scene. Thanks and over to you. Thanks very much Ellen. So let let's get something clear to start with. The imposition of welfare benefit cuts is not narrowly about whether a lot of disabled people are scramures or frauds or that we can't afford welfare benefits. It's about an ideology, neoliberalism, that's been committed to spending less on supportive public services and more on redistribution to an overclass of individuals and corporations and has long used stigmatizing people on benefits as one means to its regressive redistributive ends. We also need to remind ourselves how much has changed in our personal lives uh in a different direction though. When I was young, a woman was said to be a spinster on the shelf if she wasn't married to a man by 30. It was not a crime for a man to rape his wife until 1991. And if a woman had a child, quotes, out of wedlock, then she was made an outcast. It was stigmatized as illegitimate or a bastard, and the pressure was on for it to be removed from her. There were signs for rented accommodation in news agent windows that said no dogs, no Irish, no colors. Men went to prison for being gay. Disabled people were routinely institutionalized, excluded from school, and many seen as incapable of mainstream life and relationships with researchers dismissing them as quote social parasites. Now, no one's suggesting, at least it all mean that issues of discrimination and oppression have been cracked. But our personal politics, our roles and relationships with each other have unquestionably moved on massively since then, nationally and also, I think we can say, globally. Yet our formal politics seem to have been moving in the opposite direction with hate and discrimination encouraged against asylum seekers, refugees, disabled people, mental health service users, Muslims, trans people, people on welfare benefits, and many more. Paradoxically, as our formal politics increasingly seek to alienate us from each other, ourselves and especially strangers and people who are seen as different from our own and others rights. Nonetheless, we have seen an increasing equalization of our personal roles and relationships. And that's the point. The political lessons we've been learning in our personal worlds may offer us a route to reform the formal politics we now increasingly live under. That's the point of my book, The Antidote. What's happening is not all one-way traffic to more conflictful, negative, and destructive politics and international relations with the rise of farright populism and unrestrained neoliberalism. There's been a fight back internationally in our personal politics that's progressive, humanistic, social justice, and equalitybased. despite the rise of powerful unaccountable 1% uh the unaccountable 1% damaging rights in democracy. And my my point is can we harness the one to renew the other and challenge the divisive and destructive formal politics we now face and which more and more people are alienated from and which seeks to alienate us from each other. Uh to stop that having effect and my belief is yes we can. And I believe that this is the direction we should take, building on the women's movement's calls that the personal is political, renewed also as the political should be made more personal, working for equality through our own more inclusive and equal alliances as innumerable minorities that together of course make up the majority. Perhaps the key message from this book, I hope, is that not only is the personal political as the women's movement first proclaimed, but also that if our formal politics do not wake up to a realization that the political needs to be personal rather than anti-personal, then it will continue on its current excluding, reactionary, and ultimately failed, unsustainable pathway. Our personal politics are ahead of our formal politics and they are our route to transforming them. I suggest we can all help make that happen. No longer divided, instead the potential to be united on equal terms, working together. Thanks every

[Applause]

