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Detroit, Michigan

Thursday, October 10, 2019

(At about 12:40 P.M.)

MR. J. TRAVIS: My name is Jeremy Travis and I'm going to be the facilitator today. We want to introduce the Square One Project by showing you a video to give you some sense of what's going and to set the mood, set the scope for our discussion today. So something will happen behind me.

(Video shown)

MR. B. WESTERN: Well, welcome everyone. Welcome to Detroit. That is welcome to Detroit. Welcome to the Square One Roundtable on the Future of Justice Policy where our theme for the next three days is examining violence in the United States and its implications for justice policy and practice.

I want to welcome everyone around this table. We've got really an extraordinary group of people to have this conversation with -- thank you so much for sharing your time with us over the next three days. It really is a gift and we're very grateful indeed.

I want to begin by acknowledging support from The Joyce Foundation when Katharine and Jeremy
and I began a discussion about this event with Soledad. We felt that Joyce were the perfect partners and Soledad was the perfect collaborator to engage a discussion about the challenge of violence in America and the project of justice reform.

We're very grateful also to Arnold Ventures who have been the key supporter not only of the roundtable but also Square One in general. I want to particularly acknowledge Jeremy's role in this leadership in Square One since we began this conversation five years ago, I suppose, at the end of the national academy of science report process on examining high rates of incarceration in the United States. Jeremy has been just an indefatigable lesson for me in how research might connect with the real world and have an influence on public policy.

Also want to thank Nina Vinik Dwivedi from The Joyce Foundation and Nina, of course, is program director for gun violence and for the gun violence prevention program, and I want to thank Joyce for joining us as an observer today.

We're going to hear more from Soledad tomorrow with her welcoming remarks, but I'd like to invite her to say hello and make a brief statement.

MS. S. McGrath: Thank you, Bruce. Yes,
hello everyone. We are just delighted to be able to partner with Bruce and Jeremy and the whole Columbia Justice Lab team on this roundtable. To me, I think this is -- this is one of the national platforms that really has the potential to move the field, and so I'm really excited. I'll talk more about Joyce's interest in this work and our approach to the issues that we're going to be discussing over the next three days, tomorrow. But welcome on our behalf and I'm delighted to join you. Thank you.

MR. B. WESTERN: I also want to thank the Damon J. Keith Center for Civil Rights and Wayne State. We've been very lucky in all of our roundtable meetings to be on college campuses. I think this is a very important venue for a discussion like this, and Wayne State has been a tremendous partner in the organization of this event.

I also want to acknowledge Amanda Alexander and the Detroit Justice Center for their partnership. We've had many, many conversations and emails, and I'm not sure whatever modes we've communicated in in preparation for today. Amanda, I think, is doing primary work in the country, and I feel just absolutely lucky to be working with her on
this project.

Let me quickly introduce our Square One team. Katharine Huffman is our executive director and the leading spirit and energy of Square One. My great friend and collaborator, Jeremy Travis, is co-founder of Square One. I think many of you have been in contact with Sukyi McMahon. Sukyi manages the roundtable. Sukyi...

MS. S. McMahon: I'm here.

MR. B. Western: Sukyi is quite genius in pulling off these events three times now, and we couldn't do anything without her.

Also joining us from the Square One team, we have Anamika Dwivedi Madison. You'll be seeing them around over the next three days. This is certainly a team effort and we have really extraordinary support from all of them.

I also want to acknowledge The Ray Van Group who have been a huge part of our communications. This conversation, I think, would not be as resonant and important as it is without the work that's done by Ray Van that helps to amplify the discussion that we're about to have and as you saw from our video, provide us with a vehicle for communicating the message that we're developing.
Media Tank, Michael, I know, will pull aside many of you over the next two or three days to talk about the work you're doing to discuss how it might connect with the major themes of Square One and our lives I've already acknowledged.

Of course perhaps the greatest contribution comes from the participants themselves. We know that all of you are unbelievably busy in your days off, and we've asked you to share three days with us in what we think is a nationally important conversation about violence and justice reform. We're very, very grateful that you're able to join us in this project. This is a big ask, we know, and we're hoping it will reward the larger national conversation and cultural and policy conversation around the social problem of violence and the challenge that it poses. So thank you, thank you very much.

Our format over the coming three days, Jeremy will moderate our discussions. We're guided in our agenda by a number of papers that were circulated to all of you, and we'll begin each session with presentation from our -- a short presentation, really the provocation for our agenda for each of the panels, and you can see the papers
have ranged very widely. I would encourage you, if there is still more or deeper reading to be done, I would encourage you to do it. I think if you're tuning in from the life stream, I believe the papers are available online as well, and I would encourage you to look at them.

So our theme is violence, right, that's what we're going to be spending our time talking about over the next three days. And we've been in anticipation of this meeting. This is, I think, one of the most pivotal conversations that we're going to have in our three years of our first phase of our Square One of trying to reimagine what justice in America might be. And violence, I think, is a pivotal topic because it creates a twofold challenge.

Violence creates the challenge of healing. How do we get beyond violence in some sense, and it creates a challenge of accountability, what should that be. And they're very difficult questions for the criminal justice system. We often motivate discussions like this by saying that large reductions in prison populations are going to require fundamental sentencing reform particularly around violence. We've seen a lot of reform
activity around drug policy, but we know that that
is not going to be a significant retreat from mass
incarceration.

But I want to push us to have a broader
conversation than that, and I want us to think
broadly about violence over the next three days.
And certainly, violence includes community violence,
vviolence that happens on the street. It includes
domestic violence that happens in private homes.
But it also includes the state violence of punitive
criminal justice. It includes the state violence of
incarceration and arrest and, of course, the police
have a critical role there, too. It also includes
the historic and collective violence that lies at
the heart of racial injustice in America. So as we
consider the problem of violence, I want us to think
expansively about it.

I want to acknowledge our authors. I
think they have provided us with extraordinary
provocation over the next three days with some
wonderful papers to dig into. And with that, I want
to hand it off to Peter Hammer.

MR. P. HAMMER: It's my pleasure to be
able to welcome you on behalf of the Damon J. Keith
Center for Civil Rights, and welcome you on behalf
of the Wayne State University Law School and welcome you on behalf of Wayne State University.

We're still grieving the loss of our namesake, Judge Keith passed this last April; but I think the best way to carry on his life and legacy is to do a program like this, to be relevant, to be thinking about how this fits into a civil rights frame. At the Keith Center I often say that we believe that structural racism is our generation's civil rights challenge.

And I go on to define structural racism as the interinstitutional dynamics that produce and reproduce racial disparate outcomes over time. Whether that's disparate outcomes in terms of employment or mass incarceration or education or health and wealth. And with all these wonderful voices around this table I want us to form one tile for a mosaic that we're creating. And that's to think about violence within that frame of structural racism, and take your challenge in thinking about it much more broadly.

And if we do that we start to realize the forms of interpersonal violence are often symptomatic of the dysfunction of the spatial structural racism that has been producing the
geography of cities like Detroit or where you were at before. So we don't want to -- I don't want to divorce this notion of interpersonal violence from systems. We have a bias in our country if you look at individuals and modeling systems.

Thinking again about these interrelated systems, but then we have as well this sort of collective violence that the harm that is inflicted, the structural harm that is inflicted by spatial structural racism, the unemployment, the poverty, the health disparities, the disparities of wealth are also forms of violence.

So it's going to be, I think, an incredibly important discussion. One of the greatest attitudes was it's importance to listen to learn and to learn to listen. And I think if we also take that advice, there's a whole of learning to listen to. And I thank you very much for listening to me.

MR. B. WESTERN: Thanks, Pete. Amanda.

MS. ALEXANDER: Welcome everyone to Detroit. It is a real honor to be here with you all and to have a conversation over the next three days. I really appreciate the fact that we're thinking about violence and the only way that you can, on
multiple levels. So we'll have people talking about founding violence, structural violence, interpersonal violence, and I'll leave it to the paper givers to get into more of each of those. But in terms of grounding us in place, I'll take a few minutes to do that.

In terms of founding violence, two days or three days from now on Monday, Detroit will celebrate its second Indigenous People's Day, due to the hard fought victory of activists and organizers to make that happen. What that means is that up until last year, we elect many cities across the U.S. that are openly celebrating the purveyor of white supremacy, of colonialism, of genocide. And so, yes, this is a victory but it also marks the state of affairs.

In terms of structural violence, I think that there are some things that it's important to keep in mind about the place that we are in. So Detroit is the poorest major city in the U.S. About half of our children live in poverty. Tens of thousands of homeless have faced water shut offs. There are people living without running water in our city.

Forty percent of Detroiters do not have
access to the internet. Young people are trying to pick up an internet connection at McDonald's in order to do their homework on time. Tens of -- hundreds of thousands of homes have been charged with tax foreclosure in the last several years.

So people are familiar with the sub prime mortgage crisis around 2008 that swept the country, but this was a completely separate wave of disconnection. These are people who own their homes outright, but have not paid back taxes. And for all sorts of reasons these were taxes that they never should have paid, they were being over assessed and they were eligible for poverty tax exemptions that were not readily available to them. So the level of disconnection in this city is really unspeakable.

And, yet, in the face of that we are home to some of the most visionary organizing on the planet. So, before she passed, Grace Lee Boggs, the legendary philosopher and activist, said I feel sorry for people who don't live in Detroit. I have to agree with her; and it's because in the face of devastation, Detroit has birthed so many solutionaries. That was Grace's word, people who are coming up with visionary solutions in the face of devastation.
So I could go on all day about some of the best solutionaries. Shout out just a few. So, when the grocery stores left, Detroiters didn't want to leave. People taught themselves how to farm and they started things like the Detroit Black Community Food Security Network. That are really, you know, pushing forward ideas of what it means to build a resilient, local community food system, to share seeds to make sure that food is being sourced in restaurants and to really put forward a theory on top of that of black food sovereignty.

It's people like our Water Warriors. So, even though we're on a quarter of the world's fresh water here in Michigan, people know that they're letting the water go to others and that people here in Detroit are facing water shut offs. Because of political decisions, our access to clean acceptable water as a human right is our fight.

This is absolutely a fight in all of your cities. And if several generations from now we do have access to water readily and it's available as a human right, it will be because of Monica Lewis Patrick and the people of Detroit, women like Nayyirah Shariff, who are on the front lines of that battle right now.
In terms of interpersonal violence, we are also home to some incredible solutionaries, and I'm just so glad that they're around the table today because they are coming up with solutions here in Detroit that the rest of the country needs to learn from. The people who are my teachers in this world, people like Barbara Jones, who is here with the Wayne State Center for Peace and Conflict Studies who has been leading work with young people underscoring justice for so many years. 

People like Alia Harvey-Quinn with Force Detroit, who is just doing such incredible community level work listening to people about what do they see as the causes of violence and what are the solutions. So because of Alia's work in Force Detroit we know that for every police shooting or every shooting that happens in the city it costs 1.6 million dollars to prosecute them. So city resources are going into addressing things after the fact, and their work is helping us make the case for more prevention on the front end thinking about what could we do early with a different sort of investment to interrupt violence.

And, of course, it is people like Ray Lyons, whose Detroit work is valuable as to gangs,
who are doing hospital-based violence intervention programs to really wrap around young people who are dealing with gun violence.

So we know that we have a certain vision of who the victims tend to be, but in reality young black men 15 to 34 are most likely to be harmed, and they are wrapping around these young people and asking: What do you need to do? And that's exactly what we're going to give you. Because of their work they have been able to figure out a way by wrapping around people and providing them with jobs, with mental health support, all the other things they need to move their lives forward; they're interrupting cycles of trauma, violence and incarceration.

It's really an honor to partner with you and all of you. And I think in the next few days I want us to keep in mind that this is going to be about centering the wisdom and the experiences of people who are closest to violence, who have caused harm, who have been harmed. I think if we keep those perspectives central and really at the forefront that will guide us in the right direction.

I would also encourage us to think really big, not just think about tweaking around the edges,
because that won't last. I'd like to invoke a mentor and friend of mine, Vince Warren who is the head of the Center for Constitutional Rights in New York City. He posed this beautiful question a few years ago that five generations from now, what will black people thank us for. I think that's the level that we need to think about because this is intergeneration work. We cannot be thinking about what can we win in the next election cycle. We need to be thinking about what type of intergeneration healing are we ushering in and that we'd be honored to be a part of.

So welcome again, and I look forward to this conversation.


MS. HUFFMAN: Yes, thank you. Good morning, good afternoon everyone. I'm Katharine Huffman, the executive director of The Square One Project, and I have not enough words for how grateful and glad we are to be here with you all today.

Amanda, thank you for that welcome to this place. The concept of proximity and of being in location and near to different experiences, different cities, different cultures is something
that's critical to our work. And so we're just so incredibly grateful and honored to be able to be here in Detroit for this conversation.

I want to really briefly just give folks a bit of an overview of where we are in the arc of The Square One project's work. We have two different processes that are going on at once. One is an executive session on the future of justice policy, which is a sustained conversation among a group of people who commit to coming together over and over again over the course of three years. Amanda is part of that, Liz Glazier, Danielle Serad and others around this table and others who are not here with us today.

In addition to that we have the series of roundtables, which is a public conversation where we can really dig in on some of these key questions that are necessary in order for us to be able to really start foundationally thinking about how we can do something really different.

Our first roundtable conversation took place in Durham, North Carolina last fall, a year ago. We partnered with North Carolina Central University and HBCU there in Durham to dig in on questions around the history of racial and economic
inequity and its relevance for current policymaking
for our policies and practices in our justice -- in
seeking justice today.

From there we went to Oakland, California
where we were in the spring. And in Oakland we had
a conversation about over criminalization, punitive
excess and the courts. That's -- you saw the sort
of summary video of some of the things that emerged
in that conversation to give you a little flavor of
how that conversation went. But we were really
building on that first conversation about history
and racial and economic inequity to put that
alongside criminalization, punitive excess, what it
is that these words mean and the ways that we put
that into practice in our court systems.

And now we come here today to a
conversation about violence. As you start to think
about reacting to actions, as you start to think
about how do we grapple with these things, we -- as
Bruce said, we really can't avoid the conversation
of violence, as much as we would really like to in a
lot of settings. It's a harder conversation, it's a
deeper conversation, it's a closer conversation for
all of us in different ways.

And so the work that we'll be doing
together over the course of the next few days is again building on that work from the first two roundtables and moving us forward again.

Just to let you know where we're going, the next two roundtables, there are five in total, the fourth one will look at as we start to think deeply about dismantling, starting over, what are we thinking of building up in place of what we're taking away.

We'll be looking at social and political engagement and rights in the context of thinking about the future of justice and safety and health in our communities.

And then at our final roundtable we'll do a focus on the values that should be guiding all of our practice and policy as we think about justice, safety and health.

I can go ahead and tell you you can all mark your calendars, the fourth roundtable, we're really excited to let you know, is going to be taking place in Austin, Texas. It will be April 2nd through 4th, did I get that right, I think, yes. April 2nd through 4th, and we'll be partnering with Huston-Tillotson University, which is based there in Austin. Again, HBCU has been leading the way in
Austin for a long time on a number of different issues, and we're just really excited about that partnership. So, details to come there, but we hope that many of you will join us again.

So with that, I welcome you. Thank you for being part of this process, part of this sustained commitment. And welcome to The Square One partnership.

Jeremy.

MR. J. TRAVIS: So let me add my voice of welcome to everybody and my thanks to all of those who have joined us for this discussion over the next few days. Gratitude to The Joyce Foundation and to our ventures for the financial support. But really thanks to those of you who are here for giving of your time and your energy and wisdom and your insights into this topic of violence over the next three days.

I'm very grateful to Amanda and the Justice Center for being our host and colleague in this work and other folks from Detroit. And when we go over the agenda, you'll see that we have a space set aside tomorrow for justice in Detroit discussions. We really want to hear more from Amanda from the high level of things happening in
Detroit, so we are learning from some of those experiences. So you've been welcomed and thanked and all that, and now we'll just start getting to work.

Let me talk about my role for a second so you'll understand how this works at the roundtable. So, I'm your facilitator. What that means is we'll get into the rules of the roundtable in a second or ways that we get this work done. This is a very big table, the biggest that we've ever managed. So it will be a challenge but it has to be built on that. That also means that I'm not contributing to the conversation in terms of my perspectives and thoughts, unless I implicitly say that. I'm the facilitator, I don't want to say something on a subject that's untimely, that's really not why I'm here. I'm here to help you have a really productive discussion over the next few days.

So just to talk about somebody else who is in the room, there's this piece of machinery in front of me, which is live streaming everything that we're saying. So if you're dozing off, you might want to step outside for a second because that could be recorded for posterity. We are live streaming this conversation into the cyber room, and we are
very pleased to see how many people are sitting here watching from their desktops or they're checking in when they can. That's part of the Square One idea is to really take these conversations and make them part of a larger national discussion.

It also means that this will be recorded and on the Square One website, creating a public record of these conversations. It's very important because we want to expand our impact, your impact into a larger world.

So in that sense I want to thank our partners who have traveled with us around the country. The NCCU Law School's Virtual Justice Project, who helped make this possible, and to thank Theresa, our court reporter, who is making sure that every one of your pearls of wisdom is captured accurately. We will have a transcript of this, as well. This is to just elevate the expectation. We think this is a very important national conversation, the Square One Project roundtables in their own right.

Let me also say that it's just a pleasure, as a former college president, to be on a college campus and feel the energy of the students in the building. And I hope that some of them know
about this and on the way here, thank the Damon J.

Keith Center for making this possible.

We are really interested in connecting
this work to the energy of the next generation.

Suffice it to say that this generation that I'm part
of has screwed it up pretty badly. So that we hope
that there's a lot of energy and ideas of
creativity. Also being on a college campus is part
of our reason for -- that's one of our reasons for
centering the work here.

And in that context let me just say that
we're thankful to our colleagues of American
University, who have organized a number of watch
parties around the country for students to gather
and to listen to what we're talking about. So just
want you to think that what we're doing today is
intentionally connected to what's on a big network.

Speaking of observers, there's many of
you. This is a good sign. In Durham was a small
hardy band, we hoped it would get a little bit
bigger. This is big. So we know that many of you
have a direct connection to this work and what
you're working on, you're here for your own
interest. Unfortunately, we're not going to invite
you all to participate at all times.
There are breaks, there's evening events.

Please feel free, and I encourage you to connect with anybody at the table here, if you want to make that connection. That's what we're all about. We will find time over our three days together to -- I'll signal it when we're open to observations from the observers or questions or something that's missing -- that we've been missing. So just, I'll let you know when that feels right, as I keep going. But I just want to thank you for being here and for giving your time and attention to this discussion.

Speaking of spreading the word, we have hash tags, of course. We're on the social media, so feel free to use #WeImagineJustice for a tag line or #SquareOne, with the number one roundtable. We want to encourage big discussion about what we're doing here.

We also have left cards on your chairs, where you finish the sentence, we imagine justice in the following way. We keep track of those that we've seen in the videos, as well, and I think there's going to be an overflow room established today. So that's another sign.

Our friends from Media Tank have already been introduced, but they'll be roaming around
taking video and pulling some people aside for interviews. And that means that people should sign the release forms to make sure we have it all down properly.

So let me just talk a bit about what we're going to do over the next three days and how we're going to do things. It's important because of the size of the roundtable and to help our reporter for you to introduce yourselves. And I'll try to say, what do you want to say. Let's get names because it's not always clear who's speaking, so we can record it and identify who is speaking. So it's not that I've forgotten your name, if I knew you. So with Candice it's, you know, I'll do that once in awhile.

These microphones don't amplify, so if you feel you're not being heard, don't get closer to it, it's not going to help. It's up to you to use your indoor voice, your outdoor voice, whatever voice gets you heard; this is not going to do it. We're going through the technology of this here.

I would ask people to use people first language, not to talk about people, not use the words just to make a point, inmates, not defendants, not cons. People first language. One of the themes
of our work, I think, especially in formal discussions must include a form of dignity and to humanize the discussions that we're having. So I'd ask you if you can to exercise that to show respect.

And the final thing I'll say before we talk about the agenda is that for some people this discussion in particular might be difficult, emotionally difficult. And I just want to thank the people from Healing by Choice who have created a room, where it is nearby, if there are folks who wanted to step out and just be by themselves, just be quiet for a moment or want to speak to somebody. This is a difficult topic so we recognize that before we get started so that private room is made available.

CHUNG HOW: Hello. My name is Chung How, and we're here and we're so honored to be here. I'll let her explain a little bit about why we're here today and hope that you folks get started.

MS. T. JOHNSON: First and foremost, we want to thank Columbia University for inviting us and the Columbia University Justice Lab. Also, we want to thank each and every one of you around this room for the work that you're doing. We couldn't be here without you. It is our belief that together we
go further.

We have -- our group is called Healing by Choice and we're in the McGregor Room, McGregor Building, room 202. We're inviting everyone over for complimentary healing services. We have Reiki, which is kind of like massage but with a holistic touch. We have acupuncture to help relieve stress, anxiety. We have a self led, self care table which if you want to just have additional relaxation, and we have emotional support team there as well.

Our team is Talitha, Schantell. We also have Myanita, she's starting today with us. And we also have Lottie and Adela. So we hope to see you guys, take some time for yourself. You can also just come to a quiet space if you need to decompress and relax. We're here for you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The McGregor is right around the corner where you folks had lunch and it's right upstairs at 202 right next door. So we hope to see you folks.

MR. J. TRAVIS: So what I'd ask you to do is just to take out the agenda that's in your packet, and I'm going to expand a little bit on what Bruce said on the road map for the next three days. That's where we're headed and then we'll ask --
we'll do something to introduce ourselves to each other. Just where are we going as a group and that's what's on the agenda.

So having said that, I just lost my thought. So we've broken up our time into segments and the first segment is the story of violence in America. So each of the roundtables will be participated in, you'll know about it, we always start with history.

And the Oakland roundtable started with discussions led by Fatimah Muhammad. Our first roundtable in Durham was prepared by Heather Thompson from Michigan. So we always start our discussions always with history, and we're very fortunate. Kellie Carter Jackson is here, the author of Force and Freedom, and she will get that conversation started. We'll then take a break. Then we're going to look at Violence Says it All. Violence is a life course perspective which is also a very thought provoking paper and she will get us started. She is from Chicago and we will have a discussion.

Now each of these discussion papers is not, I say this to my academic friends, we're not, you're not at an academic conference. We are not at
a place where people say you missed such and such, or footnote 35, if only you knew my work, you would have cited me, that's not what we're doing. So the purpose of communicating by us all today is, fortunately, we're engaged in the nation's best scholars for the purpose of those papers and their intervention.

Kellie is going to get the conversation started in like ten minutes. What are the top line points of your paper. This is different from the presentations of the paper, because frankly once Kellie makes her presentation, they're going to sit back because then it's up to us to take the provocation where it takes us in our thinking. And then I'll ask them in the end what to do here. So it's a different format, they know that, I hope that that's still comfortable. So that's the plan.

Tonight -- and we'll here from Sukyi later about the evening events because they're a very important part of the Square One Project, so we don't want you just sitting here just talking with each other. We want you getting other stimulea. Tonight there is a reception with the young people. We will come back tomorrow, we will hear from Soledad.
Then our next paper, next topic will be prompted by a paper by David Hureau from the University of Albany on colleges of violence in America. And next, our friend Beth Richie from the University of Illinois, Chicago. So you see the flow of our history going into some of the dynamics and then finally getting into community level of discussions. So big dynamic then smaller, smaller, smaller and then violence in the state.

Paul Butler, not here at the moment, the paper that I think has been distributed, it came in late and he's looking at violence in the state. And then we'll expand our table to invite colleagues from Detroit to really sort of bring the local perspective to what otherwise would be very outside. So we want a local conversation, we really do want to learn from them.

And then on Saturday -- then we have another wonderful evening event on arts, justice that Sukyi will tell us more about right before we get on the shuttle. And then we'll come back Saturday morning and then we'll hear from Daniel Webster. After that we'll hear from Barbara Jones, who hasn't written a paper but she's going to share her personal experiences and some insights from her
work in healing which is going to be very -- an appropriate way, I think, for us to end our three days together. And then we'll be done. So small ambition.

At the end of each of these segments, I turn to Bruce and ask him to -- summarize isn't quite the right word, but take some themes from the discussion that he just heard. And you'll see, I think you'll agree, that he's uniquely gifted.

Before we move on to the next topic or take a break, Bruce helps us with the order of what we've just heard of the previous discussion.

So what are the rules of the roundtable? It's very important for me every once in a while to get people's eye contact. If you want to get my attention, hand gestures will work, you can do this thing (indicating). When it doesn't work, shout at me; you can finger wave to get my attention. But I will create a queue because people want to get into the conversation after the opening presentation by our paper writer. Please get my attention and we'll try to take you in order.

I reserve the right to break the queue just to say actually what someone said last session is more important than the next person, so I want to
bring David Hureau in, right? I want to bring
someone in because there's a connection and let's
see if we can make some connections over the time
we're together. That's important over our time
together and you have the right at any time to
exercise what I call the insistent wave.

And it could be this (indicating). It
could be throwing your notebook on the table because
you might then have to say whatever you have to say,
and we respect that. So that means it's urgent,
that means it's going to connect to what you just
heard and we want to have that raw moment. That's
your right; my right is to break the queue.
Otherwise we'll try to be respectful of people's
desired conversation in order.

It's a big table. Even if it were a
smaller table, I want to say this, please be brief.
This is not a chance to make your stump speech. We
always have a stump speech. Not a chance to say my
program is wonderful in the following 15 ways. Just
try to be respectful of the fact that a lot of
people here want to contribute. And brevity is a
gift. Not everybody has that gift. And if you
choose not to exercise your natural gift to be
brief, I might find a way to remind you that you
have that right. And my ways, I try to be subtle, it could be like this, something like this. It could be like this.

Brevity is important just out of respect to your colleagues because I'm sure what you have to say is great, but you can probably also say it as briefly as possible so that we could move along and it's cumulative.

I respect somebody also to say the point I want to make was made by somebody two speakers ago, I pass. That's somebody that's really mindful of what's going on. If that's where you are, I encourage you to say that.

So before we do introductions, and we will do that in a second, does anybody have any questions about how we're going to proceed over the next couple days and how the roundtable is going to work?

MS. C. JONES: Could I ask a question?

MR. J. TRAVIS: Candice.

MS. C. JONES: From Katharine's point on, say you have an executive session and you have these public forums. Help me understand how this ties into the larger goal. Like is the point to solicit thoughts and ideas from folks here that feed into
the executive session, how do they relate?

MS. HUFFMAN: That's a great question, I'll just answer quickly. So, the executive session of a roundtable are sort of in a symbiotic relationship with one another. So the executive session guides us as we're planning the roundtables. The issues that we're grappling with on the roundtable, when the project was conceived, there were sort of some broad things we knew that we wanted to touch on but the way in which they're being approached is really -- is really driven by the conversation of the executive session.

So, for example, the initial roundtable which really focused very deeply on history was something that came out of our first executive session conversation. And so when we talk about racial and economic inequity, which was the preassigned topic, let's do it in the context of history was the result of the executive session.

Then similarly, as we mentioned, there are people who are here participating in each roundtable who are in the -- among our observers who are part of the executive session who also are sort of reporting back to that. So in that way they sort of feed each other. But I think, you know, more
broadly than that, the roundtables in particular because they are public and because they are connected to the work of so many people who are here sort of speaking on their own behalf, of course, but also on behalf of many, many others, they are also part of connecting to work that's happening already, bringing that into the room and hopefully impacting that work with what comes out of these conversations. Is that helpful?

(Candice Jones nods)

MR. J. TRAVIS: And the related question that we should answer is what's the product of this three years worth of activity? And the executive session itself is designed to produce papers, authored or co-authored by members of the executive sessions on issues and topics that come up in a lot of the executive session. And those papers are -- our hope for them, our ambition for them is they will inform thinking, discussion and the next generation of work on justice information.

The papers commissioned for the roundtable also have an after life and we hope that everybody will sign up for this activity. They've become scholarly papers in special issues of edited volumes. So the papers from the first session are
on their way to production in the W. E. B. DuBois journal. The second session, I don't know if they published the second session yet. So our other ambition is to really prepare the next generation of scholars at places like Wayne State who just think differently, think creatively and to recognize the work of the scholars here.

In some ways the most important product is this, is the discussion, it's the web site, it's the social media, it's the videos, it's the work outside of these rooms. And we're in active discussion about what might follow our three years, and that's an open discussion.

Any other questions before we start?

So you're about to get an assignment, and here's the assignment. Write it on your phone if you want to or your laptop. It's typical at this moment for people to go around the table and ask people to introduce themselves and their names and their affiliations. We're going to do that. Just to sort of raise the steaks here, I'd like to ask you to take a minute to write a sentence or two, sentence or two.

So, no semi-colons, not a run on sentence, a sentence or two, maybe three, what do
you hope happens, what do you want to see happen by virtue of your presence here? And it's more than just promoting your own work, but it's really what do you want to see happen coming out of this discussion over the next few days. Just write down your sentence or two, and if they're duplicates that's fine. And then we'll go around the table and give your name, institutional affiliation and what your hopes are for our time together, your aspirations for our time together.

And just because she spoke, I'll ask Candice Jones to be the first one to speak.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Before Candice speaks, I want to note the most important product of this roundtable is what you do with your time here. It will be very interesting to see how people do or don't use this, what they create.

Candice, you go first. That's not the assignment. Okay. Do something with your hands.

Candice, your name, your affiliation and finish the sentence, I hope for our time together is.

MS. C. JONES: I'm Candice Jones, I head the Public Welfare Foundation, and my hope for our time together is that on the intersection of violence and criminal justice I'm hoping to learn
something new that creates a pensive point that
makes me hopeful about this issue.

MR. J. TRAVIS: David.

MR. D. HUREAU: I'm David Hureau, I'm an
assistant professor at the University at Albany,
SUNY, and I hope to contribute and be the recipient
of new ways of thinking about the problem of
violence.

MS. KEELS: My name is Micere Keels, I'm
an associate professor at the University of Chicago,
and my hope with my time here with you all is to
learn from all of you.

MR. J. TRAVIS: I ask you to speak up
because observers who aren't in the line of our
voices are trying to hear.

MR. LUCKY: My name is Antong Lucky, I'm
a national engagement director for Urban
Specialists, OGU, Original Gangster University. My
hope for here is that I take some innovative tools
and also meet each and every last one of you guys
here. That's my hope.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Great, thank you.

MS. HUFFMAN: I'm Katharine Huffman,
executive director of The Square One Project, and my
hope for these next few days together is that we
find ways to place healing at the center of our conversation about the future of justice and that we can recognize our shared experiences and commonalities around the need for that healing.

MR. H. FLOWERS: My name is Halim Flowers, I'm an advocate for love, and my hope is that my presence compels everybody to love everyone fearlessly.

MS. S. McGRATH: I'm Soledad McGrath, I'm with The Joyce Foundation, and my hope for this group is we move past platitude and move towards concrete solutions.

MR. B. DECKER: Good afternoon. My name is Brent Decker, I'm with Cure Violence. I think my hope is to learn, but also to bring back to kind of the public health around which we missed. And I think often very quiet and silent on the issues that are in the gray area at this roundtable.

MS. B. JONES: Good afternoon, everyone, my name is Barbara L. Jones from Wayne State University. But there is another Barbara Jones that works for Wayne State University. That's just a disclaimer for all of you. What my hope is -- what my hope is during our time and our discussions together is that we all develop a deeper, deeper
consciousness with courage to bear witness to the
issues that we may not want to see, hear or
understand as it relates to justice and healing and
what it really means to be human.

MR. J. CARTAGENA: Good afternoon, my
name is Juan Cartagena, I run LatinoJustice PRLDEF,
formerly called Puerto Rican Legal Defense and
Education Fund. My hope is to learn. I want to
learn how to de-link the term, crime in question. I
want to learn about how we best restore to
practices, especially perhaps those that are
anchored in native indigenous teachings and African
based teachings, that we can educate the Latino
community about how we can restore to justice.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: I am Amanda Alexander,
the founder and executive director of the Detroit
Justice Center and senior research scholar at
University of Michigan Law School. My hope is
really to continue relationships and really
strengthen some of this connective tissue that's
happening across the country in terms of different
experiments and doing the training from past cycle,
and each training keeps getting better.

MR. K. WATTLEY: My name is Keith
Wattley, I'm the executive director of UnCommon Law,
an organization to provide for trial reform, counseling and legal representation for people in California prisons. We have 35,000 people serving life sentences. My hope is that this discussion about an expansive historical approach to violence that makes room for the re-humanizing and even re-individualizing of the experience of violence and healing of people currently in prison.

MS. B. RICHIE: Good afternoon, my name is Beth Richie, I am the head of the department of criminology, law and justice at the University of Illinois, Chicago and an activist member of a group called INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence. And my hope is that the work we do will dignify those people who can't be here, especially those people living in cages. And in particular, I hope to bring intersectional lens around gender to the discussion.

MR. D. KENNEDY: My name is David Kennedy. I'm a professor at John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York. My narrow aspiration is to be allowed into the Detroit network. A larger aspiration for the meeting is that we find links between the larger issues of justice reform and immediate work.
MR. J. COLE: How are you guys doing? My name is Jahmal Cole, founder of My Block, My Hood, My City based on the South Side of Chicago. A lot of students have never been Downtown and never seen the lake and never waited for a taxi. Their whole world is shaped by their block or their neighborhood, and that could be tragic without any exposure to the city. My hope, my time with you all, is to listen as much as possible, ask questions and learn because I want to get some ideas. I think ideas are powerful weapons and tools that can be used to change the world, and we can't get ideas by just staying home. So I'm looking forward to asking questions and learning new things, thank you.

MS. E. GLAZER: My name is Elizabeth Glazer. I'm the director of the inner city Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice. And my hope for today is that -- is to learn how we look beyond the frame of thinking about violence as a matter for the criminal justice system and to where we think about the context of violence as to where we go from the very lofty, arrogant platitudes, as someone said, to very concrete solutions in America.

MR. J. TRAVIS: And now we're going to ask this side of the table to continue.
MS. K. CARTER-JACKSON: Hello everyone, good afternoon, I'm Kellie Carter Jackson. I am a student professor at the department of academics. I definitely want to learn something new. That is always my goal as being a scholar. Even more than being a scholar, I want to be able to connect with people in the academy. Oftentimes I'm in spaces speaking with other scholars. What I want to do is look at the theory, but also connect it to practical practices, and see how these ideas can be implemented outside of an academic framework:

MR. LUPPINO-ESPOSITO: I'm Joseph Esposito, I'm a director at the Process Work Institute. We are a bipartisan group that works on criminal justice reform issues. What I want to focus on here, and we've heard a little bit about it already, is finding ways that nonstate actors can be effective and also to just find other ways to minimize the state solutions to what really should be community solutions and really focus on the solutions of what we're facing today.

MS. A. HARVEY-QUINN: My name is Alia Harvey-Quinn. I'm the founder and director of Force Detroit, and I really appreciate what Kellie just stated. Let's be clear that we've been researching
solutions to violence since the eighties and that if those solutions had been implemented, we would not be in the state that we're in. So my hope is that we go beyond just a hierarchy of knowledge to deep tangible solutions that connect to people, less people dead, less people in prison.

MR. D. WEBSTER: Hi, I'm Daniel Webster, I'm a professor at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. It's tough, I mean, everybody's already said what you're going to say. Basically, I want to look at approaches to community restorative practices following acts of violence; and secondly, I want to share a little bit about what I know about efforts to reduce, but also learn about and discuss the harms connected to some of those approaches to reduce gun availability, as well.

MS. F. MUHAMMAD: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Fatimah Muhammad. I'm the executive director of the National Network of Hospital-based Violence Intervention. I changed my name, it's too long. New name is the Health Alliance for Violence Intervention, the HAVI. So my modest goal is for the eradication of structural racism.

MR. J. TRAVIS: In the next three days?
MS. F. MUHAMMAD: In the next three days.
But you know, honestly, what I'm hoping for here is
that we actually build and take our relationships to
really strengthen a much larger movement to
transform systems and mobilize for our liberation.

MR. R. WINANS: Good after, family. And
welcome to Detroit. My name is Ray Winans. I'm
glad to know that everybody is here. So my prayer
is that over the next few we will recognize that the
community is the one that needs to be leading the
work and we use our power and influence to advocate
and follow their lead versus to get folks to follow
ours.

MR. E. JONES: Good afternoon, I'm Eric
Jones. I'm a chief of police in California,
Stockton, California. Thank you for bringing the
missing perspective here, as well. What I hope for
is -- I like to consider myself a practitioner, but
I really require applying active research to push
before best practices. And I'd like to see where
practitioners and academics have commonalities,
speak about our viewpoints and our perspectives.

MS. B. TILLERY: I've Beverly Tillery,
I'm the executive director of the New York City
Anti-Violence Project. I hope that some of my ideas
really merge with the ideas around the table about how do we reframe anti-violence work with the decriminalization frame lens. And I really hope that we not only really get into dialogue but long-term collaboration.

MR. P. HAMMER: So my name is Peter Hammer, professor of law at the Damon J. Keith Center for Civil Rights currently. I'm a big fan of visioning, all right. So my hope is that we can engage in informed visioning that we center our understandings of healing and liberation in new sources of safety and justice.

MS. C. COLON: My name is Celia Colon, founder of G.O.D, which stands for Giving Others Dreams. I'm also a client advocate for the national Bail Project. My hope here for one, of course, is to learn from everyone that I connect with, but to really, really create an action plan that creates systemic change where we really acknowledge that true investment is intervention and the savior of humanity is investing in people. And what we need now is that at the end of day that everything starts and stops with mental health.

MR. R. DAVIS: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Ron Davis. I'm a law practitioner for 30
years and retired police chief, also. I had the
honor of serving in the Obama administration. I'm
now a partner -- I was about to say I'm a partner in
one of the greatest consulting firms in the country.
I guess I got beeped out on that.

I believe in the project and my hope for
all of our experience and titles and successes is
that it serves as a foundation for the discussion,
but not a limiting of our ability to be creative and
think outside of our own experience. So we're
impressive in what we've accomplished, but that can
hinder us unless we step away from that and accept
new ideas.

MS. D. SERED: Good afternoon, everyone.
I'm Danielle Sered. I am the executive director of
Common Justice. My hope for us and others around
the table is that we stop ever pretending that
solutions to violence don't exist and have not
always existed; and, instead, really examine the
kinds of shifts in power that will be necessary to
elevate and center resources those solutions.

ERIC CUMBERBATCH: Good afternoon,
everyone. Thank you for having me. I am grateful
to the activists and advocates in New York City that
have provided me the platform to be here today. My
name is Eric Cumberbatch, I'm the executive director of the New York City's mayor's Office to Prevent Gun Violence. And I hope to leave the table with healing being at the core of all of our efforts and the understanding that the co-production of public safety must be community led.

MR. J. TRAVIS: All right. Katharine.

MS. K. HUFFMAN: I just want to also acknowledge for everyone two of our participants, Kimberly Fox and Paul Butler, are going to be joining us tomorrow. They weren't able to get here until tonight so they'll be joining us.

And also want to just hold for a moment, Pastor Mike McBride, who was planning to be here -- he's been at our other two roundtables -- had a tragedy in his congregation and is not able to be with us this week, but he sent his dear regards and we'll be missing him.

MR. J. TRAVIS: So I want to say just two more words, and we'll ask Kellie Carter Jackson to get started. We'll ask what Square One means, and we'll have someone from the Square One team tell us where the title came from and what it does and doesn't mean.

The idea that brings us together under
this umbrella is the idea of a radical
reimagination. And many of you have stated this as
your hope for your time here, participated and
contributed to the process of reimagining justice in
our country and what that might be to you.

We call it Square One thinking, sort of,
what if we ask ourselves if we started at Square
One. What if we really set aside what we have
created, acknowledge the harms that have been
associated with the system over a long period of
time and acknowledge, in particular, the racial
injustice that has contributed to that system and
started thinking anew, as if we were at square one.

At some of the discussions of Square One,
both the executive session and the roundtable just
among friends, there is an acknowledgement that
there was a time when there was at square one.
We're not saying let's go back to that time. That
time never existed, and conceptually we have to
acknowledge to get to that different way of
thinking, we have to do some hard historical
reckoning. It sounds like it's a somewhere over the
rainbow moment.

It's actually not just an imagination
process, it's also a reckoning at some personal
level and historical level and concrete level, which
is the paper we're about to hear that what we have
created not only has workings of an empirical sense,
but has done damage and is conceptually taught.

So the Square One idea is a way of
creating ourselves at the same time binding
ourselves. I just want to say that because when
expressing ourselves, we have to think differently,
we have to think creatively and we have to think
historically. That's the intro.

Kellie Carter Jackson, I don't know if
you know this, so Kellie's written this book, and
you know I was in the audience in the historical
society when you gave that.

MS. K. CARTER-JACKSON: No.

MR. J. TRAVIS: She's here. So if you're
at all into this like I am, you've got to read this
book. It will challenge your understanding of the
abolition movement. I'm so glad you're here.

MS. K. CARTER-JACKSON: Thank you.

MR. J. TRAVIS: I just want you to know
that if you give us like ten minutes or so framing,
and then we'll get going, unless there's anything
else that we have to talk about. Ready to go?

MS. K. CARTER-JACKSON: First of all,
thank you, thank you so much for inviting me to be here, you never know who's in the audience when you give some of these talks. I also want to say thank you for bringing me back to Detroit. I was born in Detroit at Hutzel Hospital, and my mother was raised in Sterling, Michigan, my father was raised in River Rouge. My roots go way back to Detroit, and so it's really special for me to be back in Detroit.

I haven't been back in a few years and it feels good. And I see how much the city has changed. So, I also feel really humble to be here talking. I saw that the first like two, Heather Thompson and Fatimah Mohammad, huge people in the field, so it's really humbling for me.

I want to talk and take ten minutes, I don't want to go for too long, about some really difficult questions about violence, how we understand violence. And not just talk about violence in terms of it being problematic, but looking at violence in terms of its utility and how it's employed and how it gets used and how sometimes it succeeds in ways that we don't expect.

I look at the abolitionist movement -- my book, of course, is all about freedom and how black abolitionists or black leaders in the 19th century
said, listen, slavery starts in violence, it's
sustained by violence, it will only be overthrown by
violence.

So, I looked at a group of people who
would be considered radical and talk about how they
reimagine violence, reimagine the overthrow of the
institutional of slavery and say, moral persuasion
is not working. You cannot morally persuade slave
owners to give up their slaves. Nonviolence is not
working, turning the other cheek is not working.

So what is it that does work? And so
these groups of black men and women in the 19th
century, when around the Civil War they start to arm
themselves, they start to carry pistols, they start
to develop their own black self-protection
societies, and they're actually very successful at
making sure that fugitive slaves are not returned to
slavery and protecting not just themselves but their
communities and even strangers.

So I talk about this concept of
protective violence, it's not just self-defense,
it's not just someone coming at me, how do I defend
myself, but how are black leaders and black
communities protecting oppressed people. And some
of the questions I asked is how should oppressed
people respond to their own oppression?

So I think a lot of times the narratives that we've been given is very, what I call romantic bedtime stories, people like the underground railroad, people running away and people fleeing, but we don't realize that in order to flee, you also had to fight. And that a lot of these runaways are arming themselves and are committing murder to prevent themselves from being sent back into slavery.

And it's a topic that I think a lot of people are uncomfortable talking about, because we privilege the performance of nonviolence. We think that nonviolence is almost like Godliness, right, that we put it at this level that is so righteous that anything that operates outside of that is sort of -- we object to that.

And so I wanted to sort of put this idea on its head and look at this group of radical people who are saying; no, we need to protect ourselves, we need to arm ourselves, we need to defend ourselves, and how to actually do that.

The type of question I really want to look at is: Is violence about a means of producing social change? I think it's interesting and I talk
about this in the papers, as well, is how black
communities are able to create or sustain and bring
about change over time.

One of the examples I give is of the
Black Panther Party and how they used the Second
Amendment, and they carried arms wherever they went.
And they inadvertently created change, it created
gun reform, right. If you look at the state of
California, who has one of the strictest gun reform
states, this was in response to black people arming
themselves.

And then just recently I was watching
Dave Chappelle, and he had this joke where he's
talking about violence in the black community and he
says, you know, we need to make sure that black
people are registered. And people are thinking, oh,
registered to vote. And he's like, no, registered
to own guns. If you want gun reform, the quickest
way that you can get it is basically to register
black people to vote. People will get so freaked
out, they'll say okay, okay, we're going to have gun
reforms, we're going to change the laws.

So I talk about the way that guns and
race and white supremacy and just how we think about
what progress is or what progress is like.
And then I also want to talk about not --

the kind of violence I'm talking about, to be

specific, is not black on black crime. I'm not

looking at how black people harm other black people

or intraracial violence, but I'm really looking at

white supremacy and how should people who are

oppressed respond to white supremacy. We know that

white supremacy is violent. It is responsible for

slavery, it is responsible for rape and lynching and

assassination. What should be our method or

approach to dismantling white supremacy, what does

that look like? And I think it's incredibly hard to

do without also simultaneously examining utility and

violence.

And so I bring up different examples of

how protective violence has been a really successful

framework in the black community for combating white

supremacy.

So I look at in World War I how black

veterans in 1919 stormed the armory and started to

fight back against these white mobs who were

attacking people in Chicago. I looked at how the

Deacons for Self-Defense protected civil rights

activists and made sure that children weren't harmed

in these mob attacks, and they also were very
successful in doing it.

There's a really good book that I think doesn't get a lot of lip at all, but it talked about how nonviolent people like Martin Luther King Jr, he had tons of guns in his home. And that Rosa Parks kept a gun on her, and there are a lot of black people that armed themselves, and that we don't talk about this tradition of gun ownership in the black community outside of gangs, right, outside of these practices for provision and protection, provision meaning hunting.

I'm talking about the 19th century and still today, hunting for themselves, providing additional resources for their family but also protection from the Klan, protection from white mobs who sought out their lives.

My grandmother, who spent most of her life in Detroit, was born and raised in Louisiana. And she told me this crazy story about how every weekend her dad and her brothers and all of her uncles would go to prison.

And I said, what do you mean go to prison? Like visit somebody on the weekend? And she said, no, they went to jail for their own protection. And I said, Grandma, I'm confused; what
are you talking about?

And she said, you know on the weekend all the white men would get drunk and they would lynch black people, so if they were already in jail, then they were protected. Friday night they would all get together and go to the jail, spend the weekend there, and then they would come back on Sunday morning or Monday to go back to work.

It was mind boggling to me that black men would go to jail to seek protection from drunk white men, white supremacists and racists who sought to harm them. And there just seems like there has to be a different way, there has to be another kind of way.

And I also talk about this in the article, and that it surprised me that my grandmother had a pistol in her nightstand. And I don't think that was just for, you know, like for someone who was trying to break in. I believe that she kept her fear from childhood, this idea of what it meant to protect herself, what protective violence was from her standpoint.

So I really want to talk about these ideas of how do we dismantle racism and white supremacy, how do we dismantle the things that
caused the most harm in our lives.

I think that violence is a political language, it's a way of people who don't have power to communicate in a way that almost assuredly gets heard. When people don't have the ballot, like in the 19th Century there was no ballot for them, there was no citizenship for them. There were no governing forces that would protect their livelihood. So they had to create their own sort of protection in society.

And I want to examine how black people have really been effective in employing some of these ideas. One of the number one questions that I get asked, and it never fails in every talk I give, I think people are all on board with using violence to combat the institution of slavery. I think most people can say, oh, of course slavery was wrong, of course slavery was evil; and, yeah, it would be totally appropriate for someone to use force or violence to protect themselves in the face of slavery.

In the 20th century, I think people can look at the Ku Klux Klan or a lynching or mob attack or school violence and say of course this is wrong. Of course Jim Crow was evil, of course Jim Crow
should have been physically combated and approached in that way.

But when you look at the 21st century, no one would take on those sort of stances about how violence should be overthrown. If we were to talk about how people should combat, you know, state violence, no one would say, well black people should pick up arms and just sort of go for it.

So I want to talk about why is it that a hundred years ago, 200 years ago, we could look at slavery and say it was wrong. Although, no one would have said it was really wrong in the 19th Century. There were a minority but they were not seen as the norm, even in the north.

And even in the 20th Century with the civil rights movement, apart from people like Martin Luther King Jr., we don't really want to talk about Malcolm X, because that's too confrontational.

But how do we get at these ideas because we're living in a moment now in which the violence is still there, all right. The violence is very much still there. It is still deadly. It is still costly. White supremacy is insidious.

But how do we combat that in a way that is meaningful, that is effective, that is not
platitudes, as someone was saying before. I don't think that you can, you know, say to someone in the face of a mob or in the face of a police officer who's armed, you know, to turn the other cheek. You know, that doesn't really sit well with people who are constantly facing violence.

So what are the solutions? I don't have a lot of great answers. These are things that I'm still thinking through myself, if I'm being completely honest about what I think is useful. But as a historian, you know, I'm always challenged with looking at the past and finding patterns and finding methods or strategies that worked or didn't work and trying to figure out how they can applied today.

One of the easiest answers, not easiest answers, but I think one of the simplest ways to sort of frame it is what I want to accomplish is how do we stop protecting the advantages of whiteness? How do we punish white supremacy? You see how white supremacists benefit? There are no consequences for white supremacy, right. There's never really been consequences for white supremacist acts or racist acts.

So how do we create not just sort of like a divestment in inequality but an investment in
equity, and what does that look like on the ground?

I think, personally speaking, it requires sacrifice. And I don't think people are ready to forfeit their power, real or imagined, psychological or economically. No one wants to be the first person to sort of put their dollar or put their investments into this.

And so I'm trying to grapple with this idea constantly of how you get people to divest their power, particularly the power that is given to them through whiteness and through structural racism. So, I'm not talking about necessarily reparations, although that becomes a part of the conversation, I realize. But how do we really say racism is an institution that is not just harming people of color, but it is grossly benefiting white Americans. And how do we remove that advantage, how do we remove that privilege, that benefit.

And I think it's one thing to say racism is bad, racism is wrong. What we don't want to talk about is how is racism profitable, how has racism worked in a way that it has benefited financially, economically, socially, psychologically, you name it, white Americans. And so -- and how does violence fit into that conversation, right, on both sides, on
MR. J. TRAVIS: So the floor is open for whoever wants to be first to certainly react to what you just heard. The floor is first open for anybody who has what I call a clarifying question. I didn't quite get it or can you state what you said in another sentence or two. So any clarifying questions for our opening?

MR. J. CARTAGENA: Kellie, explain to me the difference between protective violence and self-defense.

MS. K. CARTER-JACKSON: Can I explain the difference? I talk about it in the book, and I'm also writing another article. I think that when we think of self-defense, we think of an individual act. So when someone has been protecting themselves, or maybe you might be protecting your children or protecting your spouse.

But when I think of protective violence, it's something that's much more organized, much more collective. There's a strategy behind it, and it is meant to protect people who are facing the brunt of state violence.

So in terms of the 19th century, I'm looking at fugitive slaves. Fugitive slaves are
running away from plantations trying to get to the north, trying to get to Canada. So these black, self-protective societies, these black communities talk about how can we collectively protect the most vulnerable in our society. They don't necessarily have to know each other, many of them are strangers, some of them become friends or family.

But it's much more broader than self-defense and it's not necessarily always violence, right. Sometimes it's force, and I think it's also important to distinguish force and violence. Violence is always forcible. Force is not necessary violence.

So I want to sort of tease out these ideas, because I think to me self defense is a little too simplistic, and it doesn't address the totality of how black communities and black leadership are going about trying to protect their humanity because they're not citizens, because the police or because the state is not in their favor.