so um I'd like to ask Ruth Listister to speak. roots a tireless campaigner for human rights and social justice now working for those in the House of Lords. So she's going to offer a view from the House of Lords. So thank you. Thanks Suzy. Um well my welcome to the lords rather than nether regions of the lords but um although it builders a view from the lords I think it is physically so uh I think I've read this book more what I call my compass um spectacles on and compass is a left center organization um that's can that basically works towards a good society um and I think particularly parts two and part three of Peter's books which I wrote forward um offer a compass for thinking and talking about how we build a good or at least a better society and I like very much um the emphasis in it on the importance of means as well as ends in politics learning as Peter said personal relationships and from the myri myriad groups that many of you may represent working to affect change on the ground, including of course disability groups. And I very much liked um Peter's feminist aim to unite the personal and political in empowering an emancipatory way. And in my forward I quoted uh from Justinda Arden the former prime minister of New Zealand u who demonstrated how it's possible to be a different kind of leader uh with her emphasis on what she called our daily acts of kindness and at a time when so-called woke politics has come under attack I think the book offers a more nuanced account which recognizes that we all have multiple identities and the intersecting nature of those identities point to what I called in my earlier academic work on feminist approaches to citizenship a politics of solidarity in politics. So, as I'd expect from Peter, there's a strong emphasis on participatory politics and policymaking. And what he has to say about co-production is particularly pertinent given the promise that the PIP review will be co-produced with disabled people and their organizations, reflecting the strength of the their campaigning against the universal against original universal credit bill now shrunk to just the universal credit bill. uh which we are debating in the laws next week, but we won't be allowed to do anything with it because it's been treated as a money bill. Um but just I thought it just worth reading out the principles that Peter put for co-production because it might be quite useful when it comes to uh engaging with um uh the government. Value all participants and build on their strengths. Develop networks of mutual support. do what matters for all involved. Build trust. Now, that's going to be difficult because I think so much trust has been lost uh in what has happened over recent weeks. Um so much anxiety, so much stress, worry about what what is entailed. I mean, there are still cuts there, but at least the PIP cut has been taken off the table. So, building trust is probably the first thing that has to happen. share power and responsibility and people can be change makers and organizations enable this. So I think that's a useful template against which to judge whatever is proposed by the government. So while it doesn't claim to be co-produced, the child poverty task force um has at least acknowledged the importance of different forms of knowledge uh and has listened to parents and children with experience of poverty as well as more traditional experts and that is I kind of something of a breakthrough really and changing realities which some of you may have come across bring together people with experience of poverty academics and child poverty action group uh in what ATV forth world has called the merging of knowledge. So bringing those different forms of knowledge together um and have been working with government and others on the child poverty strategy and um drawing attention to the realities of poverty started during COVID and has carried on. So despite the continued power of neo neoliberalism summed up by Peter as one dead man who seems to keep walking the right I'm afraid

I can't say I've reread the whole thing but I have read a bit of it um and the growing strength of xenophobic and racist right-wing populism. I'm glad the book uh and I would encourage you to read it ends on an starting route to 82 St. George's house.

Yeah, I told you we're going to talk about compass. So, uh ends on a note of hope. hope that lies in the politics of um connection and inclusion and a hope that I think has been kindled uh by the power that it's not going right

shown by the hope that the power that's been shown by disabled people in recent weeks. actually it is quite an achievement to get a government to pull out half of it in effect half of what it's trying to do in this bill uh on the floor of the house of government and John might have more to say about that. So I just want to finish with a couple of quotes that I I put in my forward. Um the first is from uh Rebecca Soulnit who has written very persuasively about hope I think um particularly in the context of the climate emergency. Um so to hope is to risk is to take a chance on losing it's also to take a chance on winning and you can't win if you don't try. And then in the words of the doctor writer Rachel Clark on the anniversary of the first lockdown, hope is a leap of faith. It requires a willingness to act on the conviction that all the big facts of the present and there are many big facts of the present. All the big facts of the present, a better future is possible. So I think the book offers us possible route towards that future.