And so for me, I wanted to try to generate an idea that would be a little bit more inclusive of their ideas and of their plans to protect not just black people, but even white abolitionists that are susceptible to violence
1 because of their knowledge.
2
3 MS. C. JONES: This is a clarifying
4 question, first. Kellie, I read your paper and
5 assumed that you are sort of interrogating the idea
6 historically that systems were overthrown just with
7 simple nonviolence, that throughout history violence
8 is taken by force. But then you just asked this
9 question; which is, how do you get people to give up
10 their power, you know, which is -- which feels to me
11 like a given. Is that just something you're --
12 those feel different.
13
14 MS. K. CARTER-JACKSON: Well, they're
15 part of the same idea, I would say, like giving,
16 relinquishing, right. A lot of that comes through
17 force historically. So if we're talking about
18 rights, certain rights that black people -- the
19 vote, citizenship, the abolition of slavery, Civil
20 Rights Act and Voting Rights Act. All of these
21 things don't come necessarily because people give
22 them, right. But people are forcing their freedoms.
23 So -- and not always like through, you
24 know, forcing through the barrel of a gun. I think
25 that force is something that is required when people
26 are not going to sort of just say, oh, you know
27 what, here's my plantation.
But I do think that you can use force to
get people to relinquish their power in various
ways, and we've seen it happen at the national
level. The Civil War is a perfect example of how
force and violence was used to create the 13th
Amendment, the 14th Amendment, the 15th Amendment
and so forth and so on.

So it's not that there's no precedent for
it, we have historical precedence. But it is not
easy work, it is not easy work. And nor do I think
a Civil War is required for that to happen. But I
think that when you look at nonviolence, it was
grossly ineffective in getting the institution of
slavery to be overthrown. I mean, leaders were
doing this for decades and no one was willing to
relinquish their slaves.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Any other clarifying
questions? If not, the floor is open for somebody
who would like to start the discussion -- yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just want to get
into this discussion, and I swear I will heed my
word count quick and be done.

I appreciate this article and for all the
academics who had to write papers. I know it's
difficult to be the strawman. And, I really
appreciate this. I appreciate this one in particular, because I feel like particularly for people of color and women, this notion every nonviolence is a tool.

I think it's kind of a tool of oppression. I was just having a conversation on Monday night where we were having a conversation and I was putting to the group -- I also think it's a little bit like generational, I was talking about -- talking about sacrifice, because I always feel like with children and young people, I've always wanted to teach my children and for all the practitioners in the room, I want to teach them peace, I want to teach them justice, and I always thought that when I think about that, you know.

And it's like I have a new baby niece. She's a little girl, she's a black girl, and I'm from Chicago, my family is brought up on the South Side of Chicago. And I absolutely want to teach her to fight and will, right. I used to run the youth prison system in Illinois for years, and I still really struggle with that time in my life because I know decidedly I feel like I did what I needed to do. But there were also choices, conscious choices, that I made that were not humane, they weren't kind,
mostly to people who worked for me.

I did a thing that I feel like to the mission of our end was at times for everybody involved that felt violent and were by force. And I remember, because I'm looking over here because Ryan consulted on our project, she sort of watched it from conception.

And we made this really conscious choice in the beginning of the reform process where I was like, no, we're not going to convince people to come along and evolve as human beings at their pace while children suffer in solitary confinement and get their ass kicked by state paid guards.

We're not just going to wait for them to evolve. I'm going to like fight literally in a very short amount of time violently drag them and the state forward. And there were both things that I think improved as a result of that, but certainly in a case for human evolution, there are people who also were smart enough to be conscious of what I was doing that weren't going to come with me.

But I still feel like I had to struggle with this idea, because I hear all the time in conversations about police reform, about corrections reform. It's sort of like you have to bring people
along, which I -- you know like I'm putting this all out there and I don't think that it's an easy answer. It's like kind of you do, but also what makes us think that you can like wait on people to evolve while humans like actively suffer right now.

And I think that's where I struggle sort of with -- like I just think your article and your discussion sort of brought some of that stuff out for me. Whereas, I think we try to -- we project as a society this notion on oppressed groups. It's like women, it's like decorum, maybe I should -- Jeremy will then try to manage me for the rest of this stage from talking.

MS. K. CARTER-JACKSON: We always expect them to be docile, we always expect them to take up nonviolence, do the right thing, do the noble thing. We never expect the oppressing group, right. No, you do right, you be noble, you use nonviolence.

Those are only ideas that get used and get perpetuated for oppressed people. We expect -- demand that they be patient; that they be long suffering, that they be passive almost. And we don't just demand it, we valorize it.

I mean, even when you think of like my friend, excuse me, has a book out on photography,
and she shows us kind of a picture of Rosa Parks
sleeping on her bus kind of looking out the window.
She's not even looking straight at the camera. And
she was like this is the kind of activism that we
want, the kind that sits down, stares out the
window, that's passive, her hands are in her lap,
and then we praise this image for desegregating
busses.

But that's not really what desegregated
the buses. They boycotted for over a year, they
refused to give their dollars, and that is what
brought about the change.

But I also start the book with James
McCune Smith, a famous black abolitionist, and he
gives this scathing speech in which he's talking
about how black abolitionists are celebrating
Emancipation Day. It's like in the 1840's and
they're celebrating British emancipation. There was
no longer slavery.

And he was like this is ridiculous -- I'm
paraphrasing, this is ridiculous. Why are we
celebrating freedom's giving. This is not the kind
of freedom we're having. If we're going to
celebrate anything, let's celebrate Haiti and people
that forced their own freedom.
So part of the struggle for me was that when I thought about this work, you know it's like maybe I shouldn't call the book Force and Freedom; maybe I should call it force feeding freedom, because that's what people had to do in order to gain their rights. They had to force feed publishers like that, but, no. But Force and Freedom is what it is. But forcing freedom is what you have to do in order to bring about change. It never just happens.

MR. J. TRAVIS: We're having exactly the right conversation that's going on. Thank you for that.

MS. B. RICHIE: I love your work. I think we can spend from now until Saturday, next week Saturday, talking about it. Thank you for your work, deeply appreciate it.

Two things come to mind that I don't know -- these aren't questions are they, Jeremy?

MR. J. TRAVIS: If that's the best way to add to the discussion.

MS. B. RITCHIE: So one of the things I want to think about is how to move from the notion of individual self-defense and especially campaigns around individual -- releasing people who are
charged with crimes of self-defense to the notion of protective violence. And I think there's, for me, something that's hopeful in thinking about collectivising anti-violence work that might require use of violence as a short-term strategy, right. I could go on and on.

So I do want to work with some conditions around the use of violence for violence to end as an anti-violence strategy, but I want to keep looking it up. Help me do that.

The second thing I want to sort of bring forward is the ways that, at least in the world that I'm in of teaching students and working with younger activists, everyone is an abolitionist. First it was a generation of people who identified as prison abolitionists, and now it's abolish the police, abolish the surveillance strategy, abolish parole.

There's a lot of use of the term abolition and very seldom does it include a historical understanding of the real dangerous work of abolition. And I was moved in your paper to try to think about how do we, when we're trying to engage struggle on the ground, how do we not just think of using violence to protect one's self, but using it in a collective -- using resistance in a
collective way. And how do we reclaim the dangerous
work that abolition, white supremacy is, not just
have it be a kind of identifier as standing on some
side of racial justice, but really putting an
urgency on it. And I appreciate that you did.

MR. LUPPINO-ESPOSITO: I appreciate that
you got into defining benefits in the initial
questions. I think sort of in our general
discussion, I'm sure we'll hear more of it later as
we talk about responses to violence generally. So
not to take away from what all the practitioners
were talking about, I think about the examples you
give, sort of an eye for an eye example.

MR. J. TRAVIS: All of us have to work
hard to get our voices up.

MR. LUPPINO-ESPOSITO: No, so yes, so I
think sort of one for one. For slavery, it's very
obvious. I think we can talk about mobs. That's
the very obvious one on one. And even sort of the
Black Panthers' response to the anti-desegregation
action.

So for today, not to put you on the spot
or anything, but maybe this is a question for the
group. Do we, since you did sort of split force and
violence, I think what is the force and then the
answer to that force or the violence to that
violence.

I mean, if they're actual incidents or
actual -- a mob comes about, then yes, then I think
it's a good idea to have protective violence, as you
talk about it. But sort of a system in general,
talk about that larger systematic issue, what do you
see as sort of that exact response.

MS. K. CARTER-JACKSON: Honestly, that's
something that I'm still thinking about it. Like
when I was writing this paper, two shootings had
just happened; the one in El Paso, Texas at the
Walmart in El Paso, Texas; and the one in Dayton,
Ohio, the 1st or 2nd of August.

And oh, my gosh, I never like the
response of the NRA, which is like every bad guy
needs a good guy with a gun, whatever. Like it just
seemed very disingenuous.

But I don't know, when you have something
like Charlottesville and you have, you know,
Neo-Nazis marching down the street and you have your
counter march to go against that, you know, what is
the response to someone who drives their car, then
the other person get in their car and drive through
the Neo-Nazis. I don't have good answers for that.
But I do know that it is too -- in my opinion, I think it is ineffective to respond to that kind of racist violence with nine -- with what is the word I'm looking for -- like passively or maybe just sort of like, I don't know, hugging and lollipops. It doesn't feel like that matches the violence that's been committed.

So I don't necessarily want to see like, you know, an eye for an eye, but I do need to see that kind of violence taking place being met with an equally powerful force. I won't say violence because force is not necessarily violent, but met with a powerful kind of force that can combat, shut down, circumvent, prevent those kind of things from happening again.

So if -- and I can't think of an example offhand, but I think that boycotts have been very effective. I think people really feel it the most in their pockets. So if you say, you know, okay, this violent act happened so we're going to enact violence under and strip these companies that have been so influential in sort of selling these high intensity rifles and things of that nature. That to me is the kind of force that's effective.

But's really, really hard to boycott
effective. You know it can't just be one person saying, well, I'm not shopping at Walmart anymore. It has to be a movement of people saying we are not shopping here, we are not buying this, we are not investing in this.

And so that's what I mean by it's got to be more than self defense. It has to be collective, it has to be strategic, and it has to be effective in the turnout, in the response to what is happening. Does that make sense?

MR. J. LUPPINO-ESPOSITO: Yes, that makes sense.

MR. J. TRAVIS: So interesting and this moment is always the most -- the most pointed moment in the roundtable, how do I get in, what do I say, what's my voice and I think it's such a thought provoking paper. It's exactly what should happen. So it means people are thinking deeply.

I wanted to come back in, Beverly had her hand up second.

MS. B. TILLERY: I echo all the sentiments really appreciate the paper in general pushing us to think differently. I mean, I have nothing but questions about this notion, but the thing that was -- that I was thinking most as the
conversation was evolving was that in some ways it
would be really helpful to have a reframing of the
civil rights movement in terms of this notion of it
being nonviolent, because it wasn't that, of course.

And it's almost like the nonviolent
language that was used was the marketing tools to
make it palatable to people, but it wasn't really
nonviolent, right. People were putting their lives
and bodies on the line all the time. That was about
force, and that wasn't really about nonviolence.

And then on the other part of my brain
I'm also thinking about the language that white
supremacist groups are using right now is that
protective violent language, right. That's exactly
what they're saying is that we are protecting, we
are threatened now, so we are arming ourselves and
protecting ourselves.

So just thinking about how over and over
again we see that often tools that we are using to
address white supremacy have an unintended
consequence of them arming our oppressors, and how
do we deal with that.

And so part of my question is also, you
know, we have to be thinking about not just
dismantling white supremacy but also violence in and
of itself. And so what does that look like? It does seem like there's this short-term, long-term thing. Like the expediency of the force and the violence almost seems necessary at times, but that doesn't give us the long-term, how do we change that violence.

MS. K. CARTER-JACKSON: I want to -- is it Joseph or Yousef?

MR. J. LUPPINO-ESPOSITO: Joe.

MS. K. CARTER-JACKSON: Joe, I'm sorry.

So I just want to -- your question about -- I want to see if we can pull concrete. I know it's a historical reference in the acumen of the paper, but I want a full concrete to the conversation around criminal justice than what we're having, which is that right now we have tons of systems, right, if you want to use systemic violence as an example. We use corrections that are system and frankly very inherently violent.

And I think the leak that your paper allows is that there are times even when arguing in a reform moment the state is doing something, but I wonder if when the right person is in power if we are responding to those systems of violence with the same force that will be necessary actually in that
1 change.

2 So I just want to see if we can leak from
3 just like in the paper to some of that. And the
4 thing that it makes me think of concretely to Joe's
5 point about a couple of concrete examples is sort of
6 like you have a president, I think who now -- a
7 former president who talks more now about criminal
8 justice, I believe, than he did when he was
9 president, right.
10
11 Arguably a moment when, if I use the
12 academic from Harvard who got arrested outside of
13 his house, the Henry Louis Gates moment, where there
14 was such a public -- where the president for a
15 moment had said something even a little bit candid
16 and felt so compelled because of the response to
17 back off of it.
18
19 When, actually, I think the original
20 response was probably not outrageous enough to what
21 was clearly sort of an act of inappropriate use of
22 state power, you know, not quite to the level of
23 violence. But sort of like what if the systemic
24 response, his response, from that sort of bully
25 pulpit had been more forceful, right, to make a
26 statement. And then what if DOJ in the enactment of
27 its policies had been more forceful, right.
Like I actually want us to think about that, because that's why your paper is so interesting to me. When we think about officers killing people every day. Like the way it's discussed, this woman in Texas, everybody's hugging her -- I'm not saying there's anything wrong with hugging the woman, I believe in redemption. But, you know, it's sort of like even when we're making the choice to prosecute police officers who kill people or engage in what seems like patently unlawful behavior, the systemic response to that state sanctioned violence feels very nonviolent, very controlled, very soft in response to something that seems like a clear abusive act of violence.

And I wonder if we could leak from your sort of historical view to why that is in a question of reform.

I saw -- I feel like I felt President Richie, don't go too far with this violence. But I actually do want to push us to say why we don't respond to some of these issues with more force, with more outrage, with more disdain and how we look at this system of criminal justice.

So I just wanted to bring that because I think there are some concrete things right now that
1 we get to looking at.

2 MS. A. HARVEY-QUINN: First of all, thank
3 you for sharing your work. I feel like it brings a
4 lot of validity to my approach. I'm a part of the
5 Faith in Action national network. Pastor Mike
6 McBride is my folk.

7 When I was originally hired to do this
8 work I was supposed to be working with clergy. I
9 was supposed to be working with clergy to develop
10 nonviolent advocate strategy. And at the same time
11 I was watching my father and a group of his
12 colleague attorneys, who were actually activists,
13 hunt down prejudice.

14 And I decided to fight and work with them
15 and support them and to resource them, rather than
16 work with a more -- a less aggressive constituency,
17 right, and try to, you know, push them to be more
18 radical.

19 So some examples from the work that
20 inspire me, and may not speak to exactly what you
21 are trying to address, are there was a rapist in
22 Detroit that was killing women and disregarding them
23 in abandoned houses in early June of this year.
24 That rapist was apprehended because activists fought
25 to find that rapist with the same amount of vigor
that there is violence in the street.

And so I think -- so I posed this question about hyper masculinity and how it was seen as problematic, but is it a useful conduit for addressing these sort of like issues of aggression in our community.

So what I've seen is my team went and they took their hyper masculine selves down to the pride parade to protect pride parade in the same time frame when Neo-Nazis came. They came the first day, we didn't know. On the second day, they had gotten together. Now these are all street gangs, right. Some of them are strapped, some of them are active gang members. And luckily they didn't meet the Neo-Nazis, because it was an experiment in what could have been a combustible experience, right.

But there's the potential that even the threat, because one of the leaders is a prominent leader, and he can make an on line video and it will go viral. So he called them out, and he said they would come in, and he gathered his group and they went down to protect the pride parade.

Earlier in that week they just hunted down the predator. Now, the police got the credit for it, but the guys were on the streets talking to
addicts or whoever they could find that wouldn't
otherwise talk to the police, because they weren't
in good relationship with the police. But these
guys can have conversations that wouldn't
incriminate them.

And so I wonder if even on another level
anybody who's been down like a block in Detroit,
just a regular block, has passed by guys like
playing basketball in the middle of the street.

So my vision for safety -- the safety of
Detroit is when you pass by those brothers, you know
they on the block, period. You might as well be in
good relationship with them. They know you, they
know your car, they know you belong here, they know
if you don't.

If that energy were somehow utilized to
create a safety mechanism, it could be magical
instead of telling them that they shouldn't be
themselves in their own homes and in their own
spaces, which should be safe.

I mean, they're essentially secure and
comfort for somebody, but they could be secure and
comfort for everybody. It could be facilitated in a
beautiful way that's, you know, that's magnanimous.

And it could be like how do we stop talking about
hyper masculinity in a way that it's just harmful.

It might be harmful in a one-on-one relationship that's unequal. But if we use it to fight these systems that are harming us, like if we sort of aim it at the giant, you know, we can do things. So that's what's inspired me.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Great. We have Katharine next and then Eric Jones after Katharine.

MS. K. HUFFMAN: Yes, thank you for this paper, Kellie, and for the conversation that's coming of this. I hear this and I really appreciate the distinction between violence and force and that incredibly close relationship that they have.

One thing that's coming up for me as I hear these stories from long ago and from right now that you're just describing, is a little bit of what Beverly was alluding to, the ways that you can see that, you know, power doesn't want to give things up and that the things that feel like progress in the moment actually become just another way to justify further oppression and the way -- what comes to mind is the ways in which oftentimes hate crime statutes are designed and intended to be protective of people who are oppressed, but then actually wind up being then being another tool for oppressing the people
who they were supposed to protect.

There's a feeling in this thinking that
makes me afraid of that type of replication. And
so, you know, just kind of lifting up for the group
is how do we think about, as we restructure the
balance of power, how do we make that something that
doesn't just sort of ultimately perpetuate power in
the same places that it always has, but with a new
set of justifications and a new set of explanations.
It feels very precarious and scary to me in that
way.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Eric, and then Rich.

MR. E. JONES: Very cooperative work, and
I just wanted to -- a couple things that helped me
with some framework and I appreciate that.

Specifically, you said something that
made sense to me which was violence, not an exact
quote, but violence has become a voice or has become
a voice of the unheard or the oppressed or has
become their voice. Totally get it.

I understand that maybe some would view
this as okay, now we're going to view violence as
(inaudible). But I do appreciate us discussing the
violence versus force, that's helpful for me. I
would just say if there's one thing maybe we can
look at is we've seen an increase in date crimes.
We've been seeing it.

But we haven't seen -- I'll also speak for California. We're also seeing an increase on assault on police officers who are, specifically, just because we're wearing police uniforms, police officers being ambushed for just being police officers. I don't know if you examined that or are hoping to take a look at that, too. Why is all of this violence?

MR. J. TRAVIS: Can we please just keep a running list of questions. You get a couple minutes again. Just hold on. Ray is next and then Peter and then Daniel.

MR. R. WINANS: You did a phenomenal job. You asked the question what does it look like. I remember probably about two or three months ago, Amanda and I sat down over some dinner. And she said, Ray, just focus (inaudible). And I said, why?

And so I shared that to say sometimes it's best just to not even acknowledge it and continue to understand who has the power and continue to build our collective power, our national power without even recognizing it, not even acknowledging it.
You mentioned the giant, right. So you know David and Goliath. David never acknowledged the giant. He just continued to build power and didn't even acknowledge it. (Inaudible)

MR. J. TRAVIS: Peter, then Daniel.

MR. P. HAMMER: Our brains don't work like that, that the institutional state has a monopoly on violence. We know that's historically false. We practice this type violence all the time. Ku Klux Klan. I'm just trying to think in my own mind how do I rationalize the sort of mythology of the state having a monopoly on violence.

The other thing associated in my mind is social contract. You think about racial contract and it was never intended to be anything other than white males protecting white males.

And then it is not necessary to have answers to the questions that you say, right. At this level, this sort of timing, it's enough to call it out. What you're doing, I think, is very powerful in helping us call out the inconsistencies of this, like the hate crimes and other things, these frames that control people. We're going to control you, I think this is very powerful for us to be -- just to be acknowledging the strings that are
there and then seeing all of the gaps and just
letting us ask the right questions. This is very
powerful. And one plug for an organization that's
Force Detroit being used very appropriately.

MR. J. TRAVIS: She has answered the
question. Thanks, Peter. Danielle Sered.

MS. D. SERED: I thank you so much for
this. I'm really grateful for its positioning
relative to all the other conversations we'll have,
because I think we'll benefit from it.

I think a lot about the question of,
particularly as a white person, right, what it looks
like to think about the end of white supremacy in
our lifetime, which I think is a prerequisite for
all of our survival.

And I think white people, I think we are
so, in many ways, identified with the stories of our
superiority that we hear a call to end white
supremacy to be a call to end white people. And we
respond to those extinction threats, and we respond
with a level of force that would be appropriate to
the threat of extinction.

And I think even absent overt violence,
some of the kinds you're describing in the black
community, I think white people will individually
and institutionally behave as though that violence is happening all the time.

When we think about the appropriateness of commensurate force, we behave as though we were at war and we behave in those war-like ways. And I think one of the things that comes up for me is the question of -- like I'm really -- I'm a huge lover of accountability and my views are only those of hope, but I think -- I believe in accountability not only because as an avenue to the relinquishment of power, the redistribution of resources, those sorts of things, but is also something that can start to open up pathways to healing.

And the thing your paper is for me really are the ways in which violence and force might have potential to compel accountability as an intermediary step to these other things. And not directly like violence happens, but rather in a context where force is being exerted and a context where mood is acting more and more powerfully with a range of dimensions, like the organizing of people to like physical violence as we define it more narrowly, the degree to which that might compel me and my people into a mode of accountability and repair.
And I think my godson when he was five, there was a party happening of his peers, something was broken, I was like I sat everyone down. Who broke this? Everyone was like. And then my smart ass godson said, what will the person who broke it have to do. And I said, they'll have to say they're sorry and pay a dollar and make something beautiful to replace it. And then he went, I did it. And this other kid is like, and I helped.

I think there is a way in which us white people, we want to know what the price is for telling the truth. And we do not want to tell the truth before we know the price, because in our position the only thing that we know to do in response to violence is like scorch the earth. So we cannot envision that there will be anything other than our extinction.

Over and over and over, like children, like two people's children, like we cannot envision that the response will be anything other than we and our own going through that same degree of unfathomable pain. Somehow we fought and did it. It's unimaginable but for the fact that we did it.

So I think so many ways for me is how do we get out of that catch 22 where white people, we
want to know the price of crime. And whereas, in fact, what I know about all accountability processes is that it is in the courts of the process of accountability that that price becomes set.

I think that for me that's the catch 22 because I'm always grappling with it. And I think about the Civil War and about the end of white supremacy. And your paper for me does really push me to think about what the role, the specific role, of force is and maybe this will bring about change.

MR. J. TRAVIS: So our next speaker is Fatimah Mohammed.

MS. F. MUHAMMAD: Thank you, I so appreciate you all around and for all the brilliant thinking and this paper and your comments. I really was going to say a lot of what was said, but I think there's some thing that I want to say to help push us. And you know, Katharine, I want to go back to the fear I heard when you were speaking.

It goes back to what you said about the dangers that what we're treading into, and I'm aware that this is public, like people are listening and it conjures the notions of what we say in secret that we don't say publicly, because this conversation we're endeavoring into is dangerous.
Right, we're talking about something that disrupts courses that are mobilized by our economy.

So this is the piece I want to make sure that we have in the conversation, which is the economic incentive to use force in the ways that uphold white supremacy and structural racism. And that the thing we can imagine here is that without the economic resource, frankly, how powerful can they be.

We talk about boycotts, right. And I think what I hope to imagine for us to be architects of is what is the next presentation of boycott. Boycott was at a time when supply chains were limited and localized, right, that you could actually mobilize people locally to have enough of an impact or enough force to actually generate response that actually allowed us to then have a conversation.

We are in a much larger global system. We have technologies that, you know, we have people investment that is going to technology that we're going to hear about ten years from now. And so how do we get ahead of that and redirect some of that to what we're talking about.

And so it's a call for all of us to think
about who else needs to be at this table to help us strategize for the kind of economic resources, frankly, that we need and the economic strategy we need behind these ideas, because I think that is the force.

I took the course to both be a new understanding of the past, which I still appreciate; but then, what does that mean for us. I mean, as you said, five generations down the line, what are these constructions and how are they situated.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you very much.

Barb Jones.

MS. B. JONES: Thank you for your paper. Your main question that presents a quandary for you presents a quandary for me. I can't speak for everybody else, but the question is: How should oppressed people respond to their own oppression?

That question is like: Is there just one answer? And what really is important for me when I think about that question is verbal violence. Verbal language. Oftentimes, verbal violence and verbal language is a tool used first before another tool, such as a gun or a knife, is used to harm.

But verbal violence is something that I'm very interested in because I believe that it starts
with our language. And we don't know how to use
glue as a tool to -- well, let me reframe that,
let me reframe that.

Some of us don't know how to use language
to resist, and based off of the verbal violence it's
usually a racial epitaph, you know, to incite or to
really engage another person to react. But the
verbal violence that starts off as the beginning of
an issue, as far as being oppressed, is always used
to keep us suppressed.

And I would just like to, you know, dig
more on how we can, from a verbal standpoint, have
these conversations to where we don't respond with
more verbal violence that gets elevated to the next
level, and then the next level and then the next
level.

When we talk about violence, I would like
to see, you know, as we continue to have these
discussions for the next few days called words and
language and the verbal aspects and the verbal
behavior that we have can maybe address some of
these oppressions.

Our young people don't know how to
respond to that verbal violence except to use verbal
violence. So I would be interested in continuing
that discussion when it comes to language.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you. Turn to

David, there's a slight modification. There are so
many questions coming back to you. This is a good
vent. So I'd like to organize some reactions to --
some people say they're speaking to me, they're
speaking to you. Like Barbara just said, she's
addressing things on your mind.