So many thanks Ruth. So now I'd like to take it straight over to John McDonnell MP whose tireless work in partnership with deaf and disabled people's organizations contributed largely to the gutting of the UC and Pit Mill last week. So thank you John to offer a view from the polls. Peter sent me the PDF of the book to to read. I can't stand reading on PDFs actually. I got through it and I see that what I sent back as a quote is on the back of your leaf. This is remarkably open for me at that stage and there were two issues as you saw from the quote that I was really worried about and that's been mentioned. One was the rise of the far right across Europe in particular and in America, but then also here. But I I thought that people need to be woken up then to um the potential consequences of a farright government in in this country, which some people think is just pure speculation, but if you look at the opinion PS now is a real threat. And the other element of it was corporate capture of government. I was worried about some of the policies that were being pursued by by the Stan administration and reflected some of the influence particularly of um the finance sector in in this country which has dominated our economy for so long. I think it's moved on since I read the book and I think there's a third third threat um which we've seen very recently which is forms of authoritarianism that's seeping into a whole range of our aspects of our life. So I just two notes of caution really. Um, if you're a Labour Party member in this meeting, be careful because anything you say may be taken down and used in evidence against you to withdraw or expel you. And the second is we mention Palestine as we saw in Kent yesterday in whatever context you can do because of the prescription. I never envision that prescribing a a protest movement as a terrorist organization in this country in that way. Um so I think things have moved on and it makes the relevance of the book even more significant. Um because in in these coming um I think before in these coming struggles there's an ex I think there's an extreme demand for people to come together and think through what we're up against what we're facing and what avenues that we've got through all our different relationships and organizations and potential organizations that we can use to combat those three threats. the rise of the far right of corporate capture and now this authoritarianism and the interesting thing as well in in reading Peter's book he set out the principles of how you can work together and I think the principles of many of us so huge but it's good to have it succinctly written in that way because it does create an agenda of how you establish relationships but what's interesting is there seems to be a new way of building at the moment I'm an eternal optimist but I think I just get the impression there's a new wave building at the moment where people are waking up to the seriousness of what we're facing and what we could potentially face in the next 5 years and as a result of that people are feeling way forward in terms of new organizational forms in terms of new campaigns and struggles and I think one of the things that we can do when we leave this meeting is it starting trying to ensure that in those discussions we're very tentative at the moment in those discussions that will take place. We try and put into their discussion the principles that Peter has elaborated in his book because I think the new wave that's coming and I think the new wave that's coming will swamp the existing institutional arrangements of our politics. That's my view. um because people people it's a combination of uh almost despair at times as I put in my quote but also a rising sort of frustration some of that building into anger as well and I just think people thought after 14 years of austerity and it's continuing on now unfortunately some in many respects enough's enough really they're not taking it anymore and people have been incredibly creative this morning. I I was with a group based um the base of Pluto now um the left book club you know which has thrived in the 1930s 57,000 members had all these groups across the country it was started off again a few years ago and now what they're doing is exactly the same they're launching local groups around the country because they're building up their membership and they're publishing books often they're publishing them extremely cheaply um and their books that have been published elsewhere, but they're just trying to inform the discussion at the local level so that you can learn from the struggles that have taken place in the past and currently as well and you don't have to always reinvent the wheel but you can adapt with it and I just thought that's a good example of what's going on out there and I'm I go around the country doing different meetings boring the hell out of people but they literally I'm maybe it's me but I'm coming across so many initiatives like that that are taking place where people are thinking creatively actually the formal polic politics has let us down at the moment. What can we do? And that is beginning to feed into the formal politics as well because we wouldn't have won those votes in the House of Commons and won the thing around the legislation. Still appalling legislation, but we wouldn't have gone that far. It hadn't been quite a mass movement nor mobilization right the way across the country of different organizations, disability campaigning groups, trade unions, you know, labor party members, but also much wider than religious groups and whatever. And so I think there's a potential for all sorts of combinations of initiatives now. But I want to when I when I get involved in that I want to just suggest that actually there are some principles that could be invaluable for our discussions about how to move forward. And here they are in Peter's book. Um I think that's what I want to say because I just think now we're we're on the edge we're on the edge of either going darkly backwards or on the edge of having quite significant breakthrough. And I think our job is to make sure signific

terribly dissolution party. I want to say thank you John very much.

Um and next um I'd like to invite Sarah Carr noted independent mental health and social care consultant to speak. Um welcome Sarah and Sarah's going to speak on the subject of whose problem whose solution why people power must drive artificial intelligence in social care. So first of all it's a real privilege to speak here today and to be part of antidote and it really powerfully reminds us that we're changing context practice people had and that's what I'm going to try and talk about in relation to the development of artificial intelligence in social care and that's the same principle we that must guide us when we're thinking about this and developing AI and social care. Now in his book Peter writes the key point to remember about AI as with any other major scientific or social change is that who it benefits and the consequences it has depends on who controls it. Now, right now, AI is being rapidly introduced into social care systems across the UK, but not necessarily in ways that reflect the values and voices of people who use care and support. We're told that AI can solve the problem of excessive bureaucracy, things like too much paperwork, not enough time for supporting people, and that problem's real. But we do need to ask whose problem is being solved, who's defining that problem, and whose solution is being imposed. Well, let's look uh at where a lot of this bureaucracy came from. Many of the problems that exist today are rooted in reforms from the 1980s when ideas from the private sector were imported into social care through new public management. The aim was to increase efficiency, but you could argue that the result was increased paperwork, rigid t rigid targets, and essentially a loss of trust. Social workers became gatekeepers. People uh in receipts of care and support were reduced to eligibility scores and standardized assessments. Organizational targets were prioritized over service user needs. Now, generative AI is being used to do things like transcribe assessment meetings, write case notes, and automate care planning, and it's being marketed as a timesaver. And a few local authorities are actually buying this stuff. Um, yes, it may speed up administrative tasks, but if AI is deployed into systems shaped by the wrong values, bureaucracy, standardization, and cost cutting, then it won't humanize care. It will simply accelerate the problem and what's already broken. And there's a real risk that AI will help us ration faster rather than care better. That it will optimize exclusion rather than promote inclusion. that it will reduce people into neat data points just quicker. The people who use social care have been telling us for years what the real problem is. It's not bureaucracy necessarily. It's the system doesn't deliver the personalized relationshipbased support they need to live full and independent lives. So again, whose problem is being solved? Perhaps we should flip the question. Not what can technology do, but what do people need? If we take that seriously, then service users in the communities must not only help define the problem, they must be equal partners in designing the solution. We already know that this is the direction social care is meant to be going. We talk about co-production, we talk about personalization, but when it comes to AI, those principles seem to be pushed aside. Most AI tools are being designed with practitioners as so-called end users, not with people who would live with the consequences of their use. Now, here's just one example. In a recent piece of research um on uh social care reserve um priorities um adult social care staff reserve proposed a selfservice AI tool to reduce the time uh what the researchers called case officers to reduce the time spent supporting direct payment recipients. Essentially the idea is to design a tool to reduce human interaction the service users weren't involved in shaping that proposal. If they had been, would they have asked for less contact or more support? And this is where something called design justice could offer a powerful corrective. In a nutshell, design justice is a framework that asks who defines the problem, who is excluded or included from the process, whose values and knowledge shape the outcome in AI. It challenges traditional tech development which too often reinforces existing inequalities. Instead, design justice says those most affected by technology should lead its design. The design justice network outlines a number of principles that can guide any use and development of AI and social care including one AI tools should sustain, heal and empower communities, not extract, exclude or control. Design must focus on community concerns, not just the intentions of the developers or institutions. The process must be accountable and accessible with transparent documentation of how people have been involved and design knowledge should be shared and not hoarded so that communities can shape and govern the tools that affect their lives. And this is ethical and is practical. When we involve service users early through approaches like co-production, things like it's called experience-based code design or design thinking, we're far more likely to create tools that actually work perhaps that solve the right problems that enhance not replace human relationships. For example, design thinking is a human- centered approach that starts by empathizing with what are known as end users defining the problem through their experiences, creating solutions, prototyping tools and testing with those most effective. And it's already that approach is already being used in health innovation. So I don't know if we have to choose between technology and humanity, but we do have to choose what kind of technology we build and who we build it with. If AI is to have a place in social care, it must be co-designed by the people whose lives and rights are on the line. Not just to tick the consultation box, but to shift power to make sure the values of social care, dignity, choice, control, and equity are baked into every code, every process, every policy. Because the real danger isn't necessarily that AI is coming. The danger is that it's already here and being shaped by the wrong priorities. So I'll begin uh I'll end where I began with Peter's vital reminder. Who AI benefits depends on who controls it. If we put service users in control if we let people power drive AI in social care, we do have a small chance to create tools that don't just do things faster, but perhaps do things better. Don't just make the system efficient but make it perhaps fair. Thank you