So you're here to help in that thought
process, and then we'll turn to Bruce for his
observation and maybe just end a little early,
because this is going really into very good
territory.

Give you some more time, David; give
Bruce some time, and then we'll take a break. Is
that agreeable to everybody? There's just so much
stuff and it's going pretty deep. David and then
Kellie and then Bruce.

MR. D. HUREAU: The group, also forgive
me and this is an obvious point, and this is a
generous group. So thank you, but I think and this
is a beautiful paper. I really really appreciate
it. I appreciate it in the space of imagination, I
think. In space of imagination, consideration of
how violence has been productive right, and
politically productive. And I'm persuaded by that point and I'm persuaded by the imaginative point that it reduces.

The other part of it that I think about when I think about the use of violence historically specifically among oppressed African-Americans and I'm sure you've thought about this more but I think it's important for the group to think about is the historical phenomenon of backlash right, and that's somewhat of what Danielle is referring to. Every era that you draw from, right. Reconstruction, civil rights to, you know, mass incarceration. There has been a massive backlash and much of that backlash has been very specifically associated with the use of violence by African-Americans and to show violence as a source of inhumanity, right. They're nonfitness or true American citizenship.

So, I just wanted to bring that out there, it may be obvious and I'm sorry if it is but I think it's deep too, right. That there is a very very predictable backlash that violence can generate when used politically especially by franchised blacks, right.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Other questions to throw in Kellie's direction.
MR. K. WATTLEY: I ordinarily would take a lot of time putting my thoughts together before I speak, but we don't have time. And I want help figuring some of this out because as I said in the introductions, I'm going to take it back to the individual level because I've worked with thousands of people who committed murder, most extreme form of violence, and the common theme among them is they were motivated somewhere deep down by fear.

And I was thinking about this as the conversation moved towards and somehow I knew Danielle was going to get to where I needed to be. Thank you. But try to understand how we have a system that somehow we still see police killing of unarmed black men and we're still shocked by it, it still keeps happening, and I'm trying to look for it, I look for patterns, where is the fear that drives that violence?

And, you know, the context you provided just about thinking of white supremacy at some point recognizes that the damage that it has done can only be right by their extinction. Like it's the fear of extinction that drives the national conversation that criminalizes people who are coming here to make a better life, from other countries. Criminalizes
just black and brown people in general. And it seems to justify so much violence, and that's not just a historical context, that's right now, that's today.

And I'm trying to figure out how we sort of bring those two together because I see what the individual level looks like. Somebody's fear -- usually a fear of rejection is why people kill people believe it or not. We thought all day about how to get there, so that's where it comes from. So I'm trying to figure out how to connect that to this culture of fear that drives so much violence in people like me. So I need help with that. I don't have it figured out. I'm just throwing it out there because these are things that come to mind. It tells me there's something there.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you very much for that. Kellie make sense out of all this.

MS. K. CARTER-JACKSON: This is a lot. I'm going to try to synthesize some of my responses that address a lot of what's just been brought up. I think this is really tough because there's a line in the article where I say that white supremacy is more afraid of losing than they are arresting people. In fact there is this idea that my success
comes at the expense of your success, my dream comes at the expense of your dream and vice-versa.

That we can't all win, right, we can't get all get the gold star, we can't all achieve something. If my kid is at a successful school, your kid has to be at a failing school. Part of that is not just white supremacy, a lot of that is capitalism, right? Like this idea of scarcity, this idea that there's not enough wealth to go around, there's not enough success to go around, there's not enough food and water to go around.

There is this, this competition that we have created where we don't allow people to be able to have things, basic human rights at the same time, right. So I'm not talking about everybody but I am talking about how does everyone get the basics, right, the basics, clean water, shelter, protection, a good education, literacy, health care. Like I don't think those things should -- my health care shouldn't cost you your health care. I don't think that's how those things work.

But that's how we have been conditioned to think about one another and it does create an intense fear. I see the most now -- my son just started kindergarten and man, gosh, this is crazy.
Just the battle over resources, whose school, who's
got the books, whatever. That is not just about
white supremacy, that's about capitalism and I think
that has to be dealt with simultaneously.

I also think that, you know I'm taking
this from Kendi who writes a lot about racism and
how to be anti-racist. He talks about these ideas
where he says, you're not going to change people's
minds by simply telling them this is wrong or this
is problematic. We know racism is wrong, we know
these things are wrong, it does not change in
behavior. He says if you want to change behavior,
you have to change the policies and behavior
follows.

So he gives a bunch of examples where he
talks about like loving versus ragging on these
negative ideas about like segregation, race mixing
and they became legal. Next thing you know
interracial marriages, not a big deal. You change
the law, you change the culture, you change the
attitudes that people have. Not necessarily
overnight and not everyone will be converted but
it's a big way in shifting the way that people think
about things by changing the law, changing the
policies.
I think that if we were to think about this in terms of massive incarceration, how we think about policies that have been implemented over time. To really see black people as humans, to see them as things that can be damaged but not wrong. To see them as these, you know, sort of these abstract ideas. If we were to abolish or change a lot of those policies that instead focus on people's actual recovery, actual rehabilitation, actual, you know, humanity, I think that we could change the culture and the ideas around how we see each other.

It's not the perfect solution or the only solution but it's the one that I see as being most effective in terms of how you can bring about concrete change like the 13th, 14th, 15th amendment, the Voting Rights Act and change people's ideas. But the backlash that you talked about is real and that backlash is violent, I mean extremely violent.

And I don't think we have instructed students enough about what that backlash is and why that backlash is there. I think we focus so much on the victory that we have refused to look at the places, the pockets that have not found that success, not found those benefits, and that's extremely difficult.
I also think that there -- I want to just address a little bit -- I feel like I have it as well in talking about violence. That there is this -- this shyness or not wanting to sort of see this as extreme or radical and I think that's fair. I think -- you know, people ask me all the time, do you own a bunch of guns. People think that I'm this radical from this book that I wrote. I think that if we think about the moment in which slavery is happening, no one was championing the abolitionists. This was a dangerous, dangerous position to take. Their lives were always at stake. No one was on their side. No one thought that slavery was problematic or wrong and I could go on. This same thing in the civil rights movement. No one liked MLK. People thought he was a troublemaker, they thought he was obnoxious, they thought he was someone who just caused problems and they didn't realize how much people's lives were at stake for having the issue raised up as.

I think that we're going to be honest with ourselves, yes, there is a definition shyness about putting those issues out there, right. There is a real reckoning that we have to have when we commit to doing something. James Baldwin has this
great quote. He basically says that to know something is to act and to act is to be committed and to be committed is to put yourself in danger.

That this work that we are doing is not for the faint at heart, right. It is not for people who don't want to lose anything. It's not for people that don't want to risk anything. That real change is dangerous and it's complicated. And as Americans we're so comfortable with our comfort, right. You know it's really hard to talk to people, Americans in particular, especially Americans that are well to do, about forfeiting power. About saying, you know what, I live in the right community but I'm going to put my white daughter in this black school, I'm going to invest in this black school and get involved in this black school.

Black parents have to do that all the time. Black kids in a mostly white school and I have to combat all the time, not just for my son, but for all the other children of color in that school. We are not willing and I'm speaking mostly about white people. We are not willing to go places that make us uncomfortable, we are not willing to forfeit things that will cause us to be uncomfortable. We don't want to risk anything.
And that unwillingness to risk is what keeps all change at bay, all change at bay. So it's not just about this desire to be violent, to meet guns with guns, right. I think that's a little too simplistic but it is about willing to sort of see the sacrifice that's required to make this kind of work effective, really effective five generations from now effective.

And so when I say I don't have the answers it's because, you know, they're not fun answers, that's for sure. They're not things that, you know, we can sort of tell our kids. No one wants to tell your kid, well, like sometimes you might have to get beat up or sometimes you might get arrested, you might just have to go to prison for five years, no one wants to tell their kid that.

But these are the realities that we are facing when we do not sort of meet the forcefulness of white supremacy with an equal forcefulness to combat it. I don't think that there are tools that we're using that I don't think are effective, not in the short-term, not in the long-term. I think even when you think about boycotts, if you think historically about the Montgomery bus boycott, that was only supposed to be a day. When these, mostly
domestic workers, they were taking the bus into 
white control. They said, hey, we're going to stay 
off the bus for one day. It worked so well, we're 
going to stay off the bus for a week, okay, two 
weeks, okay, a month.

The Montgomery bus boycott went for over 
a year. It took that long so it's not just saying, 
hey, this black Friday, don't shop at apple. That's 
not going to change. You have to say we are not 
going to shop at apple indefinitely, which oh, my 
gosh, that's my whole life. You have to think about 
like the investments that we have. When it went 
over a year, by the time Montgomery was like, okay 
we're going to desegregate the busses, think about 
that, you've been doing something now for over a 
year. You've been getting to work or church or 
wherever it is, for over a year.

You have a whole new lifestyle, a whole 
new investment in which you have created this idea 
of choices and now you can ride the bus again. That 
victory felt very hollow for those women who got 
back on the bus. Okay, we can ride the bus again, 
but I had built this relationship with my girlfriend 
for the past six years car pooling with her or 
whatever it is, right. We can't just think about
these things in terms of like, short-term, send out a tweet, hash tag this or that and then, you know, mission accomplished, right.

This is hard work. When I think about the abolitionists, their movement formalizes in the 1830's. They don't see the end of slavery until 30 plus years later. We have to ask ourselves are we willing to do this work if we know we won't see an answer until 35 years later, until 50 years later, is it worth that kind of commitment to us. And for most people we can do the work for a couple years, maybe for a couple months and then it fades or the money dries up or whatever it is.

So I think that, you know, these are hard conversations to have because to be committed to something is to put yourself in danger, right, and no one wants to be in danger. And that may be physical danger, that might be economic, right, you lose your -- you don't drive the fancy car, you don't have the huge house, you don't have the stability that you want. That might even speak emotional or interpersonal danger and that you lose valuable relationships or you lose connections or you forfeit the promotion because you're policed.

Those are things that are really, really
hard to deal with. And I tell my students all the
time, you know, they're so optimistic and that
encourages me. And I'm like, yeah, you guys think
these things are messed up and racist and sexist
because they are. But then you get married and you
even have children and then you have to put your
kids in school and then you do the same thing that
your parents did which is to take them out, put them
in a private school, put them in a Carter school
because you want the best for your kids.

And you can use that, that's a really
seductive idea, I'm doing the best for my kids, I'm
doing the best for myself, for my community, that's
valuable, that's valid but it's not helpful to your
entire community and that's what we have to be
honest about, how do we invest in the community and
not just in ourselves.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Let's turn to Bruce.

MR. B. WESTERN: Well, listen, we
started, I think, on an exceptionally challenging
note even by the standards of roundtables past. So
I'll just do three quick things by way of wrap up
and I don't have anything particularly deep to offer
in summarizing this conversation.

First thing is just a quick digest of the
conversation as I heard it. I just want to restate the three questions that Kellie started with because I think it will help us to grapple with those over the next three days.

How should oppressed people respond to the conditions of their oppression? Is violence a valid means of social change? How is white supremacy the standard? What do we envision? So I just want to restate those questions for us. Again, so I think as the conversation unfolded after Kellie posed those questions and provided her historical analysis, there was both a measure of resonance and a measure of discomfort around the table with the arguments.

Resonance and Candice started us off then -- I heard Candice's message in a kind of complex way and I want to talk to you more about it too. But we're certainly one part of how I heard you was certainly violence can be attacked particularly in context of real urgency, right. When harm is immediate, violence can have real utility and in your experience that was definitely the case. People saying Kellie's analysis helps call out or really a white wash mythology, particularly the civil rights movement which we have
this sort of overwhelming understanding of civil
rights movement is and only a nonviolent movement
which is not historically true.

And there's a truth telling in Kellie's
analysis too about what abolition really was. And
in the face of white supremacy and slavery, there
was a real truth telling. But there was also
discomfort around the table than was registered in
different ways, particularly by Beth, I think if we
take this idea seriously, to think what would a
modern abolition, a contemporary abolition movement
look like. What are we asking the young people that
we know who are in the ranks of the front lines of
social activism, what are we really asking of them?
David, too, I think, if does violence invite violent
backlash.

Of course there are groups around this
country engaged in collective racial conflict and
here we are in Michigan, right. And we know there
are groups of white nationalists who are armed and
organized and raise a collective conflict of that
violent kind. So there's resonance and discomfort,
I think there's a consensual ambiguity in this
conversation that I want to push on. What do we
mean by violence?
Violence is not -- violence and force were distinguished, I don't fully understand that distinction. I want to understand it better. For me, a boycott is different from violence. And if we're somehow saying that boycott is an act of violence, I need to understand better exactly in which way you're using the word violence. That's my little digest.

The second thing, something that I was thinking about as I was listening to the conversation is the role of the state in all of this, the role of the state as an agent of violence. And Peter touched on this and for me as a sociologist, the state exercises a monopoly, not over violence, but a monopoly over legitimate violence. And that was David's classical definition. And it seems to me violence becomes viable as a political strategy when there's a vacuum of state power. When the state is failing really in its obligation to keep people safe.

And people taking out bombs in defense of their own safety. I want to think harder about that as a context for this conversation. I think this connects with something that Candice was saying as well. When is the state more or less forceful and
when can we activate the resources of the state.

Because maybe that is the most efficient
organization for activating force.

The third thing I think at some level I
think this whole conversation, this opening
conversation was really as much adept in nature of
white supremacy as anything, and for me it was
really, really instructive. I think the implication
is that we should understand white supremacy as
socially organized collective violence on the part
of white society against communities of color. And
in that context the fight for equality on the part
of communities of color is received as, is heard as
an existential threat, the extinction threat, which
was Danielle's phrase and that Keith was struggling
with as well.

That's something I'm going to wrap up
with is this conversation developed sort of the
nature of white supremacy as a system of socially
organized violence that the questioning of which
instills such acute fear in violence in response. I
think that is somehow key to our discussion over the
next few days as well. So that's my summary for
this incredibly provocative conversation.

MR. J. TRAVIS: I thank all of you.
We'll take a 15 minute break. Them when we come back, we're interested and a little bit ahead of schedule, so observers who want to make an observation or throw in a question before we start with Micere's paper, we'll give you that opportunity. If you're prompted to think about something that we should think about and talk about here, this will be a chance to do that before we get started. But Kellie you started with this statement about humility to be asked, so you set a high bar for the rest. So in 15 minutes we'll see you back here. Talk amongst yourselves and share the purpose of being here.

(A brief recess was taken.)

MR. J. TRAVIS: Stand up and your name and your affiliation if you care to share it and your question or observation.

MR. S. JONES-DAVIS: Sheri Jones Davis and my observation is that I heard someone say something about I think it was language or literacy, and I think about how people address police sometimes if you don't have an accepted vocabulary or whatever it may upset them and they may feel disrespect. I said that would be another conference, and I also said that how about people
with no language skills like the hearing impaired?

I didn't see a signer here. I have learned to sign.

That would be added at this conference. It's been
mind boggling. I appreciate everything that I've
heard.

MR. J. TRAVIS: I hope you stay for the
next two days.

MS. S. JONES-DAVIS: Yes, I signed up for
everything.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Any other questions or
observations? Please stand up. Thank you so much
for that.

MS. HARTNEY: Hi, I'm a student at U of M
and I am also a student here at Wayne State, I'm a
graduate student. I just have one observation which
is on the last discussion which is really about the
ways in which nonviolent resistance by people of
color is actually seen as violent resistance. And
so you would think that football players taking a
knee, if we looked at the societal reaction, you
would think they were shooting people, but they're
not. We just perceive people of color acting in
nonviolent ways as somehow violent and that also
applies, I think, to individuals maybe questioning a
police officer when they got pulled over and then
getting shot for it. So I just wanted to throw in

to the mix a perception of nonviolence when it's
violent when it's actually not violence.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Anybody else on this side
of the room?

MR. GUARDUEX: Dennis Guarduex, I'm a
graduate of Wayne State, my thought in response to
the discussion this afternoon is we're all searching
for solutions that have sufficient force to not just
poke at the problem but to actually change
conditions in our communities. And it occurs to me
that this may come in various different ways. It
can be one paradigm operating on one paradigm with
exceptional expertise and strength. Racism on one
end and religion on the other or multiple paradigms
assembled together in a collective action strategy
and they're reinforcing each other.

But we are looking for solutions one way
or the other with sufficient force that could really
make a difference. We have a level of homicide per
hundred thousand population in this city that was
only equal in New York one year, the year of 9/11,
and we've been at that level every year since.
That's the kind of condition we have to change for
the true revitalization of the state.
MS. PATTERSON: Tennel Patterson with Pretrial Justice Institute and I just wanted to make a couple of observations. For one, is that we may in fact not have any control or influence in that of how oppressed people fight depression. So we may not have a decisive moment to wait. As not being those that are the most oppressed in terms of the ability of us to sit in this room.

And then the other thing is just the way how westernization kind of impacts our vision about violence. One can't exist as what's happening across the country and the effects of walking with the war torn neighborhoods so that gives the illusion of distance in terms of really considering violence in our everyday lives. And so there's just some privilege connected to that and I think it's important to weigh in these conversations that we have an ability to speak of it.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you so much. Are you ready to start the next section which is biographies, violence, life force discovery. Talk about the black of papers. I've been asked to ask people move all the microphones closer to us. Apparently that lessens the need to adjust the sound for court reporter sitting here which is part of
what's going on here in the sound system. The floor is years. Get us started.

MS M. KEELS: Thank you. So, thank you guys for having me here today. I really feel like an interloper, outsider into this conversation, into this conversation and that's because I come from these -- I come to these issues from such a developmental and somewhat clinical perspective.

THE MR. J. TRAVIS: Sorry about that.

MS M. KEELS: I'm going to move even closer.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Just keep going.

MS. M. KEELS: I will just keep going through that. And so -- and I also am working on this in a different practice setting, meaning educational settings. And when I get kind of to the end of this introduction, hopefully it might make it clear why I come at this from such a different lens versus those who are really working at this in the criminal justice system and so it would be great for some of this conversation might be around how these different perspectives might come together when thinking about practice.

And so it was a little daunting when I spoke with Sukyi and, you know, she asked me to
explain -- write a paper that would explain and talk about group level differences in the intergenerational transmission of violence and why there are these observed group level differences in violence which is a very developmental perspective, a very complex behavior. And so it was really daunting, and I hovered a bunch of theories in the paper in order to try to give my perspective for how I see these things. I'm largely not going to talk about that but happy to answer any questions that might come out of that.

And what I'm going to talk about instead has just kind of come from the different conversations that I've had with several of you because it has helped me think more about how this connects with the way that all of you, many of you think about these issues and that different lens.

So one of the things that I'll start with, which is in the near at the beginning of the paper is that so Jeremy asked us to use people first language and I find that that is critical to use when, especially when you want to engage people's imagination for doing something differently. And in the paper what I state quite clearly is that I use -- it makes it harder to write when you use
people first language, it's one of those things. I say in the paper -- so I say why I'm saying in this people who engage in violent behavior instead of saying a violent person. The reason it's harder to write is you have to extend all of those, a person who did this.

But the reason for doing that particularly when thinking about something like violence is that it shifts how you then think about possibilities for action and I also have the benefit of being in an interdisciplinary department where there's anthropologists, psychologists, people who do anime models of behavior and lots of those different things.

And so instead of people in my department think really closely about language and they show things like per example, the different -- they look at whole different societies and different cultures. And the language that they use for different things shifts the way their brain functions. And so just thinking about and it's going to be a theme through this and it's a theme through the paper is the neurobiology of all of this and our brain functioning with many of these things that we're talking about.
And so when we think about those things, might say use a person's center language because we think it's important to do. But I'm also saying it actually shifts the areas of the brain that light up when you're talking about something and that matters because the area of the brain that lights up is going to matter for the thoughts that come after in that individual. And when different areas light up there's not going to even be thinking about certain possibilities of action, they will have been shifted by the initial words that you said down to one pathway versus saying a different set of words can start to shift them down a different pathway.

Just really thinking about how critical some of these things are with language, so that's one of those things that I just really wanted to connect with and have you guys all think about as you are thinking about how you communicate your messages to people. Those first words about thinking about violence, are they going to affect what that person thinks is possible with changing violence.

And so also regarding this issue of language, it's kind of what motivated me to moving to thinking back again about practice. I started
about 20 years ago now going into clinical psychology and I wanted to work with very low income families. I got the opportunity to work with those families in my first sets of like learning my clinical training and I quickly realized I did not want to do that and that's just because it's about what happens in that room, in that session. And when you're working with high need families, you keep -- for me it felt like Groundhog Day, didn't we just talk about this, didn't we just talk about this?

But in part that's because they kept returning to context that reinforced the things that we were trying to undo in one session once a week for one hour, many of which they couldn't meet because they had all of these other contextual things happening in their lives. And so, fast forward, about 20 years later, my practice project in creating trauma informed schools and the connection to violence was around the tragic murder of Tyshawn Lee in Chicago and it was around language because what I had done this those intervening years was a lot of neighborhood effects, research, large quantitative studies, we were looking at the numbers, differences in exposures to violence and
things like that.

So I knew the numbers really well for Chicago. But a lot of the narrative, most of the narrative was and continues to be when I kind of like looked up out of my academic space into how we talk about violent incidents, was incident based. Was a lot of the narrative was how could this incident possibly happen. Well, easy to understand how the targeted gang associated murder of a nine year old can happen for me was fairly easy because I knew the numbers. The numbers were that there were over 800 violent police incident -- recorded incidents in the community area or neighborhood where he lived.

So in the 365 days before that incident, so that incident was just in that string of everything that came before, but yet the narrative was, well, how could something like this possibly happen. And yes, it was a first that there would be a targeted gang associated murder of someone so young, but it follows from everything that came before in the level of violence in the community.

And the continuing narrative when we think about this incident was around what to do. Well, since it was just an incident, what we were
going to do in the city and in the school system was that they were going to take their team of crisis counselors and rush them to that school for two weeks in order to insure that the kids got crisis counseling and then they could return to normal functioning.

Again, two weeks of counseling is not going to get you over something so heinous, and what is normal functioning if 800 -- over 800 violent incidences happened in the 365 days and that would continue to happen in 365 days after, but we don't see any of that when we talk about each incident as an incident. And so with all of that, I was in schools, doing interviews with principles and teachers and things like that and it returned to this issue of what really got me back to schools are an ideal site, if we really want to disrupt the intergenerational transmission of violence and trauma. Because it solves an access issue in that how you get access to vulnerable kids in order to transform their outcomes.

So as a site, it gets you around that access problem, then you have to give people practice tools for what do they do. So when we were thinking back to that intergenerational transmission
of violence and group level differences, for me that
is a history question, and it can only be a history
question unless again you think is there something
fundamentally different about the people that make
up different groups in a given society and if
there's not, then it's going back to thinking in
connection with developmental theories, what is the
history at the many different levels of the society,
of the community, of the family and of that
individual's life history to date when particular
incidents happen.

So what is the totality of all of those
experiences that then are associated with engaging
in a particular violent incident and it's only by
understanding those things that we could really
create change. I also want to note, as many said at
the beginning of this, none of the things I'm
talking about in the paper are new. None of it is
some new contribution to science that I just made.

It's all things that we know in the
scientific record, in our research, in our
understanding about these issues. It just doesn't
make it all the way to practice in terms of the
issues that I'm working on. And that's kind of what
the trauma informed schools work that I do is taking
all that we know about the neurobiology of exposure to violence and stress and trauma and connecting that to what should be happening in schools if we want to transform the way schools work.

And so that's one of those things to acknowledge that many have said. Like we know, we know what to do, but how do we make that matter in practice. And so I talk about some neurobiology and stress and things in the paper, happy to answer questions about that as we go around the roundtable. But largely what I want to do -- and Jeremy, I hope you can give me that wave so that I know, because I lose track of time.

MR. J. TRAVIS: You're fine.

MS. M. KEELS: Largely, one of those things of what I want to do is just give you a couple of stories to try to say why schools are a site if you really want to change this and in the schools that we work in. So just a couple quick stories from schools in Chicago. One school, for example, has as their standard policy, one of calling police each time a physical fight occurs.

This is K to 8 elementary school and so in our working with the school, by the second week of the academic year police have been called several
times for fights between kids and we're transforming what was an educational issue into a criminal justice issue. The kids are so small, largely, that they're using zip ties instead of handcuffs because, you know, their wrists are so small. And so, it's what do we do? We have to -- well our work then is changing that policy, but to change that policy we have to give those teachers different tools for what to do when a fight breaks out.

And just the end of a long story with this is that instead of -- in this school also policies when particular students have gotten into these incidents, the policy then became, when you see them coming, a few particular boys and a few particular girls, when the school would see them coming they would send to alert the police to say such and such is coming to school today, be on alert because we're probably going to be calling you before the end of the day for a fight, which yes, would happen.

So, changing that to one of, so when you see such and such and such coming, the school counselor gets alerted and goes and stands outside the door, greets that student at the door, brings them in, take them into the counseling room. We
find out, do you need food, do you need to sleep, what needs to happen, making sure those things happen so that at least we can shift it to them making it through the day without having to call the police.

But it was shifting that framework of how do we respond to these things from this criminal justice framework of our perception of their behavior to, well, actually what do we know with them. Many of them were actively homeless, many of them, we know, were using in order to manage the stress and trauma in their lives, and many of these other things. And so once we can tip those things down then we can say, okay, isn't that the job of the counseling team at the school?

So how do we then create meaningful systems and structures to shift that. And so, it's kind of all of those things that I was trying to make the case for how to shift our sites of action around these things that maintained intergenerational transmission of trauma and violence.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you for that framework on a big topic. The floor is open for question both to what you just stated but also
invited questions from the paper as well. So let's see if there are clarifying questions. Yes, Kellie.