Sarah. That was so powerful really thoughtprovoking. Um so now last but certainly not least from an organization whose name sums up the spirit of today breaking out of the bubble with Jen Taylor, Gina Barrett and Vic Forest. So over to you. Hello. You all from breaking out of the bubble. My name is Jennifer Taylor. Do you want to say your name? My name is Jordina Bat and I'm Vic Forest and we're all from breaking out the bubble. Cloaking out of the bubble is here to support people with learning difficulties to have a better life. We will say something about that. Regul at the bumble is um it's an organization which I named um um so we help people with learning difficulties to come out of their houses. We um um we literally influence an organization to work in the way a person with a learning difficulties want to work. So that's why the name is called breaking out cuz and our organizations don't have that chance to do it the way we do it. But we always say that we want them to work the way we work. So if we got meetings then like we got meetings then they will help us with our meetings and and like do like 5050 right like literally do things together. So that's called that's why it's called bring and we also we also have a um management committee meetings and we also run um let's dance and have a jazz and we also do a lot of um training the police in pecking um and doing all kinds of stuff and training. No, we are training and which is all about us us and that's that's to do with us because people with difficulties need to um have a better life for the better and for the future. Um and I've noticed quite a lot of um society that looks down on people quite a lot which we don't like and we like to be respected and to be to be friendly and people try to be nice to us and everything goes and live for yeah like we all live our lives to the fullest so we always use we always Hey, everybody who's got a learning difficulties or disabled must live their life to the fullest cuz we do it. Breaking out the bubble does it. So, we want them to do it as well. How is breaking out the bubble who who had has the power? We have the power because we know how to run a organization for people with learning difficulties and we also know how to to to tell people um stop um treating us like that like we're stupid and we're not cuz we can do things for the better. Yeah. We we have the power to tell them what we want them to hear. So literally we we will go to other organ like other organizations and tell them what we want to what they in desire to. So with us we just like literally go to other organizations cuz sometimes they want our support. So we help them to work the way we work. So it's like a model. So literally we just go and sell our model and um and lots of people wanted us to do it because we know how to talk it. We know how to we live it, we talk it and that's what our that's what we do in inside of our organization. Um Gina and Jennifer, how does the organization run and who has the power inside the organization? We we have a um we have a management committee meeting. So literally they have the power and we have the power as well. But whatever we discuss in our it always has to go to the manage committee meeting. So they will have the final word. We have a word but they will have the final word. Who's on the management committee? Would you would you say people people learn deputies and election has to run through us? So so so the people that don't manage the people they by us they can go through what they do and we tell you some of the different organizations we work with.

We worked with the police. We've worked with doctors. We um ba basically we um train the doctors to work the way we wanted them to work. So we train the doctors, we train organizations. [Music] Um and lots of people want our training because they understand we breaking out the bubble people um know how to to relax with. So they always want our training and say, "Oh, can you train us?" Cuz it's it is um how to work with people with learning difficulties and um it's like and we say, "Yeah, we can do it at the back of our heads, which we can." So, and we've changed, we've done it, we all the t-shirts. We we also work we were trying to work with funders as well because funers don't get back to us. They don't tell us when we get the funding and they don't tell us and and every time we bring them up they don't listen to us. So, so you know it hasn't been from them and this is what we're trying to find. I've got we've got some money from Trust for London Social Justice Fund to um work on um looking into how funders can work better with people with learning difficulties and and that's why cuz every time I've noticed right the funders don't get back to us to us when we get the money the funding and up. So you might then like to come to our office at 336 to tell us that you got the funding. Yeah. Because then they know and then you can face