MS. K. CARTER-JACKSON: Really great. I have a lot of questions but I'm going to keep it to one. So you talked about the school being the best place to develop or to sort of handle these problems that you're encountering with children. Is that mostly because the children are spending the bulk of their time at school or as you mentioned before looking at a child's past or history, these are children that are actively homeless or have insecure shelter, whatever it is that they live, that there's no one that's coming to their home to sort of meet them where they're at basically. Is that the reason why the school is seen or prioritized as the safety solution because the school is perhaps where the child feels most safe or most secure.

MS M. KEELS: Somewhat. I prioritize the school because as a society, we have mandated that kids go to school in this age range. And so it just solves an issue of access. Ideally it really should begin at prenatally in terms of individuals, families, mothers and fathers that have risk characteristics that are associated with predicting the likelihood of kind of abuse and neglect for
their children.

One thing that I pointed out is the same factors that predict the likelihood of abuse and neglect in a family are the same factors that predict the likelihood that child will grow up to be a violent adolescent. So it's a set of systemic structures. So, no, the prioritization of the school is simply because as a society we've mandated it, we're funding it and so the least we can do is make it an institution that does not retraumatize, where as right now it's largely an institution that punishes children for not being able to manage all of the other structural violence that they experience before getting into school.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Other clarifying questions.

MS. B. RICHiE: I wonder, I appreciate especially the theoretical discussions and the models that you laid out and also mentioned. And I wonder if you can say anything about gender differences in both the experiences within the schools but also the opportunities for intervention. And there may not be much to say about it. I just wondered if you...

MS M. KEELS: There are few -- there are
meaningful gender differences in terms of -- but
that's a gender interaction difference in terms of
who tend to be -- tends to be women who are most of
the majority of the educators, and so they respond
differently to male and female acting out behavior.
And also perceptions of threat differ in terms of
male and female acting out behavior, so there are
some gender differences there. Which does not mean
that girls are not punished for acting out because
there are some of these relative differences which
is relatively girls who act out are punished and
sanctioned even higher than boys who act out because
they're so culturally deviant. So you've violated
all my norms, at least as a girl you're supposed to
be sweet and docile. So there are some of those
gender differences that come into play.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Last, Eric, clarifying
question?

MR. E. CUMBERBATCH: My question, as you
mention that the counseling teams in the school
building, and my question is around should there be
licensed mental health counselors and/or is there a
mixture of culturally competent people from the
community that are engaged in whatever trajectory
they're taking that young person across and towards?
MS M. KEELS: So one of the challenges with -- largely a lot of our work is with teachers who get the support of the counseling community school. When I started this, it was really thinking about the counselors in the school. But in the schools that we were working with, schools located in high crime neighborhoods in direct poverty neighborhoods.

What the principals were saying, if you're focused on the counselors, that's just not really going to help me because I'm not dealing with one, two or three or four or five kids, pretty much all my whole student population needs support in this way and so there are not going to be enough counselors, one and two, they're still going to spend the majority of their day with the classroom teacher.

And a quick illustration of why this matters so much. One of our schools, a fourth grader brought a knife to school in order to stab another student because he'd been beaten up on the playground one too many times, sent him for expulsion. The decision came back, he's not going to be expelled he's going to be back in the classroom in one or two weeks.
He's sending him back into that classroom with the classroom teacher. So our work has to be with that classroom teacher to make sure that she will respond to the mandate of bringing him back, but he will be back and when I go into that class -- what I know I would likely see because of some of the other classrooms, is that student turned around facing the back, isolated in the corner, as far away from her and everybody else as possible.

That's only going to exacerbate the situation. So the work is actually, has to be with that teacher so that it transformed that student's classroom experience, understanding why that happened, which for us -- so I have to get educators to understand this term that we call proactive self defensive aggression which matters not just for educators but everywhere else. Proactive self defensive aggression, we are terming for kids, which is, all the adults have failed to protect me. And so, I brought a knife to school to protect myself because I've been beaten up one too many times on the playground. And so, I need to get you as an educator to understand not a violent boy, responding to a context and situation.

MR. J. TRAVIS: And another clarifying
question. Ron Davis is being patient.

MR. J. CARTAGENA: What role have you
seen special education play in this kind of
conversation? I ask because I used to litigate by
day with special education managers. And
misclassification of establishing style in kids as
being learning disabled and being abandoned as well
by the school systems. And in this particular case,
especially the last example you just gave us, to
what extent are the teachers or the system
misclassifying these kind of children as special
needs kids?

MS M. KEELS: A lot, essentially because
they show up for all of us. Inability to manage
stress, inability to manage trauma shows up as
behavioral dysregulation, cognitive, emotional and
behavioral dysregulation which then -- gets a high
likelihood of getting labeled into one of the like,
emotionally, behaviorally disordered categories.
And so a lot is where that misclassification can
show up, yeah. And so it's helping to understand --
if there's a set of life circumstances around this
child, that where we can trace a line from where
this behavioral dysregulation is stemming from, then
that should not be the classification for the
student.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Opened up for general discussion, Ron Davis will be the first. The questions that have been directed towards Micere have in some cases focused on schools, but in the case of Kellie's question, asking, are the schools our only frame for thinking about trauma and response to violence. The answer for this discussion, as you point out in your paper is, it's not the only frame, it's illustrative point of intervention. So let's make sure as we have this discussion we're talking broadly at a community societal level.

I'm just going to read, with your permission, the opening paragraph of your article. To start, the term intergenerational transmission of trauma and violence, rather than transition of violence is when the trauma of violence, cultural economic and interpersonal violence one generation goes unhealed that is passed down to the next in one form or another. That's sort of like the biggest frame possible. So let's use schools as perhaps a way to refract this question and put it on the microscope and is fascinating. But let's remember we want to connect this to our first discussion
about history and resistance and our discussion over
the next two days about violence. Ron Davis has the
first and somebody else. So.

MR. R. DAVIS: I'm not sure this goes to
what you just said Jeremy but there's a comment you
made about, we've had the answers, and I think I've
heard that throughout the early morning that there's
a lot of answers. And I guess the question comes,
so I agree with you. The real question for this
group, whether it's today or in the future would be
is, what's preventing the answers from becoming
actual implement in practices.

In many cases is that understanding the
governing structure and how to govern is the answer
to that. For example, when you talk about the kids
in the schools is what you offered, is what many
people do not offer, if not this then what? The,
then what, is critical. When I was at The COPS
Office we funded a lot of officers in the schools
and a lot of groups and probably many around the
table don't like that because of the school prison
pipeline. I got that part, a hundred percent, I
agree.

My concern then would be, if not this,
then what? If you're focusing on the officer but
you haven't addressed the teacher who is the one who
called the police to begin with, then whether I put
an officer in the school or whether they come from
the beat down the road, they're still going to
respond to the fact that Johnny hit Sally. And if
they're not a school resource officer, the only tool
they have to respond to Johnny hit Sally is to take
Johnny to jail.

At least if it's a school resource

officer, you can get the teacher, the school
district and that officer to understand that there's
alternatives. The, then what, then Johnny doesn't
have to go to jail, it last nothing to do with the
criminal justice system and we can talk about
healing. But in many cases what I see especially
with the schools if we don't understand the, then
what, we start going after the pieces of a puzzle,
that as we pull them back we've got to caution
people, be careful what you ask for because you're
very likely to get it.

And when you get it you've got to
understand why the teachers are in fact calling the
police. Part of that is fear, right? It is if
Johnny hit Sally then I'll call the police. If
Johnny comes back and stabs somebody and then they
found out I knew about the fight a week ahead of time and didn't call the police, then our litigious society says that I'm going to lose my job, I'm going to get sued and everybody's going to make me the demon that was neglectful because I had the benefit of 20/20 hindsight.

So if teachers, unless we're given that environment to make decisions, to resolve these conflicts and I think this is a good environment to look at societies at large is what are the alternatives for the teacher, what's the alternative for the community why does everything have to be based on fear that if I don't do this, then this will happen.

Why do we take chances and say we can probably prevent Johnny from coming back with a knife if we intervene now. We meet with parents now, if we get them with the counselor now. That doesn't require to kick cops out of the schools unless they're not doing the right thing. You can kick them out very quickly. It doesn't mean you kick them out of the community. It means you change their role so that they're now part of the team that should also welcome, maybe not literally welcome but welcome the kid back to the school.
So if this kid knows that the police are not looking for them, that the police are aware that are they're getting counseling services and that they're not sitting in the back of the classroom.

So, I just hope we move on and at some point, I said this role as being an executive at a local agency and a federal, the biggest things of hindrance from evidence based practices and I talked to a lot of academics that have solutions to solve and change the world but they can't get it past go, right, because they cannot answer the political questions, the governing questions or understand the process to be able to move something from A to Z and I think without that, then these become very nice ideas, become academic papers and they sit on the shelf and practitioners like me or Eric or those that are running systems can't do anything with it because we don't have the political leverage to do so.

Just a thought, I thought you framed it very well when you said if not this, then what and focusing on the teachers. But I would also include, if there are officers, that that training has to go to the officers, they have to get it. I will tell you about The COPS Office, we changed the criteria
that if you got funding from my office, you had to
one, get training for my officers who would now
police the team rank, understanding the youth
development, you have to have an MOU with the school
district, that made it clear that you are not part
of this very process, you're not here to enforce the
law. And to make out very clear what you are to
expect and not expect. And that the principal had
the veto power against all activity as well as
removing you from the school.

THE MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you. So Ray,
Candice exercised her right for her to respond. You
didn't notice it because you're on the same side or
the --

MR. R. WINANS: I noticed it. It's all
love, my mama here so I -- (audience laughter).

MS. C. JONES: Now because his mama is
here, this is why I -- (audience laughter).

I want to respond to this though having
both been a former --

So I'm going to come back because I'm
going to respond to your article in a large way.
I -- we know how to treat kids when they are
privileged. So this idea that you don't know how to
respond -- on college campuses like when Tim hits
Chuck and they fight in the frat house, we ain't locking them up, we're doing something else. So it's like I actually want to say that we find these responses adequate when the kids are like poor and of color, right, then you can call the police and nobody else can figure out any other way.

So I actually -- the idea that it's like we do this because teachers and systems are afraid of accountability, I think we do this because we won't hold accountable teachers and systems for treating children of color humanely, but I just ain't buying that. And I know we're all capable of coping with disagreements so I'm going to let y'all know early in this process that I will do that. And I get it with kids and trauma but I want to scratch at that a little bit. I know there's sensitivity like on how to run a correctional system because one of the things I struggle with sometimes is that systems -- especially with law enforcement, we have gotten to this place in society that we want to take the position that systems publicly funded are above reproach.

And that's just not Okay. We can't be super sensitive about the idea that actually has to critique these systems. And so I just want to
respond to that.

MR. R. DAVIS: I think we actually agree with everything that you just said. I guess what I'm offering is some of those systems are based on economic privilege and white privilege and race. So if you're in a white school and you got money, then go to the professor's point, then you have answered the, then what. If you're in a black school and you have no resources, then there's no alternative but the police. And this is how we solve problems in the views of color.

So what I'm offering is that I'm not suggesting that the system is completely -- I think the system works as perfectly designed, which is flawed, it was designed for a reason.

MS. C. JONES: So, I was actually at the Department of Education when they were rolling out the ACA, this was the Obamacare, colloquially. One of the big things that was debated was because for communities of color and low income communities making the focus of enrollment in ACA schools. And also using federal money and pouring tons of money into health centers that they would locate in schools, both physical and behavioral health centers.
And the theory behind it, I'm no education expert so I'll lead with that, but the theory behind it was that there was good research that for lots of reasons schools are hubs in communities, right, they are large publicly funded campuses in most neighborhoods. People have to go there because kids are mandated to be there for most times of the day and usually lots of kids in communities with schools, you know, lots of people with communities with schools have children.

So by putting them in the school and forcing that to be the focus, not only would you ensure better behavior and physical health care for the kids but you would likely get better physical and behavioral health care for their families which would improve some of these other, I think resulted traumatic outcomes that you're talking about. So I wanted to offer that that was a really concrete idea that was proffered and then never funded.

MR. R. DAVIS: That's my point, you're making my point.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Candice and Ron --

MS. C. JONES: I'm done, I'm done for the afternoon y'all.

MR. J. TRAVIS: We're just going to move
on to ray. What would you like to add to this.

MR. R. WINANS: Most definitely have a
great appreciation for it, right? You're familiar
with average childhood experiences, right? So
that's the language that you're speaking, right.
I'm pretty sure you have an appreciation for going
through the school piece. We decided to take a look
at violence in a school based environment. And the
opportunities that afforded us was being able to
expect the parent involvement, parent aid through
the process, bringing law enforcement into the
schools to really shift the paradigm of young people
and staffers just to stop getting kids arrested in
school, mediating and mitigating retaliation that
was happening in school fights versus the community.

And I asked my mom if it was okay for me
to share this, right. I have a score of eight,
right. And so, with that it was always that fight
mode, right. And so I never forget and I tell moms
all the time, I take full responsibility of my
actions but I decided that I wanted to gang bang,
right, living in the neighborhood that we was in.
And I got chased home by half the school one day and
my mom's response was be glad they didn't catch you.

What that said to me is now I have to
protect myself and I was 13 at the time and so I
took a gun to school and I took a sawed off shotgun
to school because my mother said, be glad they
didn't catch you. So in my child like mind said, I
have to protect myself now because I didn't want to
get jumped.

So if we understand that the average
childhood experience is everything -- every
traumatic experience that happens to a child up
until the age 18, your brain doesn't fully develop
until you're 25, that's why the schools, the
juvenile facilities and things like that are a great
access point because now you get the house and now
you get to go upstream in being able to bring
resources not only for that child but also into that
home. So I want to thank you for bringing that to
the forefront of this conversation.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Let me just tell you
who's in the queue, Beverly Soledad, Barbara and
Joe. So we'll see where we are at that point.

MS. B. TILLERY: So I wanted to say that
I was really challenged by your paper because on one
hand it was very survivor centered, trauma informed.
It really talked about all the things that I think
that we know. And at the same time I kept coming
back to feeling like it was continuing this narrative of black and brown kids being violent because of their trauma and, you know, even in your paper, you say only 20 percent of these children are actually acting out in violence.

But it had that sense of this is explained the violence and also there's so much violence in these schools, right and that it is pervasive, it is systemic, all of that. But I kept wondering, well, where is the analysis of the larger violence in society in this because it felt like almost it was -- it was standing alone and not recognizing even the trauma that it was referencing and so it felt like to me like the answer is, okay, you deal with the trauma that those families are dealing with. And that the solutions of dealing with the issues of the schools, obviously you have to do that, but it didn't feel like it was going far enough.

It just felt like to me it was saying again to us and to, you know, children, that you're violent. You can't help being that way, you're violent. And so I'm just wondering like what is the -- I don't know if other people had that same reaction to it, but I wonder what is -- how do we
get ourselves out of that cycle of thinking and sort of blaming people as violent.

MR. J. TRAVIS: So just start making a list of questions like that. Really questions like that I'll give you a chance to answer. Now we want to keep the conversation going. Next is Soledad and then Barb.

MS. S. McGRATH: Thanks, Jeremy I think I'm taking us back a little bit or taking a step back because I'm really struggling with some definitional issues. You use the term neurobiology of language and how we frame an issue really matters and the language that we use really matters and that strikes me because we're talking about violence, but we haven't really defined what we're talking about when we're talking about violence.

I feel like as a group there's no nuance, and so someone says the word violence and I feel like we're probably all thinking about different things. We could be thinking about the school yard fight, we could be thinking about murder and there's a big spectrum and I think that really matters for us to be able to, over the next couple of days, narrow the discussion and the conversation to policy change, to practice change, to how we frame the
issue and I'm sort of struggling with how up here we
are right now. And I don't know, that's not really
a fair question to you, I guess, but to the group.

THE MR. J. TRAVIS: To the group.

MS. S. McGRATH: Yeah, I'm really
struggling with that personally and I would love to
tease that out more so that we can be on the same
page about what we're talking about.

MR. J. TRAVIS: It's a great challenge to
the group and let's just like sit there for a while
and maybe we'll get it up tomorrow it's a really
good challenge for us to spend some time on.

Barbara, I wanted to bring you into the conversation
now and then Joe is next.

MS. B. JONES: Thank you for your paper.

Myself, like Soledad, I'm struggling with the many
frames as it relates to this particular discussion.
But I just want to go back to what your paper talks
about and what you just stated in your synopsis of
narratives and incidents. And when we talk about
narratives, are we talking about when you
specifically say narratives, we're talking about the
narratives of the incident that happened in the
school that has caused the issues of violence.

That's kind of like a question because it's so
broad, it's so many things --

MS M. KEELS: I'm talking about the narrative that we use when interpersonal violence happens. We look at -- their narrative is about this incident that might happen between the two of us and does not -- and that narrative does not pull in as part of that conversation, the history that got us to this point.

So, for example, one of those narratives is when we have a fight in the hallway, if we are both in a high poverty school and a high poverty neighborhood, there's a history that created that context because that concentration of poverty itself creates chronic traumatic stress that undermines our neurobiological development in ways that increases the likelihood that when we bump into each other in the hallway, we are going to have -- respond with a fight.

That is about how our neurobiology responds to stress and trauma. And so that's why -- some of -- it's hard to get all of this in my ten pages. That they allowed, but part of it is independent of the learning of observational learning about seeing violence and then acting with violence. If we had never even seen violence,
hunger, housing instability, all of those things affect, which are structural violence, affect our neurobiological development in ways such that when we bump into each other we have a fight or fight response.

And part of it is that it's kind of -- when I talk about violence, it's all of those things, but I take all of those things to thinking about that neurobiological level because for me when I'm trying to change what's happening in schools, I'm trying to move them away from some of those blame pieces that come and trying to move them to this is normal -- normal is a word that I don't use. This is human response, human reaction to all of these things, and so I need you to see these kids as having a human response and so that I need you to respond in developmentally supportive ways.

So to get them to understand that, then helps when that next fight happens, that I'm getting them to think I need you to calm the neurobiology for both of those students, I need you to do that first, and then you can have a talk about consequences.

MS. B. JONES: Okay. So based off of that, it clarifies because based off of the
discussion and things that we're bringing into this
correspondence, we're talking about resource officers,
we're talking about teachers, we're talking about
special needs, we're talking about state sanctioned,
you're speaking of lack of resources. I mean we're
talking about all of these other things that add to
the cyclical issues of violence. And again I'm a
little, you know, confused because I'm focused on
the narratives of the actual what's going on.

And with the other pieces to me it just
distorts, you know, about the resource officers
that, you know, Ron Davis was talking about. I want
to name -- I want to rename resource officers
because resource officers, they're not resourceful
because they're coming in doing a job that is -- you
know, it's not resourceful, it's punitive. Let's
call them punitive officers because that's exactly
what they're doing. So that's another piece of the
pie but, you know that's another discussion.

Then we're going to talk about teachers.
Some teachers may not be informed to pull the right
or ask the right questions as far as the incidences
to get these real narratives in order to better
inform the teachers on how they should respond
instead of calling the punitive officers, you know,
to come and deal with the problem that we can handle ourselves.

MS M. KEELS: But they're less likely to -- so what shifts is that they're less likely to call that officer when they move it from a blame based individual perpetrator, blame based understanding of what's happening when you see aggressive behaviors to, oh, this is a response to stress and trauma.

So that shifts who they call. So then they're going to call the counselor instead of calling the resource officer. However, the schools that we work in, all of the people have to come to our training including security staff. And so we can -- for example in that school that I was talking about where the policy was to call -- to alert the police, the person who was driving change in that school was the dean and security staff because by doing this work, they could then see through a different lens.

And so in terms of thinking about how that applies to this work and thinking about criminal justice system, it's seeing it through one very narrow lens. So for example one of those stories that I could tell is there's -- when news
reports of, you know, pulled from the headlines
types of things, police officers shoot a black
autistic teenager, that started with the mother
calling the police to help, how does that end with a
shooting of that individual, it's because there's a
very narrow lens through which they see the behavior
and that narrow lens is one that's solely through
threat.

And so it's about changing that lens
through which you can see what on the surface looks
like threatening behavior but it's dysregulation.
And so in terms of thinking, well, how do we get
from that call for help to the police officers to
the child being shot? It's because there's only one
lens that they were trained with.

THE MR. J. TRAVIS: Let me pick up that
invitation and just extend the invitation to others
who are about to speak, that's fine. To use, in
essence this is a paradigm. The school is a place,
where we, society, intervene in certain ways about
certain behaviors. We intervene regarding similar
behaviors as you just said in other context other
than the school and we don't -- we're not adept at
finding other frames other than the classic frame
that we get through a school resource officer and
get through the police.

And for a lawyer that's the legal question, what is a crime? But it's also a resource management question, who comes -- and what do they know, what do they care about knowing when the government is called, which will often happen. So, what I love about your papers is just blowing up a lot of some established understandings of what we do and how we do that and how we define, back to Soledad's question, define a particular behavior as being violent.

Let's just extend that invitation to other starting with Joe to see if we can use this paper as a provocation for creating a big frame around this question. The queue right now is Joe, and I've got to get your name right, Antong and Keith and Beth and then we'll see where we are in terms of time. And we'll get to you. Joe, you're up.

MR. LUPPINO-ESPOSITO: Yeah, actually to that point, it would be pretty interesting to have the first question about access and into the schools a few other people waiting on it being a hub, that now it all makes sense. But they got me thinking about the idea, you know, we're talking about the
problem being such a massive problem in a lot of schools. You know, are there alternatives to schools being an institution, right. I mean maybe just charter schools, they have specifically tailored things and that kind of thing, depending upon the needs of the community and they have several schools instead of one single neighborhood school. Or, at the next roundtable education policy people, to say, can their education actually be going on if the problem is so-so bad.

Like does there need to be something else first and education is secondary and maybe that's too much blowing up of this. But I think if we're at a point where teachers can't really be doing the teaching, because we need to give them that teaching, they need to be doing so many other things. Does our priority have to shift that our thoughts of that school, whatever that building is, whatever that meeting place is, is not necessarily education first.

It's dealing with trauma first and then education comes as we attempt to settle it. That's obviously a lot to chew. And then I also don't want to bring it out to sort of where I know a lot of groups will then say well then how involved are we
going to get in everyone's lives as well. We want
to be helpful to families but we don't want to be
taking over families either.

I know working in a bipartisan space
where we have a really interesting connection from
folks home schooled community. Are the applicants
talking about the problems of when there's too much
and sort of an attack on what some probably hear
from the families. And that then becomes well,
child protective services is simply going to say
this child can't stay in this home anymore because
it's so bad and taking children out of the homes,
that's a very interesting connection that we have
left, right. Home school and otherwise of people
saying that's a bad idea.

So, I do want to start being fanatical on
it but maybe say there's some things sort of at the
forefront which is the problem, which is, if
education is going to be so difficult, maybe we need
to focus the resources first and foremost elsewhere.
And then obviously still include education but not
make it that the teachers have to become
psychologists versus starting with the psychologists
then also having to be the teachers.

MR. J. TRAVIS: I think you exercised
your right. Gently and fairly perceptively.

MS. F. MUHAMMAD: It's my style. Thank you for saying that, because I think we were stuck in a frame about school, when I think the question that your paper can tee up is: Who is responsible for addressing intergenerational trauma and violence, like who is responsible? And I think that is a big question.

I want us to envision other ways that actually put our youth at the center, that could actually mobilize support. And I want to also for my profession and say I don't know a school in this country that really trains people to address the intergenerational trauma and violence that we're seeing in schools, I really don't. I mean I'm going to be very frank. I think that there are people who are brilliant, who are geniuses, activists in communities already that may not have a license but are doing remarkable work and have been. And who are over tasked and don't have the capacity and I think we need to better understand what they're doing and how they're doing it and partner, these institutions need to better partner with communities.

Now that is not evenly distributed, I
also know that, you know, there's a -- when we talk
to the community and then it's like, you know, these
are real skills and people have them and they're
incredible and then I think that there's a question
of how do you develop those who have the potential
to have them but truly need some support. But I
think we have to start there.

And what is the work force that's
accountable for this? You know, how do you pay for
it? And then how do institutions partner but I
don't think it's just counselors. I want to say
that I really don't and I'm concerned because we
send counselors in and they don't understand what
the problem is. I mean they really don't and
there's tools that we use, you know, I think there's
a place for cognitive behavioral therapy, I think
there are some really great therapies out there but
this is so much bigger than that.

And what's hard about even saying that is
that it is still not getting at the structural
challenges of poverty, of criminal justice system,
all of those things, those structures are still
happening. Why are we waiting? We know, we can
predict. Our ZIP code is predictive. Like all of
these things we know and because we don't -- it's
kind of like in the meantime, because we don't have -- we've not yet mobilized our movement but we're going -- we're in this room so we're doing the work to disrupt and transform those systems to actually truly serve people.

In the meantime we want to make sure that we're not sending the next generation into right, without any kind of defense and that's where this work portion comes in. But it's only mitigating the larger structural issues. And if you focus too much on the individual level, you miss the structure, you say too much about the structure then you face that solution well what's happening with Ray Ray right now, right? How do we make sure that this child who right now has this problem, it has something that supports and I think that's the tension I heard you say Soledad, like what are we talking about when we say violence that's so hard to disentangle.

Because we actually, in other context, we pit those two arguments against each other and we don't actually have an integrated way of recognizing because it's either the kitchen sink solution, right, which doesn't get anywhere or it's so hyper focused, we miss the bigger structural challenges. But I'd like to envision a -- you know, kind of
going back to your point of, you know, I think these modalities of resourcing communities to actually support and name and build a sense of healing culture, create an infrastructure within communities should be happening all the time, all the time and that there needs to be space.

And how does the state support that sort of infrastructure that doesn't really exist anywhere, we have little bits and pieces of it. But I want to just also give a shout out to Ray because I consider you a genius in this way of mincing the hearts of people and the number of people but that is -- we'll work out the willingness and how you train others to do that work for people who have felt completely abandoned and had for generations. That brilliance is what we're trying to elevate in right now in my opinion.

MR. R. WINANS: Thank you, you took that to another level.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Okay, Antong, thank you for being patient.


MR. J. TRAVIS: That was worth waiting for.

MR. A. LUCKY: Oh, yeah and I wanted to
say, you know, for the team because you took
probably 40 percent of what I was going to say
because I do believe that -- I admire the paper and
I love this paper, but I do believe it has to be
more than counselors who work with our kids. And I
say that because in Dallas where I'm from, we did
the first gang peace treaty and I just want to use
this right quick. We did the first gang peace -- we
had 270 gang members sign a peace treaty, right.

And then shortly after that we went into
the schools and I do believe the school offer that
proximity to the kids as a good engagement point.
But we went into the school, we took the OGs from
that neighborhood and we put them in schools. The
principal was a courageous principal, what's the guy
in Lean On Me, Joe? He's one of those kind of
principals. He willed it with the principle. I
remember him telling me, he said, Mr. Lucky these
kids are -- I ain't going to say that, I'm not going
to say that.

But we put those people in schools, those
OG's from that neighborhood that was indigenous to
those neighborhoods where those gangs were fighting.
And unbeknownst to us, three years later the
University of Minnesota did a study. The time we
went in there was 392 gang assaults, gang violence incidents a year. First year we went in with those guys, it was reduced to two. We didn't even know that.

But these were just guys from a neighborhood who the kids respected, who the kids tried to emulate that was just placed in that school. Some of those guys had felonies, they didn't have nothing to have anything to do with sexual or moral turpitude but they had felonies. So the success of that was great and they talked about that.

But five years later when they got a new superintendent he said that we could do it without felonies which was an issue. And I'm going to close on this, this is a statement. When we was proposing this to our state legislators, I remember a lady saying to me, and the success was phenomenal in the stuff that they did, I'm not even talking about that whole -- but this lady said to me, she said, Mr. Lucky, are you proposing that you going to have felons in the school with kids. It was an old white lady. I said, no disrespect, madam, but it was felons who made the kids.

So a lot of times we don't look at the
fact that one in every three black men, person of color has been in probation, prison, parole in the system. And the kids emulate, look up, that's a family member and they're coming out. How do we utilize those people who have demonstrated that they have been redeemed and transformed in the facilitation of working with our kids, partnering with people who can train them about social and emotional trauma informed therapy, how can we train those individuals?

Because one of the things I noticed with those -- when we was in schools, those teachers said unanimously that those kids respected those guys that y'all had in school. That when we mentioned their name, their behavior changed. All too often we keep overlooking that. We have to figure a way to get people in our communities back into this business of helping our kids and helping our community. We can't just keep overlooking the fact that these black men, brown men have advantage and we tell them all the time, when your character change, your characteristics have a marked advantage when we're looking at violence. I would like to say let's think in those terms when we're thinking about the solutions to violence that's happening inside
the neighborhoods and our communities using those kinds of people.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Perfectly building on the discussion on this end. So here's where we are, dear colleagues. We're rapidly moving towards the end of our day. I have a queue now that has Keith, Beth, Celia, Ray and Alia. Let's cut it there unless there's somebody insistently that has to get in. You're on the list. You're the last one and then we're going to give Mr. Hureau some time just to give us some reactions to what you've heard. Bruce to wrap it up and then Sukyi, when Sukyi is back she will give us a preview of our evening together and then we are it's going to go home and try to make sense out of all this.

I said to somebody in the hallway that our goal is for everybody to leave here with a headache. How're we doing? Your head is full at the end of the day, we've had a successful day. It doesn't mean you've had more wine. We want to just, you know, disruptive is the goal here. So that's what we're going to do. Start with Keith then Beth then Jahmal.

MR. K. WATTLEY: First I'll say thank you for that or for this, that's directly in line with
what I've been thinking and I have to agree that this is a so important to create the statement in a broader context. Structural way that we got here, how to really address the structurement. On a smaller scale, the resource that Antong has just talked about is where the real power is in my experience. I meet those people when they're still in prison.

And one of the things I picked up from the paper is that you're really talking about a condition, automatic response that people have very limited -- I feel like they have limited options in response to triggering events. In prison I've met people who we were talking about their disciplinary record in prison. We were often talking about, what seemed like an automatic response, some triggering a bit, they automatically react violent.

What I find is when they -- what I point out to them, that they actually had a choice in the way they responded to that thing. They're shocked. They're either shocked, either shocked to learn that they actually had a choice or shocked to learn that I think they have a choice, right. Because it's reality, I don't have a choice, this is what I have to do, right. So a lot of our work is helping them
develop their emotional intelligence and communication skills so they actually think, yeah, I do have a choice and so do you.

So these are the people who then transform their own lives and come home fully committed to be plugged in like you talked about to transform other lives. So the question if not school resource officer, then why not formerly incarcerated people, those are the people who, in my experience, have the greatest capacity to connect with these kids where they are, because they've been there and they believe it and they will follow it.

MS. B. RICHIE: Yes, can we add an amen corner to that. A really quick story in Chicago, there's some debate about the presence of school resource officers again in schools and I'm working with a school in the neighborhood that I live near. One of the things that kids have said, this is to the question of who's responsible. Kids have said, who influences you, my parents or the adults around me, parent like figures and the people who are one generation ahead of me who are like my parents.

What's interesting about that is when asked so are they teachers, are they counselors, are they police, it's none of those people. It's the
people who they feel closest to them. When that information was taken back to the community, there was discussion in the community about, well, should we put school resource officers anyway in the school. And the communities were about divided in half. So part of why I share that story is I think we have -- just as we're kind of saying violence is a lot of different things, communities are a lot of different things, even from in the same household.

Some people say more police and some people say less police, and sometimes people say more police and then half hour later less police. And so I think that part of the problem is we've failed to imagine anything other than the standard alternatives to school resource officers or police or training people who aren't trained on our children's needs and we haven't looked right in our own families or around our own blocks for who is a candidate for the children. And I think that's part of what we need to do. But we also need to do it in a way that realizes that there is not, at least in my experience in Chicago, I know we're going to hear Jahmal is probably going to say something about Chicago too. There is not consensus yet about what we can do that's a good alternative in part because
we haven't done a good job of lifting up a real live alternative that's right around us.

MR. J. COLE: So I want to say I appreciate the comment about we can't talk about consequences if you don't understand that the kids are responding correctly, I think that's beautiful. It's always -- I run an after school program with 150 kids that go to the lowest performing schools in Chicago. And the best part of my program is dropping them off on the blocks when we're done because that's when you can build a relationship.

And when we're dropping students off, I'll drop a lady off, you know on the west side and say no matter where her block is. When we pull up on a block they'll say, man, you got yellow tape in front of your house, like yellow crime scene tape. And the kids will say, awe man, it ain't serious unless it's red tape, that's when you know it's been a body.

These kids are 15 years old and they're forensic scientists already. Also, it's interesting when I talk to a kid and I say, hey, Marcos, what you do this week end, oh, Jahmal I had a great time I got to dress up, eat some good food, saw some family members, I got to travel a little bit. And I
say, hey Marco, did you go to six flags, where did you go? He said, oh, no, I just went to Leak's on 79th. This is the best funeral I ever been to.

The kids are my program have been to like 15 funerals by the time they're sophomores. So, when you think about, they're learning more on the walk to school than they're learning in the school. They pull up to the schools, two paddy wagons parked outside front. You see what I'm saying, like you got to take your belt off and shoes off to get through a metal detector to get in the school.

You know what I'm saying, your environment impacts your well being already. It really impacts your well being because the kids have such a burden of being so aware all day. What I've noticed is when I take them outside of the neighborhood and expose them to different things, we'll take them to let's say, we'll go to Traverse City Michigan. That's one of our bigger trips. One the first things they say is, when they get back, when they hear a police siren, they say, man I haven't heard a siren all week. This is almost refreshing when they're home and they hear a siren. It's crazy man.

So, I think that exposure helps. As far
as the police exposure from police officers too helps. Our students' jobs in the summer is to give police officers tours of the neighborhood. So the police officers, they get to see the assets of the community through the stake holders which are the youth. And so, and this is the first time the cops -- sometimes it's the first time that the students have actually talked to a police officer when they aren't being arrested or something like that. And it's also the first time the police officers interact in the community in situations where you're not arresting somebody.

You just see somebody on the porch and you have a conversation. I think cultural emersion is so-so important for not only police officers but also teachers, just learning your kids walk to school everyday, how does that impact a kid. These are some of the things that we're doing with our after school program. I thank you for the article, I thank you guys all for the comments and I'm looking forward to learning. I'm taking so many notes, so many notes I've taken.

MS. C. COLON: I appreciate the article, comments, totally piggybacking off of you. For me in the city of Chicago I'm also from the south side.
So when we talk -- I'm going to use myself for an example I'm a survivor of many childhood traumas. And any time that I went to go find a counselor that didn't look like me, never understood me or my culture or how I was raised and that's a big missing element to this whole healing process.

When you have someone who understands how you are raised culturally, it's a big big change as far as trust and commonality and really opening up. As of right now all of the systems that are in place that are supposed to help us, counselors, the police officers, you know, DCFS workers, all these people, all of these mandatory reporters are the people that you're supposed to cry to, that you're supposed to open up to and tell them what what's going on because they're going to help you.

These are the people that put you and your parents in prison and in jail, so why would you go to them. For me I would -- if I had the money to do it, I'd do it on my own now with a peer to peer impact is something that is missing, is something that is needed for us to truly move forward.

Because what I did when I was 18, just like water is always adapting and transforming, so are people, we're always in the and constant transformation
So therefore, in order to really find healing and really have officers that connect, they need to start hiring ex-offenders, people who are impacted, to really know what it feels like to live on both sides of the street. I say that because I've been on both sides of the street my whole life. I've been impacted since I've been four. That's the first time I remember being traumatized and my body being violated visiting one of my uncles for doing life for a crime he didn't commit.

And then I also lost my youth in prison for a fight. So I've been on both sides of the world. I am, you know, on this side of course now for the last 18 years doing this work and that's why I do this work. Because when I go inside the school, and you no offense to all of my academics, I love you guys. But when a kid is there and I'm talking to students who are impacted just like me, who come from communities just like me, they will all tell the teacher, I want to hear her versus they want to hear him.

And it's just something that no one can put a price value on that because no one can tell you how to find that commonality to really open that
person up, to give them that choice. Because in my community there's an illusion of choice. There's no choices when all of your choices, excuse my French, are fucked up choices. That's the reality. There are a lot of people that never come from a community where there's food desserts or where there's one counselor for 400 students. She doesn't really want to talk to you, because she can't. She can't help you in any kind of way.

In order for us to have real change, we need to start creating real inclusion where there's people like me working in schools, working in the places that are mostly impacted and where people are just become a mill, like a puppy mill, but a human mill of that prison to pipeline.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Such a great conversation that you're adding another level of richness to it and I'm just remembering that it was Eric who asked that first somewhat innocent sounding question about the proverbial snowball coming down the hill and never know where a conversation is going to go. If it's important to ask, whose job is it in this wonderful conversation about --

MS. C. COLON: We should be the police officers. We're the ones who can infiltrate the
MR. J. TRAVIS: I'll recognize you, I'll tell you who's up next then Ray, and then Alia and then we'll ask you to sum up a little bit, then Bruce.

MR. LUCKY: Yes, I just wanted to make a couple statements that I didn't make and appreciate Jahmal and Celia for what you all just said and Keith what you said. I just want to say that in all our work that I wish we practiced the radical empathy for the people that we serve or the people that we study. And I was prompted on this listening to Jahmal because I know in the work that we do inside neighborhoods on the ground, you just can't do a drive by analysis of it, it's too complex. You have to be close enough to the people that you serve. And because if you're too far off, by the time up get close, the problem can shift and it will move and you can be off in your diagnosis.

I say that -- we tell our people that we work with, people in the neighborhood that people get paid to study you, look how you walk, look how you talk, look at him run and you get shot being you. That's a crazy dichotomy. And so we try to train those individuals in neighborhoods and what
I'm saying is I think that the research and the information that we give here -- by the way, this is a good group, I love this, I'm sucking up a lot of stuff. That don't have nothing to do with what I'm talking about. But I just wanted to say that in case I forget.

But I think the research, this research, has to be available and has to be married with the people on the ground. The stuff that I'm listening -- I'm saying if I knew that, I'm just doing it out of instinct. But if I knew this stuff that she's talking about, the stuff that Kellie was just talking about, it would then empower those on the ground that's doing this work.

I do a training with police officers and I, too, been a gang member, been to prison, I'm the first one to do this training. But having this kind of information -- and it's highly engaged with the community, how to stop shooting unarmed black men, and my demographic is 90 percent white, Anglo police officers. So you can imagine how that go when I walk in the room and see a picture of me in my white prison suit, and I do that on purpose.

But having this kind of information for the people that's on the ground doing the work is
very, very important. A lot of times that information never marry. You know, like if I knew this stuff, I could whip some butt with this stuff, this stuff right here.

But it has to be a marriage and it has to be that cosigning of each because again our kids, someone just said it, our kids respect those that are in proximity to them, those that they see everyday. Now just think if we had a massive importation of information going to those people that they see every day, just think about that, how powerful that can be.

And I think this right here and what we're doing right here at Square Lab, I'm telling you -- this going to be a good three days. This is some good stuff man. I just wanted to say that in case I forgot. Thank you. This is good stuff. This is Square One thinking.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Okay.

MR. R. WINANS: I'll go after her, either/or. I think you've just been given his spot and he's after you.

MS. A. HARVEY-QUINN: So I know -- I appreciate this conversation and I would love to put on the table a different vantage point. Like I
wonder if we're thinking about what inspires hope in people. Because if -- I feel like a lot of the work that we do in this community, as well as other justice communities, are centered on like punitive incentivization and assumes that a person has an aspiration for their future that can be leveraged.

And there are a lot of people who don't clearly see their future. There was a young man -- I came to this work as a poet running a youth program, and my youth program used to attract mostly young black boys, north end neighborhood, highly violent neighborhood in Detroit not far from me. And because I didn't want to hear them rap about sex and money and drugs all the time, I used to give them topics.

And there was a topic this day, it was like, you know, this was my group of guys, we had been meeting, we knew each other, we loved each other. It was the whole thing. It was Friday night. My class was more like English class, even though they wanted to be rappers.

And so the topic was: What do we fear? We know everybody fears something, we know society fears us, right. I'm talking, speaking in their voice, right, they're young black men. We know
society projects an image where we are feared, right. But we know we're all human, what do you fear?

One of the participants in the workshop said, Ms. Alia, I fear what I become when I have to rob people to help my mom pay the rent. So you know, I'm a poet, I'm not even a social worker. All I got is alliteration. I can facilitate a damn good workshop, that's all I got.

And the conversation escalated, we cried, we talked about the trap, but that's all I had, right. So then I started trying to dig. I called his mom, hey, can I talk to you, you know, I'm the nerdy teacher. I got all the paperwork in order and I'm calling.

Well, when I call, I get the local McDonald's. I'm all mad, he lied to me, this was his application. I called back, his mom wasn't on her shift, right. So I keep calling, I finally reach her. She has three younger children. All of a sudden I see this young man as the man of the household, right. He's 15 years old, he's in the 8th grade and he's -- you know, he's big. Now I check myself when it comes to my people and how I show up. This young man used to project an aura
that would make me say we, Alia, we don't fear our young people. We'll check them all, we'll fuss at them, equally, okay.

And I finally understood that he was projecting that aura and the mechanism for protecting himself and his family and that when he was coming to my workshop -- now mind you a lot of these young people -- Detroit has a 51 percent literacy rate. A lot of these young people were writing in text message language. So this was their hope, you know. If the transformation was going to happen, it was going to happen in the context that was relevant to their culture, it was going to be about hip hop, right.

But then on the flip side, who else had the leverage to support them. You know, like if it was coming from a school base or if there was a counselor who -- for instance, you know, my mom is also a counselor and she talks a lot about -- she writes a lot of our research. That is not me writing the research, y'all.

And she talks about the disconnects in the sort of like cultural understandings and what it takes to translate our culture and how counselors are taught to disengage in a way that doesn't allow
people of color to fully open up to them, because it's not sort of like this abstract -- relationships are not abstract and visible for us in a way that they can be for counselors.

But, you know -- so I'm just, I guess, putting that on the table. Like if we flip the equation over and think about like how are we inspiring hope so that people have something, a vision for their lives, that they can buy into, then maybe we'll get a lot of this done.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Ray.

MR. R. WINANS: Here's how we look at this work. We talk about violence intervention, violence prevention where case managers, social workers are mandated reporters, two totally different things.

It's hard for a social worker or counselor to actually go into a home of an individual when their mom has three feet of sewage in the basement, right. They already have two CPS cases, so I can't afford to let the social worker in my house because I still have five other children in there. But if I bring this young man, who I know done this time in prison, he's obligated to help.

Jahmal, you talked about the environment,
real quick story. In the Bible it says that God
created the heavens and the earth, all right, that's
a Bible story. God spent five days creating the
environment and in one day created man and rested on
the seventh. He was tired. If he created man in
one day, that wasn't hard work. The five days he
spent creating the environment was the hardest work.

So we have to create the right
environment in order for our children to be
inspired, feeling hope, feeling connected with,
right. Because when I leave here, I got to go over
to Seven Mile, right. Today, as soon as I leave
here, because a young man -- well, actually, two
people have lost their lives and so we have a
candlelight vigil tonight. But the guys on the
block know, right, when Ray comes, he going to come,
Ray ain't the police, Ray here to help. And Ray is
acceptable and he's willing to help, right.

And so it's unfortunate that sometimes in
our communities, and I can speak for my childhood,
if you haven't been through your traumas.
Unfortunately, you have a murder up under your belt
that's been suspected in a homicide, you don't
understand me because I need you to feel my pain,
not hear my pain, which you talk about and fear.
Unfortunately, when I was 15 years old I took a man's life. That isn't how my mama raised me to be. I was afraid to break the code of our family to not retaliate, because I was one of those kids didn't know I had an option. You hit me, I hit you back. If you shoot at me, I'm going to shoot you, right. And so those were the options.

When I realized we had options, then and only then were we able to go back to the community and find interventions and other folks, right, and give them the help that we need.

So in this line of work we also have to keep in mind about our service providers. I know if I got a young man who need to be able to go from A to Z, and I can provide him Uber and Lyft, I can connect him. But then I also got nondiscretionary money where if you've got $2,000 worth of fines, that right there feel like two million dollars. So we can go and pay that for you to be able to do that.

The fastest way to transportation is to make it sustainable. But when you don't have enough strength, you can help me but I need to be there to help my mama. She was a single mother raising three kids, three different men on welfare. So you
telling me in the school you about to help me? My mom still got kids, you got to help her.

So unless we're going to get real about this thing, really going upstream and helping and looking at it from that real intentional framework of being able to impact that entire home, then guess what? We're going to continue to have these conversations for the next five generations. Our kids are going to be talking about the evidence-based best practices. So let's great real about it. Thank y'all.

MR. J. TRAVIS: I'm going to ask --
Micere Keel and get some quick reactions to what you heard, then ask Bruce to tell us what he heard and then we'll invite Sukyi to tell us what's next.

MS M. KEELS: And I'll be quick because you guys took the conversation in so many places, like there's no way to wrap that up.

But I guess the couple of things would be, one, I'm kind of talking about all forms of violence, but I'm talking about how it affects the person. And so how exposure to many different forms of violence, then, affect my ability to respond rather than react when I experience the next stressor in my life. It's essentially what that
kind of boils down to in terms of what I was talking about in the paper.

And I guess in thinking about Square One, what I would say is that I think about our criminal justice system is that police officers in the criminal justice system have essentially kind of been the catchall for the failures of all of our other systems; family, community, as well as all of our other supposedly supportive state systems that were supposed to do all these other things with social services, with health care, with education.

And the failure -- the failure because of the lack of resourcing and supporting those systems, the one that -- and I say by default and design -- that was the catchall for all of those failures was the criminal justice system.

And then also when you think about violence, violence is relational, foundational, it's relational. And the criminal justice system, I say this in the paper, is designed to break, to remove an individual from all relationships.

And so when you mentioned helping the client feeling like they had a choice. They didn't have a choice until they had a relational interaction and an experience through that
relational interaction that brought what was formerly an instinctive reaction into their higher cognitive structures that they could then think about that. But before that, it was all at the level of the brainstem back here, which is just reaction to experience.

But through these conversations, through these relationships, through feeling safe enough -- we talked about this at lunch -- through feeling safe enough and vulnerable enough in relationship that they can reflect on their life's experiences and process that. When you process traumatic experiences it then comes up into your higher cognitive structures and begins to be something that you can think about. And so that is what enabled choices.

But that is all relational work, not something that happens in our criminal justice system. And so if we want a shift, rethink our criminal justice system, we have to rethink all of those other -- reimage -- or imagine all of those other systems that have been defaulting, or we've been defaulting to the criminal justice system.

The last thing I'm going to give you guys is a provocation. When we're thinking about change,
and this one is tough for me that I'm still trying
to figure out and learn. And this is in the
meantime. I agree with all of you that the people
that have been disenfranchised through our criminal
justice system that are now not part of our helping
and serving systems. And so, our systems that are
serving the youth that we're talking about didn't
have these experiences and don't understand, but
still they are the ones that are there in the
meantime.

And so how -- and that's what I'm trying
to do with the work that I'm doing, with the
practice work, is getting those systems to change.
Getting that white middle class man or woman who
drove in to that school in that high poverty
neighborhood to do something different. And this is
around guilt.

And so I say, it's provocation. It's
associated with thinking of how many people
responded to the case that happened and the hug that
happened in the courtroom, and what are do we do
with all of that and how do we understand that.

In doing a lot of the work that I do with
teachers to get them to change, guilt comes through
that room really quickly. Because one of the things
that I'm doing is they're starting to think about all of the things that they've done with students over the years and the things that they've done that may have attributed to that school to prison pipeline. And they start to feel really guilty about those decisions, about calling the police, about all of those things.

So I've learned through many failed attempts in getting teachers to change and schools to change is that when that wave of guilt comes through that room, is I have to stop and very intentionally walk them through self-forgiveness.

Why? I'm going to come back to the brain. When -- guilt is a very unhelpful emotion. When you experience guilt, you want to push it away, which means you stop listening to what I'm trying to tell you. And so I've had to learn this, that for me, it may not feel good to do it in those trainings and in that work. If I don't do some work with intentional working them through some of that guilt and that self-forgiveness, they don't hear anything else.

And nothing changes, because then they're living in that guilt; and that guilt is clouding how they're, you know, seeing student behavior and doing
anything and they just pushed everything out that
were intentional actions that you could do
differently.

When you think about how you're working
with systems that are just full of guilt, how are
you going to work with the people in those systems
that you need to change in the meantime; and how
does guilt play in as a very unhelpful emotion in
getting people to change.

I would say it's something that when
you're thinking about justice and criminal justice
and the justice we want versus what I'm going to
need to work people through to get there, I just
think we need to think about that.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you. I feel we've
been treated to a master class and brain science,
psychology. We're going to write up that transcript
as to share with lots of people. One of the themes
that keeps coming up in Square One is people who
have run systems or been involved, my name up there
as well, in managing the system, how do you deal
with the recognition of the harm that you've caused,
right. And we're just going to sort of step by step
think about this. I appreciate that, right, Chief
Davis. We have had our first really interesting
discussion in Durham.

MR. R. DAVIS: That's right.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Very powerful moment.

That was an emotional moment when he just said, what have I done. That's a reality, once we get there and you've helped us think about a little bit, I'm being a smart aleck. So Bruce.

MR. B. WESTERN: I think we've had two very strong conversations and thank you Micere for this tremendous paper and the conversation that followed. So I'm going to pick up three things that came out of this last session. And it was interesting that you started with language and you talked about the importance of person centered language and interestingly Alia also actually ended with language. I'll say a bit about that in a second.

You were saying the way we talk about violence is fraud. And if we say -- if we talk about violent people as opposed to people who have engaged in violence, that engages different parts of their brain and it sends us down different pathways in our thinking. In a way I think this whole conversation that we're having is an experiment in a non-pathologizing language. I think with an evenly
successful with -- it's hard to do when the topic is violence, but I think that's what this whole conversation is shooting for.

Non-pathologizing language and non-pathologizing narrative around violence and this was Beverly's point. I think the way in which we talk about violence is pathologizing when we view it as innate quality of the people. It adheres in people's individual selves and it's suffused with moral blame. So with pathologizing, if violence -- we talk about violence as an innate trait and we blame people for that trait as a consequence. I also think -- and I worry about this in my own work, that the way in which we talk about violence can be pathologizing in expert discourses as well. I wonder if that was a little bit behind Beverly's comment. I know that's definitely something I struggled with as well. I'll return back to that idea, and it goes to the relationship between researchers and field sites which is a para-relationship to be sure. So that's language.

I saw a lot of the conversation and definitely the paper takes a deep dive here. Sort of asking the question, what is trauma informed, what is a trauma informed school. I think we're
asking this in a lot of best BA's too. What is trauma informed policing, what is trauma informed programming in the criminal justice area?

Two things I took away, at a minimum, and it's only the start of a much larger conversation. Being trauma informed involves understanding people in their social context, what neighborhoods have they grown up in, what kinds of schools did they attend. And in a biographical context, what is it in their lives that has led them to this point right now. So understanding people in the social context and in the biographical context is the starting point for being trauma informed in our schooling, in our programming, in our criminal justice intervention.

This, in part, involves suspending blame, understanding people in their life context, in their social context means suspending blame. Very difficult for criminal justice agencies to do because the criminal justice function at its core is a blaming institution. That is what the criminal justice system is about. I think if we are to embrace a non-blaming philosophy of dealing with trauma, ultimately those answers are going to lie outside of the criminal justice system because at
its core the criminal justice system is a blaming
institution.