and tell them that you want the funding. It's Jamie from Trust. So helpful. Yeah. Jamie is the one of one funer that we love because she always like gives us advice and and if we want if we've got like we like to say we like to pick her brain sometimes. So literally we would go to her, bring her up and say, "Oh yes, that's a good idea." So she gives us advice. So we love doing picking brains and she's a great funer to work with. You don't get um funders like that. So that's why we like we don't mind Jamie because she will go to earth and earth with for us and so we will do the same thing. But other funders don't work. I I've worked with other funders as well. So, and they don't get back to you because they don't understand the model of breaking like literally breaking out the bubble and stuff like that. And we were like I'm like this why don't you get it because it's easier for us to but yeah some funers and we have had funers like that and they they don't understand it. So it took us like literally it took me a while um to explain it and I'm like look listen it's simple as clear to us but it's not clear to them. So yeah we have we have access to allies who work with us we tell you what we like them to do for for us and how we like them to behave for us. We like to to treat us more better. And we like to we like to tell them how we work and and how we work and tell them how to behave towards us and be friendly towards us cuz that's what we like them to do. And we like them to be nice to us and not look down at us all the time. So yeah. How we like to make them work. Oh, like friendly meat. [Music]

And Reese and Gabby and and so ba basically we like work with like we Gabby and Vic and like they understand what we want. Unless we say no, this is not supposed to happen, then it's not supposed to happen. But they they're good workers and I can't fault them because they do exactly what we want. Yeah. Um so yeah. And and they're also nice nice people to work with. Yeah. Cuz they're like a family and colleagues and and that's how I like to work. Yeah. It's just a family of just go to work and you know it's just great to work with people like that. could please say something about about being a access. Yeah, I just wanted to say something that we are not funded by the government or the council in any way like and because I think if we were to be funded, not that it would be easy to be funded, we we just couldn't do the work that we want to do because it's all generated by the people with learning difficulties in our team who say what they want to do. when we've had money from the council uh in the past, it's been like we want you to do this and it isn't quite what you want to do. Um, Peter mentioned in his book about a decrease in pay for people who support disabled people. And I've seen that happen in in my life as well in the the role that that I have. And um I mean I'm not paid for out of government money, but it's it's we see people coming in. It's like um who've had no training. Yeah. Don't really know what they're doing. Some some of them are really nice, but some of them are not so nice and they really don't know what they're doing. It's a job they can get and and they for little pay and they're they're doing it because they need a job, but they don't know what they're doing yet, but they don't have skills in it. We set up this together, didn't we? This organization, it's like and from from scratch with no money whatsoever. None. um like after the when it was people first land the council stopped funding it but access allies like me and Bob need to be able to understand a lot to do the job. It is it is skilled work. I mean and it should be it should be recognized as skilled work and um you know we need to be able to support with our controlling to watch our own you know feelings you know are we trying to do something. We need to understand complex information and make it accessible for you. We need to work in a way that you want us to work. I like kind of like your personal assistant or like kind of do what you want. Yeah. And um you know we do research, we make films, we do a radio show, we do we do all sorts of things that require we do a radio show actually I never mentioned but yeah we do a radio show once a month and I think that this lack of money and you I think it probably is mentioned in the book but it's to do with the lack of status that's afforded people with learning difficulties. I mean, I'm sure that the prime minister has people who help him do his job and help him access different parts of his job who get paid a lot lot more than the people who work with people with learning difficulties. We will tell you what we have achieved ourselves and me since being part of big bubble and how we feel about ourselves today.

Literally uh literally for me literally I was not like this. Um I just I won't go into all of it but yeah um I was when I went to People Lambo cuz it was that time. Um I wasn't talking I wasn't talking to like this. Um I did I wasn't like glued up like I am now. And um yeah, it was it was I was like shy as you wouldn't recognize me like literally and we're making that like literally you want to recognize me. I like no I don't do this and I'm not talking and stuff like that. But now I've literally come past that um part um I can just talk say what I want and I have to cut a lot of Since I've been part of bubble, I've done quite a lot of meetings. is I've done on groups like Sky and our lives and um done a presentation in front of a lot of people telling them my life story and they liked it very much and they didn't know that talking I like to do a lot of talking and doing a lot of presentations tell them how it is to to treat to learn more better and and yeah so I've done groups I've done presitations I've gone to a lot of meetings um still doing it now and going to um doing a lot of meetings and talking how how I live my life as a person and plus I'm a mother of three two sons as

Thank you for listening. We have enjoyed getting together and listening to Peter's book. I think you've done a great book. Um because you know it's it's a fantastic book and I would like to get a copy of it.

[Applause]

Yeah, that is a great book

it um a book that we've been saying a very long time. So, well done. [Applause]

Thank you, gentlemen. And that was great. And uh it really resonated with me what you said about being nice because I think we all need that. And when you were talking I realized that a lot of places I've worked in they're not that nice. Not people aren't that nice always. And I think it's so important to say that about being kind, being nice, being treated with respect and so often that just doesn't happen. So thank you. Yeah. Great. Thank you so much. So can I before Ellen makes our announcements could I ask Rya please to close the event with his final because listening to everyone speak I've been so impressed and so amazed and wish I was quite at here we go and it just change it round instead of change please it's please change so I'm in trouble I'm upset no it's more I'm destroyed the world in in a chaotic state and climate change poses yet another threat. Wealth creation leaves me out on the limb and the widening inequalities cause me to adds to me feeling out of place. Something needs to change. Is it reasonable? Whatever it is, it has to be at peace.

Political direction and policy and action are making things worse. Adance to caring values in steep climb. My aim is to be a member of a peoplepowered organization that sets out more improvements to my life that make me feel properly. A world where cooperation sets competition to one side. A world that affords respect and dignity

to all that ranges far and wide. A world where political direction and action reflects compassion. Not stick and stick and charact transaction. A world be getting meaningful happen. The antidote in action.

[Applause] I'm pleased I got that one out. What was rather sad is that I missed the most important line or messed it up, you know, which was by giving people powered organizations their rifle status because what Jen and and Gina and Vic have outlined to us today is just what they've done to ensure they do get rightful status and then we learn a lot from that. Can I just finally just as the init initiator of this in a sense say thank you to everyone who's come particularly thank you to policy press of course and particularly thanks to to John and to Ruth who have been such a strong support and it's it's cheering I shall go home feeling better I hope other people can say the same but thank you everybody thanks Peter so in the spirit of creating new and stronger networks um there are just a couple of announcements and information I wanted to share with people. So the first is that there because um benefit cuts against disabled people have come up a few times today. There is an anti-benefit cuts coalition which was founded by disabled people against CCS union and John which brings together a wide range of deaf and disabled people's organizations voluntary sector organizations and and trade unions sharing ideas and coordinating activities. So if any other organizations here who are not involved would like to get involved, you can contact DPAT through mail dpac.uk.net.

And I was actually talking to the facilitator, a colleague of mine, Meg Thomas, just this week, suggesting the next meeting should perhaps focus on building community movements. Um, the other thing to let people know about is a conference that's happening this Saturday, the 19th of July between 10 and 5:00 p.m. at Hamilton Hamilton House near King's Cross. It's hosted by claim the future and it's going to be on the topic of Labor in government one year on uh you'll be able to hear Donald speak, uh, Kate Picket, Prem Seeker, and Acid Raven. you.

Thank you to all our speakers. Um, and thank you to everyone for coming. Thank you.