Third point, I got to -- and I couldn't
say any better than Fatimah's intervention which I
thought was utterly genius. So the paper is
motivated by the ideas of the school as the point of
trauma intervention. But Fatimah asked who is
addressing the monumental problem of
intergenerational trauma. What agency is doing
this? Because the school certainly only has a very
small window on that problem. And here I think,
what I took from the conversation that followed and
from your comments is the community has a
fundamental role here and we talked about this in a
variety of ways, one of which was the importance of
peer to peer impact as Celia talked about it, Pete
talked about it, Ray talked about it, Antong too.

The fundamental importance of system
impactive people in addressing the challenges of
intergenerational trauma and be sure I return to
this in her comments at the end. There are
certainly expert tools and there's a role for
experts in this, but there is also a special
experiential wisdom among people who have been
directly affected. You asked then a brilliant
follow up question which was, so if we embrace this agenda, the sort of promoting community based resources to deal with intergenerational trauma, are we dealing with all of the structural problems or are we just mitigating them in a way.

Are we just equipping people to cope with really terrible social conditions and helping them live there and more functionally in those terrible conditions. And I think there's one answer to that question that I heard at the end is we're doing something more than that, if this healing process can be mobilizing. And this in fact I think really brings us back to the theme of Kellie's paper now, our first session, if this healing process is mobilizing, then we're doing something more than just equipping people to live in really challenging conditions.

So what does that mean, what is sort of this mobilizing version of healing. I think it is at least two things. It must inspire hope, right? It must help people look forward to a future for themselves and their community and their children and this was Alia's point and it must inspire connection which I think was Ray's -- Ray's point too. This is a form of healing that is at the same
MR. J. TRAVIS: Well, congratulations to all of you for a very productive, very productive day. I can't wait until tomorrow and what we hear tonight. We are on a great journey together. I was so inspired and motivated, provocation from all of you, it's really fabulous. The other piece I raise up is this wonderful phrase we use by intent, also confronted with, you picked up on, in the meantime, what are we doing in the meantime, what qualifies for in the meantime.

So Sukyi, you're going to tell us what's next on our agenda as a group. So come on up.

MS. S. McMAHON: I just want to applaud y'all, being out here, it's amazing, seeing the work that's being done. I can vouch for this growing process, it confirms a lot of what I'm doing back home in Austin with my group. We take it to heart as community organizers, what's being done here, what the take away's can be from this extremely diverse background of people. So thank you for all that you are doing here.

I wanted to mention, just quickly for tonight, we do have a shuttle for the participants,
it is actually probably waiting for you. What's next is Aretha's Jazz Cafe for our young adult vision attendees. We've got young leaders from Detroit who are going to share with us their visions for safety and justice. They're from Team Hype, Inside Out Citywide Poets and Ain't Afraid, which is a Muslim girl artist group, all stand outs in young adult leadership here. So we invite you all to join. And the observers as well, there's an event RSVP just so we know who's coming and we have catered things. So we don't want to over extend but you're all welcome. Please join us there.

There's going to be different seats tomorrow, so just be aware of that. On Saturday I also wanted to mention that our very final session, we're going to shake it up and do something different. We're not going to have a paper associated with that. So you have all your reading materials, if you read it all your ahead of the game, so congratulation.

It's just going to be a different format we're going to try. It's going to be great. We'll have Ms. Barb Jones give us an excellent presentation that day on healing from violence if that's possible what that looks like. I think
that's all I have for you. I have more but I'm going to hold it and we'll make our way over to Aretha's and we have drinks and dinner waiting for you there.

(Proceedings adjourned about 5:50 P.M.)
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MR. J. TRAVIS: We are ready with day 2
of the Square One Roundtable, Violence in America.
We are welcoming some new members to the Roundtable
and first and foremost, friend and colleague Paul
Butler joining us today. It's great to have you
here and Paul, second, heads up, we asked everybody
yesterday to state their hopes of the meeting with a
sentence of two. Just think about that, and we want
to come back to you in a second. He was here last
night, so Kim Foxx is also going to join the
Roundtable. When she comes in, we'll welcome her
also. We're going to start the day with some words
of welcome from Soledad McGrath. Soledad represents
the Joyce Foundation, also long standing friend and
colleague in this work, here in previous place of
employment. So Soledad, we just opened up, share
some thoughts.

MS. S. McGRATH: Thank you, Jeremy. Good
morning. So yesterday was quite a start, very rich
and thought-provoking conversation, and I don't know
about you, but I was left speechless from the young
people that joined us last night and had the opportunity to -- we've already visioned those to have the opportunity to witness. So before we roll up our sleeves and dig into today's session, I appreciate the opportunity to take a moment to briefly share a little bit about why we at the Joyce Foundation were drawn to the Square One effort. The Joyce Foundation is a nonpartisan private foundation that invests in public policies and strategies that advance racial equity and economic mobility in the next generation in the Great Lakes region. The Foundation supports policy, research, development and advocacy in five areas, education and economic mobility, environment, gun violence prevention and justice reform, democracy and culture. We are based in Chicago and while you may hear about our beautiful city in less than flattering terms in the national media, I am delighted that we are so well represented by many folks around this table. You heard from Jahmal yesterday for a testament to the creativity and innovation which communities are responding to other gun and other forms of violence in our city and I'm delighted that our County State Attorney, Kim Foxx, another great leader in our field is able to join us today. So a warm and
special welcome to my fellow Chicagoans.

In partnership with researchers, advocates and justices and stakeholders, the Foundation's gun violence prevention and justice reforms program works to build safe and just communities through a comprehensive approach built on three pillars: Reducing gun violence, supporting constitutional policing and reducing the over-reliance on incarceration of young people.

As you may well know, the Joyce Foundation has been investing in gun violence prevention since the early 1990s and only recently expanded to include justice reform in December of 2017. I want to take a moment to acknowledge our Program Director and my colleague, Amy Bennett, who is the driving force behind the Foundation's work in this space. Our program expansion was based on our assessment that in urban areas gun violence and the justice system's response are really two sides of the same coin. Weak gun laws allow illegal guns to proliferate, causing shootings and homicides that devastate communities. But when the dominate response to gun violence is overly aggressive, policing, prosecution and sentencing, too often the tactics employed result in additional harm to the
communities already plagued by gun violence.

In 2018 Urban Institute Study of young adults from Chicago neighborhoods experiencing the highest rates of gun violence illustrates the tense dynamics. The study led by one of the observers in the room, I don't see her, but I saw her yesterday -- there she is. Joselyn Fountain, now with Arnold Ventures, underscore what communities already known, Hurt People hurt people. The study reveals that of the young adults surveyed who indicated they carry guns, many have been victims of gun or other forms of violence, relied on guns for safety and held negative perceptions of police. We also know that the traditional response to gun violence, which has generally resulted in stricter criminal penalties and more punitive enforcement tactics has not worked. For example, in Illinois, this response has led to repeatedly increasing mandatory minimum sentences for gun offenses. And as we know, these types of sentencing laws have little basis in empirical analysis or the needs of individuals and communities. And these responses have created a crisis of legitimacy for the broader criminal justice system.

Again, led by the work of many of you in
the room, the criminal justice field is slowly starting to acknowledge that to have a meaningful impact on the problem of mass incarceration, we must push our thinking and have a more expansive, creative view for what's possible in justice reform. We know that we must elevate leaders that are directly impacted and that have been tackling these deep challenges for years. We know we must reconceive the way the justice system responds to gun violence and other crime, and we know we must be bold in doing so. That is why we're here. By bringing together such a diverse and committed group of experts, I believe that Square One is the platform and the ability to help guide the field towards real policy and practice solutions.

Yesterday I raised the issue of how we are defining violence because it impacts not only the what, but the how. I may have seemed impatient in doing so and I suppose it's because in many ways I am. As Ms. Sherry outlined for us, language matters and can seemingly impact the kinds of solutions we as a society are willing to create and implement. We all know this is an urgent issue and for me the issue is personal. I am originally from (inaudible) and immigrated to this country as a child. One of
my closest family members became a survivor of state violence while waiting to join us in this country. Years of interpersonal violence is what led my mother to bring us to this country in the first place. I've spent years thinking about what justice means in the context of violence. And while we're not quite there yet, the field is poised at the precedence of that tipping point that Candace mentioned yesterday. So I'm really looking forward to today's session because we will begin to narrow the conversation and continue to learn about the doings, about the good work happening in Detroit and elsewhere to transform how we address violence. I add my thanks to the chorus of thanks you've already received for being here and helping us forge a new path and a new paradigm for how the justice system responds to gun violence when it heals communities, builds trust and enhances safety.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you, Soledad.

First of all, on behalf the key points yesterday and (inaudible) for your impressive and precise in about (inaudible) thinking throughout the day, today there will be some attention paid to your moving forward and take this opportunity to also underscore what you said that is so important to our field which is
the plan to continuing to work with the Joyce
Foundation. (Inaudible.)

The next thing I want to say is you
should always bring your mikes close when you're
speaking because apparently -- but if this group is
not aware of it, it should be aware of the work
Joyce has done. This report comes up to the Joyce
Foundation gun and this is at a time when the
federal government is accustomed to save the Nation.
So important work the Joyce Foundation does. Thank
you for making this possible A reflection on
yesterday. So we've been joined at the table by the
introduction from Kim Foxx. At this table, at any
table, Kim, and I've said Paul is also a new arrival
this morning. I said to him, I'm saying to you
sometime soon I will come back to the two of you and
ask you to do whatever everyone else did yesterday,
which is, in a few sentences, state your hopes for
today and what brought you here. But the first
thing I want to do is to ask for anybody at the
roundtable to offer reflections on yesterday and
last night. Last night was just an amazing
gathering of this group and so importantly amazing
experience to see the power of young people in
regards to your art. And before we go any further,
we should thank Madison and Evie who are somewhere
for their work last night bringing that together.

(APPLAUSE)

MR. J. TRAVIS: My extension to young
people who were on stage, but I'd like to just open
the floor for — something that really struck you
yesterday that you want to make sure we talk about
today or something that we missed yesterday that you
want to make sure we talk about today. This is not
the time to talk about it, just nominate it. You
were there already, right? Okay. So something that
was important that happened yesterday that you want
to make sure we continue today in a sentence,
something you missed yesterday that you want to make
sure that we talk about today, now is not the time
to talk about it, but just to make sure we put it on
the table.

MR. R. WINANS: Good morning loved ones.

(Response)

MR. R. WINANS: So one of the things that
stuck out to me yesterday was Anton, Jahmal and
Amelia when they kept talking about the issue of
language and really being intentional about the use
of the language, right?

MR. J. TRAVIS: Who knew, right?
Anything that Eric Cumberbach had, something you
missed yesterday or you want to highlight?

MR. E. CUMBERBACH: Don't know
necessarily if it was missed, but I do want to
highlight a few things if I can. One of the things
I agree with Soledad is really defining what
violence is in this space and what we mean when we
say it's time for us to employ and/or use violent
strategies in response to violence, which is coming
into a lot of the work that we do on the ground. So
I grapple and I struggle with that solely because
I'm in a space of working primarily with young
people that are most likely to be harmed by gun
violence. And in that space I've never once
prescribed using violence to combat violence. So
it's a very different lens for me, but it's a very
familiar lens at the same time. A lot of my mentors
from afar and you know I spent last night on You
Tube looking at Malcolm X and Fred Hampton and
others and, you know, really looking at
comparatively how was I brought up and how was I
raised and what are some of the philosophical points
that come across with using violence. So I looked
at violence as, you know, one, the condition of how
violence has been captured in America, right?
Especially gun violence. So looking at the gun being a meaningful tool of power of humanity, of I'm a citizen, I have the right to have this control. And then conceptualizing that with where I am today and what would be my tool today. And my tool today would be my mind, my heart, my tongue and how does that propel me into spaces that then I can impact and change policy, procedure and practices that then start to break apart state sanctioned offices and spaces that allow violence to be pervasive in communities for -- in communities that have some of the most vulnerable people. So I really wanted to just, you know, put that forward and come from that lens and that frame and then just share what I believe we're doing in New York City where, you know, we have an office in the mayor's office, where, you know, these -- my team and I, we've never seen ourselves in this space, this wasn't part of our trajectory, we grew up just like a lot of the young people that we're servicing in communities. And our approach is really to break down all of those silos, those barriers and become the policymakers, become the commissioners of state, city run agencies, the ones that are actually carrying out our agenda and lifting our communities.
So, you know, we're doing that and I don't know if that would be recognized as like a violent approach, but it's a forceful approach and I think we used the tool very interchangeably yesterday.

The other part that I wanted to really speak about was formerly incarcerated individuals being in these spaces to really cope with public safety which is a key element to what we do in New York City. We have a robust network, the New York City Crisis Management System of about 200 individuals that all have some type of involvement with gang crews or just, you know, from community and have that cultural competence. But we left yesterday almost with this resounding, where it's only formerly incarcerated individuals that could have that impact on community and it's not. I believe that, you know, there's key individuals in community that can move community and share and guide and be coaches and shepherds from their experience, but it's not a prerequisite to be formerly incarcerated in that space. So I just wanted to add some clarity there. Thank you.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Anything we missed yesterday? Things we missed yesterday or things that you want to just underscore from yesterday to
make sure they're carrying on today? Amanda? The
rule here is get my attention and I'll just signal
that you're on the cue whenever your name comes up.
So Amanda is next.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: So I'm getting another
word that was kind of thrown around yesterday was
healing and I hope that we can actually get more
precise, really get into what that is because it
is -- it's not a just a buzz word. It's not just a
buzz word. Like healing, it's a set of practices,
discipline. It's technology. It's many different
things. And so I'd love for us to talk about
individual, and collective healing in a really
precise way, what does this look like as a set of
practices for people in communities. This is also a
shout out for a healing by Joyce and the woman of
color feeling at work that is holding space for us.
(Inaudible.)

MS. COLON: Hi, I really wanted to speak
on -- I really wanted to underscore and really talk
about the topic of women, how in America, you know,
we've always been the underdog, and when we get
incarcerated, our children are incarcerated, but we
don't talk about what happens before that and how
violence really, really just attacks women on so
many different levels other than men, you know, the power structure of prisons when they first were created were basically all men and they didn't really know how to care for or how to treat a woman in prison. And they didn't really look at all the powers and the systems that be that are supposed to be there to be our safety nets, right, from teachers to doctors to counselors to DCSF workers, how these systems work against us and paint a picture of bad mom. And what I mean by that is like just an example, if I were to get arrested for something petty, the first thing that would happen, they would question if I had children and then they would send a DCSF worker to come and visit me which opens that door, that Pandora's box of me losing my children, or if a man got arrested for the same crime as I did, a DCFS worker wouldn't be there to talk to him. So I really wanted to talk on that to pick, the topic of women. Thank you.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Kelly.

MS. CARTER-JACKSON: So maybe this has been said before, but do you think it's important to sort of parse out semantics? Like to me there is a very clear defense between violence and between force and I think we need to be careful about how
and when we use those words. Yesterday I said
before then, you know, violence is always forceful
but force is not necessarily violent. And so while
I don't think a boycott is violent, a boycott is
certainly forceful in how you're pushing people,
compelling people to operate in a particular kind of
way. So and I know throughout my work I talk about,
you know, protective violence, but it's also a way
of believing that protective force is kind of
forcing people to engage in you, but might not
necessarily include bloodshed, right, or might not
necessarily include loss of life or things of that
nature. So while violence is the overall theme, I
think you're so set on separate categories of life
force that are a little bit more inclusive but a
little bit less on the violent spectrum of that, if
that makes sense. And sometimes parsing those out,
I think helps people to sort of accept what you're
trying to say a little bit more.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Halim, something we
missed yesterday or something you want to
underscore?

MR. H. FLOWERS: First I want to say that
poverty is balance and force, it has language that
affects your brain, the strangest dreams and it
suffocates hope. It is an infectious disease that induces its host to crimes of economic survival. So one of the things that's odd, right? I don't want to leave the conference and not address economic solutions. Poverty has a culture, it has an architecture to it that looks at very highly densely populated areas and inducing this high density population with the language in force and violence of poverty in a capitalist society, it makes one feel the only way that you can have any form of self worth is to obtain capital. And when you put on this language and violence on a child, it makes them to have -- it compels them to those illusions of choices which leads to crime economical but also leads to violence. So I want to talk about economic solutions and just not vague theories because a lot of our children are hustlers, they wash car windows, they sell waters, so they're not lazy. They have ambition and drive and they need economic mentorship to legitimize their ambitious drive that they have to make it in a capital society.

The second thing about public safety, to the point where the guy said about, they said in the schools, do you want us to have felons in the schools? We're dealing with an issue right now in
the District of Columbia where the U.S. Attorney's Office is advocating for the release of Rayful Edmond, one of the most notorious drug dealers in DC and American history. So they say that this is a story of redemption. This is a person that's been proved to be responsible for a lot of violence. So we talk about violence, this is to the prosecutors that's in the room and the sheriffs and people like this. Our criminal injustice system is not about public safety and the reason why I say that is because at the age of 16 when I was indicted and charged as an adult, this was when Paul Butler was in the U.S. Attorney's Office with Eric Holder, I was offered a plea bargain to cooperate with the government to be released within a year, right? If I just cooperated against my co-defendant. It had no concern with whether I was still violent, whether I was still a menace to society, whether I went back into the community and killed more people. It was only concerned with cooperation, right? So we have to talk about violent people who get apprehended by the government, but the government is willing to release them back into our communities because they won't cooperate to bring more people in prison. The third thing is love is healing. This is to Amanda's
point. Love is powerful and it's forceful and it can be violent, right? And out of all the things that was said yesterday, love has language too. And In these circles we often don't mention it enough. Out of all the things that was said yesterday, the one thing that Soledad remembered was what the children said last night, is because how it made her feel, that language that the children was disseminated to the audience, out of everything we said it impacted her brain, because we don't remember what we hear, we remember how we feel.

MR. J. TRAVIS: So we have two more and then we'll wrap it up, Fainah and then Ron. I think I got everybody for overnight reflections, things we missed, things you want to underscore.

MS. F. MUHAMMAD: Thank you. That was very powerful. I want three things, I'll try to be really brief. I mentioned this to Bruce last night. In his summary he was talking a bit about this trauma from work, (inaudible) work and it's a little bit of a reason that I think is so important which is the way that Bruce kind of framed -- make sure I'm paraphrasing. But making sure that we understand the trauma of those who are serving, and the reframe is ensuring that people feel understood,
have the experience of being understood for what
they've experienced and their own healing process.
And the distinction is so important because as we
discuss what new solutions are, the desire to I
think frame this as -- here's what we're doing,
here's a practice, here's what it looks like, a lot
of output without really understanding that the
voice of those who are experiencing this and really
checking, has to be part of how we evaluate, how we
understand effectiveness and that can easily get
lost. So experience, I think that there is a
dynamic that showed up yesterday about the role of
police and with a group this brilliant and bold.
I'm excited to think about in a new structure, in
what role the -- it's hard to say because I don't
even want to use the word police. I want it to be
-- so I'm thinking about that. And I'm also still
really hoping that Danielle brought this up
yesterday about what compels threats or perceived
threats of extinction among white people and the
work of the deconstructing rights of supremacy, go
continue to kind of interrogate that because I think
that's huge. All of those things are connected and
are implicated in how we discuss the new.

MR. J. TRAVIS: And Ron Davis.
MR. DAVIS: I think the area that I would like to go further into is alliances. In other words, stakeholders, who should be at the table, how do we determine that. I think something Eric said about there's no one exclusive right to seek input. And so we talk about system impact, but also make sure we have system drivers at the table for two reasons. One, the input of those who have managed this flawed system is still valuable and, then two, you learn as much as you give. So we're going to start thinking about a new way to change the whole demographics of society. Do we abolish the police, do we replace them? Whatever the outcome is going to be, we need to have various take-overs at the table to be able to do that. I want to caution as we move forward and we go in our different ways is that we do have to step out of our comfort zone and bring people to the table that make us uncomfortable. And so people that have my job as a police officer, when you see is what you see. You see the pain that people who look like me have caused you, you see the pain that the system has created, where you see an opportunity to work with someone in the system to make some of the change. And some of the nonverbal communication, you can
still feel some pain. And I was talking to my colleagues, you can feel that and it's understandable and highly respected, but part of us stepping out of our comfort zone is to realize that we need to have all voices at the table. Five years ago the argument would be the person that caused pain shouldn't be at the table. That means half of the people here would not be sitting here. That was wrong then, it's wrong now, we need to have system impact, formerly incarcerated, drivers of the system, police chief, sheriffs. One person right now, the police union and even if you disagree with everything that comes out of their mouth, is it good to understand what comes about and then how to change it. So I would say we just need to make sure and I think this table has done a great job of collecting that, but as we go off on our own, you've got to have those alliances. So how do we determine who should be at the table so it's not the same group talking to each other about different things around the county, that you're getting the heart and soul of practitioners, people on the ground and people that really do want to listen and change and take advantage of that. So I would say those alliances are important.
MS. JONES: And I'll try to be as brief as I possibly can. I'm looking forward to what today brings about, but one of my concerns, I'm looking forward to what today is going to evolve in. One of my concerns and I want to echo everyone, everyone's sentiment is I want to kind of piggyback off of what Amanda said when we talk about healing. I believe that it's very, very important to talk about victims, co-victims, victim survivors, who have gone through so many aspects of the criminal justice system. One thing that I hope that we get out of this is to talk about all of these systems and the re-traumatization that happens on a regular basis that really impedes healing, and that involves every one of us here. And I just want to give an example when we speak as it relates to law enforcement, and I'll go into a little bit of this tomorrow. But when we talk about victims, co-victims, survivors and every aspect of what the criminal justice system that people touch, we leave out when it comes to lethal violence, lethal crime, we leave out the re-traumatization of families that have experienced violence from a survivor's standpoint. Whether your case makes it to court and all of the issues that relates to dealings with the
law enforcement, the medical examiner, medical examiner, the prosecutor, the witnesses -- and I'm only talking once a case gets to the judicial system. I believe that is a huge piece that's missing as it relates to victims, co-victims of homicides and lethal crimes that we really have to talk about. It leaves the victim and the co-victims and their families out of the process and how families are continuously re-traumatized when it relates to being censored when those of us who have gone through the criminal justice system who are not able to even speak, that re-traumatization over and over and over and over, that prevents healing from even taking place. So there's many themes to that, but I just wanted to introduce that piece, and I believe that we're skipping, you know, over the survivors and the families who are constantly in this system that don't even have the resources to even get to a point of even starting the healing process because they're still in the process of the justice system, of the judicial system. So I say that passionately and I'm hoping that we touch on that. I'm hoping that that's a basis or sets us up for the next roundtable that I would love to be a part of as well. Thank you.
MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you. Very important contribution. So before we get started today, you should acknowledge, Paul. Also acknowledge that Ms. Glazer had to leave last night, as she may have mentioned. You know, our city is about to take a vote next week on closing Rikers Island. She is managing a lot of that discussion in New York and hasn't come back, and we wish her well and Alia has to leave tonight also. So, Paul, we'll start with you. We asked everybody yesterday in a sentence or two or three your hopes for your time here.

MR. P. BUTLER: So I'm here for two reasons. One is I want to learn a lot. I feel like in some ways I've been part of the problem, maybe in some obvious ways in my former work as a prosecutor. But when I stopped being a prosecutor, this was in the '90s when we were just starting to get some of the data about the ravages of mass incarceration, and I started to think about reform. And one of the ways that I talked about reform was by emphasizing nonviolent drug offenders. So those were kind of the poster men and women for reform, throwing people who caused harm under the bus. So even thinking about reforming the criminal legal process, there
was some damage done to the work that most needs to be done. So I'm excited to be here to learn and to be challenged and I've already been challenged just in this conversation because I've heard what Ron said and I agree that it's so important to have a lot of different people at the table, including people who have caused harm, people who, like me, have been a prosecutor. But when Ron said police unions, I don't know if I can go that far, those are some bad dudes.

The other reason I'm here real quickly is to make sure Kim Foxx isn't mad at me. There was a high profile case in her office and I wrote out that piece saying that I thought that the office had done the right thing, but it wasn't clear, that there needed to be more transparency. The next day she wrote a note that explained why the office had done what it had done in a way that I thought to be a model for prosecutors' offices. It was more accountability and more transparency that I've ever seen a prosecutor do in a case like that. So a shout out to Ms. Foxx.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Kim, an assignment to you, your hopes for today.

MS. FOXX: Sure. I came to beat up Paul
Butler and now I don't have to. Thank you all for having me and listening to your reflections on yesterday, I'm so sorry that I missed. I come as a sitting prosecutor, but it is complex in that I come as someone who's has been the victim of violence, who's been a survivor of violence, who has lived in violence and also in law enforcement. And I think it's really important because as I hear the conversation about the lines that are drawn, what we know about all of this work is that people embodied all of that. I just happen to be a prosecutor who is a survivor of sexual assault, who is a survivor of domestic violence, a witness of domestic violence by my mother, who has had a brother who has gone to prison, who has watched the system do its churn. And so I think my reflection in hearing all of this, is that we bring all of those pieces to the table. I have a label in my profession right now who I am, but in doing this work, I've run into the totality of all of that experience, all of it. And recognizing having been a survivor, a victim, a witness, all of it to a system that historically has not had people like me in positions of leadership. And I say that not simply as a woman of color, but someone who grew up in public housing, someone who
has listed all the dispatchers of people who end up
in our systems as both victims and defendants, I
have every risk factor of those folks, I have more
in common with them than the lawyers who work for
me. And so this -- coming to this conversation,
particularly in a place like Detroit which very much
mirrors my hometown of Chicago and talking about
violence and reform and justice and the impact of
systems in this role with the title, with all of
those experiences to learn how to do this in
allyship with everybody but the police union to
learn. I've been -- Jeremy knows I sit at
roundtables often. I'm often very frustrated
because it is usually with like-minded folks and
other prosecutors and quite honestly there is a lot
of self congratulations about using buzz words, a
lot of self congratulations when we're talking about
reform, but not enough introspection about what it
means to be victims, how we define that word, how we
show up in this space. And so having the diversity
of thought here, diversity of perspectives here, it
is what I'm most looking forward to and also sharing
space with really some dynamic leaders from my
hometown like Jahmal, to sit and watch him do his
thing. Cilia, who advised me on our policies in the
state's attorney's office. So I'm very much here looking to continue to learn but also to push on these labels that we have and how we lead into one label or the other, to advance a talking point with the recognition that probably all of us are carrying about four or five labels within ourselves even though we're showing up with just one on our placard.

MR. J. Travis: Just one -- another shout out for another reading assignment. David Kennedy and Kim Foxx and I have just completed three years of another executive session that controls our kick-off speaker on the role of prosecutors. And to think about what that three year span has captured in terms of the changing political discussion about what it means to be a prosecutor, what it means to be a progressive prosecutor or whatever language you use. The papers that have come out of that session are now all available on the website and some still to come. David's got a paper that's really fabulous. Those are another reading assignment just if you want to see what some of the new thinking about what Kim was alluding to about the label of prosecutor. That's changing as fast as you can imagine. So just take a look at that as well,
another activity.

So are we ready for day two? A little reminder about some of the logistics and some of the rules and some of the expectations. The first thing I've learned is these microphones actually do amplify. So please bring it close to you. There's one for every two people or sometimes one for every one and we are recording everything. And this machine here, just make sure what we're doing is being live streaming to an audience of hundreds of people across the country, some watch parties and people in the room. So a group discussion about what's happening here, so we're magnifying or amplifying your work. Also means you'll be under behavior in terms of, please don't fall asleep on the camera. Right. Make sure that doesn't happen. We went over the expectations in terms of how you want to get into the conversation, either just get my attention and I'll signal that you're on the cue, put your name tag up and we'll -- and when you're done, here we go, when you're done and I'll keep the cue unless we break it for lunch. If you want to bring somebody in or you exercise your right to an insistent wave, make sure you have something you want to say right away and we will do that. We are
very eager to have social media being an amplifier
of what we're doing here. That doesn't mean that
you're sitting here tweeting when you should be
listening, but it does mean that during breaks, or
if you have a back office of an organization that
can take -- watching and anybody can take what's
happening now, please use social media to a maximum
effect and our hashtags are Square One Justice and
Rethinking justice. So everyone with a number.

   MS. K. HUFFMAN: Square One Roundtable
   with the Number one and then Reimagine Justice,
   hashtag, Reimagine Justice.

   MR. J. TRAVIS: Square One Roundtable is
   number one or Reimagine Justice, so hashtag. Please
   use those and encourage your many friends, fans,
   family, whoever's watching you today to do the same.

   The other sort of exhortation is two
   things: Just to make sure that some of you came up
to me last night and said, so now I think I
understand how it works, now I feel more comfortable
getting involved. I just want to encourage that
comfort. Please, if you have something to say, even
if it doesn't come out quite right, don't hold back.
We want what's on your mind when it's on your mind.
And if you sort of just -- it doesn't have to be
perfect. Somebody said it takes me awhile to
collect my thoughts, that's okay if we get your
thoughts, if we can't get your thoughts because it
takes too long to collect them, then we've missed
something. You're here because we want your mind.
So please contribute when you can, everybody should
contribute by the end of the day. And if you
haven't, we'll come talk to you. Just figure it out. But the related invitation is if you're
uncomfortable by something that somebody is saying,
we particularly want to know what makes you
uncomfortable. So if we're all here just feeling
comfortable, then we've lost this opportunity. And
what was so great about yesterday was both papers
and their presentation generated this comfort and
some of it I heard in private last night. That's
okay if it means that you're still processing what
you want to say or didn't quite -- you don't know
why you were uncomfortable at that moment. But if
you hear something that makes you say, I just want
to sprint back and just want to understand better, I
want to question or I want to just make sure that
another perspective is in the room, please let us
know that moment. If we leave tomorrow and have
only said that which is comfortable, and look how
many people said today, even police units, we want
to listen to your voices, we want to have a robust
discussion, we want to know -- we want to leave this
time together having been challenged respectively,
but challenged by others while challenging
ourselves. Part of what was so wonderful yesterday
is you could see around the table people saying I
feel uncomfortable because even my world view or my
professional affiliation or what I used to think is
not quite what I'm thinking now, that's the moment
we want. That's the moment we want to capture, and
not capture on the videotape, but capture for this
discussion. So please, it's an encouragement, if
you feel something, we want to make sure you express
it, please do that.

So let me just look at Bruce and
Katharine and if there's anything else that we
should say before we get started. You should know
that our steering committee met this morning and we
basically said yesterday was just like a dream. You
really produced exactly what we hoped for one
purpose for roundtable purposes and on this topic,
which the first roundtable was on the history of
race and white supremacy, and the second was on the
unit of excess. Big topics. We always knew this
would be the most difficult and yesterday was a success because we took on some hard issues and again thanks to Kelly and to Mr. Ray for getting us into someplace where we were challenged.

Okay. So are you ready for more? Here we go. David is going to start us off with a discussion of his paper. The big title here is the Colleges, of the topic, College of the violence in American Communities and Neighborhoods. You've got a few minutes to get us started and then we'll pick it up.

MR. D. HUREAU: I think I'm going to actually turn over much of my time. I have a few preliminary comments because I think the problem is prime. I think we're ready to get into this. I also sense that folks read the paper, so thank you for your generous reading of the paper. I also think I'll be better in the discussing, in the discussion process and trying to handle the summary.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Just remember the observers have difficulty hearing. So loud voices are appropriate.

MR. D. HUREAU: I'll try. So I want to say thank you for having me here. This is one of those days where I feel blessed to be an academic in
that if you do academia right, you can be in a space
where you're proximate to the work but you also have
some distance, right, to write papers and do some
critical thinking and I get energy from this room, I
get intellectual energy from this room. So thank
you for your generosity in spirit of being here.
And one of the people of the Square One Team for
convening such a space, making such a space possible
in universities, it's important that universities
are making space for deliberations like this.

So thank you all for coming. One
disclaimer about today's session and it relates to
yesterday, I've going to pivot a little bit from
yesterday and focus on a very specific manifestation
of violence and that is community gun violence. And
for some this framing will seem too narrow and I
respect that and I get that and I appreciate that.
And that is not to take away from any other
intersections with other sorts of violence,
including systemic violence and I think I see
there's many intersections there. But for now, for
today's discussion, I think that it is generative to
maybe get pretty specific on this topic and for me
how I think about it from my own framing, that's
justified on two grounds. First ground that's
really important is gun violence is a key form of racial inequality. For folks in this room that care about this, and I heard this yesterday, this is the reason why we should focus on gun violence specifically. It affects the life chances of African-Americans in very profound ways in African-American communities and communities of color. The second reason is that in communities where there is high rates of violence, it organizes a lot of social like, right. It influences the friends that children make, right, their access to public institutions like libraries, can they use public transportation, right, and then heading right down to where folks can live. So I think there are really grounds for focusing on this specific manifestation of violence, and take away nothing from any others. I also want to just take a few moments to disclaim that this is a paper that's for an academic audience, hopefully it has some crossover appeal, but its publicly minded. What I'm concerned with in this paper -- what I'm concerned with in this paper is what we think as academics translating into the realm of policy discourse, of public discourse and I think those ideas are important.
So this paper begins with a theoretic orientation and I don't want to talk too much about academic theory but it's important that we take stock of it and that theoretic orientation is what some might call a social disorganization framework or a neighborhood framework or a macro-social framework, but really what is interesting is not what causes individuals to become violent, right? It really is interested in the question of why is it that certain communities have higher rates of violence than others. And what's really important about that is it provides a way of seeing specifically the role of race and crime and so there's an idea of racial invariance theory which is that the sources of violence, the sources of inequality to violence have nothing to do with race themselves. They have to do with the severity unequal ecological conditions in which white and black Americans live in society where we are so stratified by race. So I think this paradigm has done so much so well and I talk about this in the paper. This is the paradigm that has shown us that it's not racial essentials that produce disparate rates of crime of unequal conditions and its history of segregation and segregation and racial harm. And
it's done many, many things as well. It's the paradigm that's given us collective equities, right, but hasn't paid much attention to guns and that's sort of my point of departure here. I think that not seeing guns has led to some real practical problems and intellectual problems for us and that's what I try to focus on. So I try to offer a interpretive statement on this overlooked role of guns in neighborhoods based on inequalities and violence. And my basic position is guns have remained largely invisible to the researchers of violence and this inability to see guns has led, like I said, to these practical intellectual problems for scholars in our public discourse.

So briefly I'll summarize four of them which largely align with the way I describe it in the paper. The first problem is I think about the lack of focus on guns is made it such that we've been unable to see the true character for the violence itself. This is where I talk about guns as mechanisms. The rates of violence that we have, particularly lethal violence and homicide, are not possible without the mechanical advantage afforded by guns. Right? This is supported by a long line of public research. Tip of the hat to Daniel
Webster and other folks.

Part of what I also wanted to do is denaturalize the connection between guns and violence much in the same way that scholars have productively tried to de-rate crimes from incarceration. There's a natural response, so two things naturally going together and I wanted to denaturalize it. I wanted to problematize guns in urban context. We think about this is part of urban context, no. They're stratified in certain ways, they're patterned in certain ways. Not all neighborhoods have the same kind of guns. So I wanted to problematize that.

I also wanted to show how guns were implicated in key existing mechanisms of neighborhood theories of violence and specifically I was interested in how guns might influence an advent of social control. We can imagine a whole host of ways that community members would be more fearful given the presence of more guns and we can talk more about this. And then in the second place, one of the key ideas within this flow from this neighborhood paradigm of research is that there are codes of violence, neighborhood-based codes of violence that are performed on mostly the
disadvantaged to men that are responding to unequal structural conditions and the unavailability of appropriate law enforcement protection and that they will use violence as a means to protect themselves. My position is that guns are an essential part of this code. Right? They are key to the performance of this code and they are likely implicated in this theory as well. I think probably most important for this room or one of the most important pieces and the piece I actually think is new is that the inability to see guns is the fact that we've been unable to detect certain kinds of change in the very, very fabric of violence, of urban violence, and I wanted to show how changes in the composition of guns is changing in ways that are likely to influence violent outcomes in the neighborhood level. And so the neighborhood paradigm is really sensitive to change. We focus on justification, the suburbanization of poverty, Latino integration, but what I'm trying to point to there's a real fundamental shift in the character of America injustice that we need to recon with. And so a gun is a gun and it's been sort of the traditional platform. I'm not problemtizing that. There are more guns. As I've shown this population
is more harmful and this population of guns is better suited and better adapted to street use.

And then finally what I wanted to show is I think there are very, very severe policy legacies of violence and punishment that flow from American gun violence policy and I wanted to offer a sense of sort of history of American gun policy that I think it has been lacking in some ways and I wanted to show American gun policies is a legacy of disadvantage and that contemporary gun policy from its very inception has force on vulnerable communities and has committed to a paradigm of place based, ecologically based punishment that has over-regulatory efforts that are aimed at stopping the flow of guns. So I think where I end up, and I'm going to just turn it back over to the group at this point, is paying closer attention to guns. Seeing guns, seeing them as an object of analysis, seeing something that's important to our academic work or practice, helps us see violence more clearly, more realistically, more proximately. It makes for better social scientific theory and I think it helps us better in forming more discourse and policy-making practice. So that's it.

Mr. J. Travis: Thank you, very much,
David. So as is our practice, we ask clarifying questions first, ask you to expand upon or explain.

MR. D. WEBSTER: What I was going to say was that -- thank you I appreciate the heads up, heads down.

MR. H. FLOWERS: You speak on the question I asked on urban violence. Do you make a distinction between the architecture of urban policy, the legacy point that you mentioned because you had Irish immigrants in cities like Chicago with guns and we celebrated the moves and things of this nature and the gun violence penalties were very lenient for them. But the shift came when communities of color after the black power movement had this infiltration of crack and guns, when the guns came, then the penalties increased. That's the question I would like to clarify. Also, gun violence, do you address how colored folks engaged in gun violence they either look at (inaudible) service versus when white folks engage in gun violence, it's a mental health issue because language matters, impacts the brain. And that's it.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Clarifying questions, anything you would like to say?

MR. D. HUREAU: Yes, the second one I
agree with you and I think it's very much tied to ranking inequalities in the intellectual context. There's even a sense, right, that we think about we were so desensitized, right? There's even a sense of what we hear and what we're saying and the violence and disadvantage in communities in normal everyday life. Whereas when white people do it, it's active terrorism or mental health or some sort of rupture. So I'm with you there. Your first point, absolutely if I bring history back into the equation, then I'm actually trying to say that contemporary American policy has been racial since its inception. So, in general, yes, I agree with you, and there's a lot more like very specific to talk about in both civil right and the gun control act.

MR. H. FLOWERS: Say like in cities like Chicago and Al Capone and the Italian immigrants who were in this high density populated urban New York, Chicago, they were killing people in violent times, they massacred. Did you make a distinction because that still is the same spaces and now that is colored people in those same spaces doing the same thing that they was doing back then and now it's like an issue where we have to put them in cages of
juveniles for life. Was it the thing back in -- did you address that? We didn't touch on that.

MR. D. HUREAU: You're right, Frank, part of some of the gun laws that were established in the early 20th century were machine guns because, you know, it was Italian (inaudible). But that point of view is very -- what you're talking about is very compatible with my point, sure.

MR. R. WINANS: I just need some clarity on the disadvantaged community because we're talking about language and what the intention was. So can you explain to me what a disadvantaged community looks like real quick?

MR. D. HUREAU: Yes, thank you. That's academic shorthand as the majority coming in, so I apologize for that. Right? So disadvantaged community, what I'm talking about there is a constellation, right, of different intersecting forms of life challenges, right? So it's the simultaneous location, co-location of poverty, of a portion of households that are single headed -- headed by single parents, right? It's the concentration of poor people around other poor people which is important, right? So I'm very much making a connection to poverty here.
MR. J. TRAVIS: For clarifying questions?

MR. R. WINANS: Again, this issue of language, just like to set the tone a little bit to be honest about the conversation we're having. An asset, right? So we explained the disadvantaged community, you really explained the resilient community. So can you just take a look, just a look at that language and internalize and articulate to the community for them to be able to understand it?

We've got community folks here today in the city of Detroit and so they wanted to be a part of it because this is part of the neighborhoods. So it was intentional that neighborhood folks was here today. And so we just need some clarity so that they can understand and participate in this conversation, right? Because I come from a single parent home, I grew up in the projects. It goes back to what Halim was saying earlier about how we associate economics to a standard of life and to quality of life. We just need to take a little bit of a dive today because the folk out in the community really don't understand that.

MR. AYYASH: I'm with it, I appreciate it. I think what I would say to that, I'm trying to point to, like I said, inequality in the
neighborhood context. I think that folks in the community, right, understand the very material conditions of, there is a high violence are fundamentally different than what most -- like where I grew up, like where most white folks grew up in terms of economics, in terms of access to resources, in terms of the funding of schools, right? In terms of the quality and investment in public institutions. So I think that's what I'm trying to get at, right, is the lack of that that is very, very clear in historic (inaudible). So thank you for that. I appreciate it.

MR. J. TRAVIS: So thanks for those questions and the encouragement to continue. So now we're opening up. The format is no longer necessarily directed at the paper. This is up for discussion and so we'll open it up for discussion. See where this goes. Daniel and then Wayne.

MR. D. WEBSTER: I want to really start out on congratulating David on a really outstanding paper that I think will really shape the field. I've been working on violence and policy issues for almost 30 years and he's really articulated so many important points that I think have been lost in the discussion that we have just assumed that guns are
just there and we then think about all the other factors that create conditions that facilitate or allow violence. But the guns are pretty fundamental to the key behaviors and the threat to life and how that is so fundamental to the trauma that we were discussing yesterday comes from, at least in part, the weaponry that allows an instant death and maybe many deaths. I really appreciate the historical connections here to gun policy. Again, as someone who works in this on a daily basis, we forget about the Fire Owner's Protection Act and some of these other really, really fundamental things that shape why we are where we are now, which is an unacceptable place. And that we have for the most part stripped away all accountability for anyone who profits from this industry of death. It really comes back to those policies, how they were enacted and why and it's entirely consistent with my own experience when I have -- well, at the ATF level tried to encourage more focus on how guns are getting to where they're getting to create the death and all the incentives, all the incentive structures within that agency is not to do that, not to focus on those who are profiting from this industry, death, and to put entirely one's energies to be more
mindful of language of oppressed communities. So I just -- most of us around this table aren't gun policy geeks like me and I just want to recognize, David, really taking this up another notch in really important ways. So if I want to sort of add to, and aside from the praise part which is due, Dave's discussion mostly put this in a context of federal gun policy. And so much of what happens with respect to guns enforcement and laws is really at the state level, but the same forces really are in play, the absolute same forces are in play that have to do with race and power and quite frankly what's easy to do. You know, I mean part of this you can think of as purely from a racial power perspective. But another thing is like what is it easy to do? I mean, we're all, you know, I'll just speak for myself, I like doing things that are easy more than doing things that are hard. Okay. It's really easy to find someone in certain areas and context where you can find someone with a gun in their pocket. It doesn't take that much. It takes a whole lot more to do a pretty sophisticated investigation to find out, okay, how did that guy get that gun? Right? All right. We see this in play when law enforcement officers are shot in the line of duty. No stone is
unturned to find out where that gun came from and
hold somebody accountable for that because a law
enforcement officer died. Virtually, never see that
when a young man from West Baltimore is shot. We
don't think about that. So this operates at all
levels. The federal perspective is really, really
important in setting the stage, but it's there and
to really think -- rethink and reimagine beyond the
Square One idea, I think some of that sort of comes
down to how do we create laws and systems and their
enforcement that has accountability for those who
are profiting from so many deaths. I'm going to
leave it at that.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you. So we have an
active cue already. I'm going to read it off to
you. Juan and Candance and Peter. I'm hoping that
Kelly would connect with this discussion yesterday
because my mind is just bouncing around. But this
is a great cue. I just want to get into it and
now's the time. So let's keep going. Juan is next
and so David, as I mentioned to you inside, you're
welcome (inaudible) the union boycott. Especially
from the outside. Although I also learned a lot
about actual guns and calibers that I didn't pay
attention to before, but I really appreciate the
part of the paper that talks about the federal gun policy because in many ways that (inaudible) gun violence that we've been talking about here since yesterday and it's another form of how government produces violence, creates structures and perpetuates those to create the violence that we see in our communities. In many ways as well, I want to address the other thing I was mentioned before, that (inaudible) mention too, we focus especially, right, (inaudible) We've been focusing quite a bit on mass shootings. In El Paso, Texas is an obvious example in my opinion of the turning point, and right next to the government building, even though more Latinos were killed in Pulse in Orlando than El Paso. So, we focus on El Paso because of the clear manifestations basis hate emanated from the mouth of Mr. 45 into the hands of a man of a white supremist. But I think the point that you're raising is the everyday violence that we face in our communities. Latinos in terms of (inaudible) are second only to African-American young men in terms of being killed by gun violence. The leading cause of death from ages 15 to 24, second only to Latino men across the country as well. Incredible large numbers, higher than young, the cohorts, the youth cohorts is almost
identical to young black men, more inclined to be killed by strangers than people that they know with gun violence. So we're seeing a lot of these manifestations in our community as well and I'm just blown away that I was unaware of how federal gun policy, which also records, permeates state policy, perpetuates the industry's profiteers, perpetuates in a way that stops even litigators with innovative approaches to try to reach the gun lobby and the gun industry but can stop it in turn and causes the weight and the force and the power of the NRA. So in many ways I think what you've given me in the discussion of the organization is a lot more to deal with, but a lot more ammunition to talk about from the perspective of how the person who uses a gun because they have -- that's the only way you can survive to the people who use guns to (inaudible). Thank you so much.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Very powerful.

MS. FOXX: I wanted to just piggyback on something that Daniel was saying about how it impacts the difference in the federal and the (inaudible) of gun and state. So I think even the conversation when we talk about what's easy to do, you have a state like Illinois, which Chicago is a
big portion of the state, so there's Chicago and then there's Illinois. And the conversation around guns and what to do about guns is incredibly different when we're talking about the city of Chicago and when we talk about down-state Illinois. And when I say "down state," that's anything that is not in the city of Chicago and how we even address again, you know access to guns. It's not even just the NRA, but when we look at our state lawmakers who are very quick to want to incentivized, enhance sentences, who want to incentivized mandatory minimums, they're not doing that for the entirety of the state. They want to do that for the city of Chicago. And so the narrative around access to guns is very different because you will have people that say, and you've seen some of this on the national level is, I want my right to bear arms. Even after what we've seen in El Paso and other places, that this narrative around the Second Amendment Rights, and the conversation around gun control, you'll see a large segment of folks who don't think like people who are being impacted by gun violence in the way that we're talking about, saying that they want to have their right to bear guns. At the same time, the access to guns,
particularly people in communities that have been impacted by violence, the issue is that most of those people couldn't qualify for a gun anyway because they have a criminal background. And so if you have a criminal background for a marijuana conviction, for example, you are not able to get a legal gun. And so even as we talk about guns in Illinois and Chicago, it's not even access to guns, right? It's people who have legal access to guns and the exclusion of people who have legal access tends to be the people who live in these impacted areas which you've discussed. And so even the conversation around gun policy on an easy local level is not that easy because it is weaponized against people who live in Chicago. And even on a national level when people like to talk about Chicago have restricted gun laws in the country and look what happens here when used as a poster child, that gun regulation doesn't work because people in Chicago are killing each other. Without the nuance conversation about those folks having an easier pipeline to guns, not having the ability to legally possess those guns because of the barriers that have been put in place and the constellation issues that make the use of that gun more prevalent than other
places where guns are legal, they can get them legally, but they don't have the concentrations of poverty, the absence of resources and all those things that makes one more likely to use guns. And so it's a fascinating conversation, but that nuance around even if you take it from the federal level to the state and local level, I am fighting a battle in my own state about what to do when scared people who have the right to use guns try to dictate what other scared people who may not have the right to use guns and rightfully are fearful, try to dictate how they have that access.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Very thoughtful of you. Thanks. Next is Candance then Peter and Katharine. Then we'll see where we are. This theme will carry through the day. It gets it into play.

MS. C. JONES: I think it's helpful, David's article. What I like about it, first is that there are a lot of things connected to yesterday. One, I thought that you were using research to give new language. You know, it's (inaudible). There's nothing every day about the violence happening in communities. It's actually quite systemic and we allow it. The illustration -- I thought Kim was going to bring it up but I know
she knows well, is that there is this sort of a very long time, pretty well-known at least by all the kids around South Side train park, and people were stealing guns off the trains. It's like, how can all the kids know and ATF not? You know, so it feels sort of like in addition to policy, you know, like a real systemic sort of falling down. It also I think the indigenous nature of Kelly's article about protectionism. It's like I know there are people who owning a gun makes them feel safe, and so they try to do it for legitimate purposes. But to go back to Danielle's point, in response, what I think is interesting in particular right now is the swift response to the opioid crisis and how people are really going after those companies legally, you know, when that research came out about that incident in West Virginia where they were sending like millions of these opioid pills to a jurisdiction where the population was like eight people. It's like who could be getting legitimate prescriptions in such a low population? However, with the gun industry, it's sort of like with the, you know, incorporation of (inaudible) in certain communities, we haven't used the same research and the same tools to hold it accountable. And so it's
sort of like we know how to do it. Jules is yet another example. It's like when now that people are getting sick, there's some early, very early evidence, and I'm doing the scale and I'm just missing the thousand people or so that they said have a form of the illness, there's very small numbers early, but we are having sort a swift systemic response to holding accountable these companies in a way that we haven't done it. So this is to your point of being concrete. We sort of know how to do it, but we've really fallen down and part of it is coming back to the issue of race, which I think is also (inaudible) we are willing to ignore it in instances where it's we think, you know, it's either every day or we'd like to instead the prevailing narrative that those folks are just more violent and so what's happening to them is not preventable no matter what tool is aiding that violence.

MR. D. WEBSTER: You might -- a quick response?

MR. J. TRAVIS: Quick response.

MR. D. WEBSTER: Sorry. When you do have systems of accountability, it does matter. So if you go back to your example of the opioids and the
lawsuits brought me back to the late '90s with the

gun industry. City of Chicago was one of the first
cities to sue the gun industry for exactly these
sort of practices. Certainly, thereafter it was
Gary, Indiana and where we are now in Detroit. That
actually reduced the flow of guns from sale by
retailers to criminal involvement quite
substantially. And the NAACP also brought a lawsuit
similar sort of rationale against the industry and
it was incredibly analogous to the opioids. And so
I just wanted to mention there is a body of
research, just getting insight from theoretical part
that this matters. When cities or states take it
upon themselves to try to hold accountability for
the people who sell guns, it's hard to find examples
where that doesn't work, quite frankly. And the
last thing I'll do, just one other piece of research
that connects to my other point, was we studied gun
law enforcement in Pennsylvania, and in 2012 a state
trooper was shot and killed in the line of duty. It
was a matter of weeks before they changed their laws
because they found out that the person who shot the
state trooper got his gun from someone, in essence
had a side business, he was selling guns on the side
and it really elevated the penalties and sentence of
public accountability. Over tenfold increases in cases brought for exactly those kind of illegal transfers because here again, it was shown upon a law enforcement officer was killed and then there's a pipeline here and we're going to have accountability. So there's lots of examples with data to support that we could -- if we wanted to, direct our attention and accountability system to the sellers.

MR. J. TRAVIS: David Kennedy exercised his rights. Just a footnote, Daniel, that (inaudible) by legislation, holding that industry immune from lawsuits.

MR. D. WEBSTER: Exactly, which David references.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Some interesting new developments here. So just as a cue reminder, David Peter, Katharine, then Kennedy, then Peter.

MR. D. KENNEDY: Thanks for letting me rake in on this. So Candance, to your point about accountability for opioids, part of the reason that that is possible, that is that perhaps proceeded quickly is because the opioid manufacturers tell you where they sell it and where it goes and those data are available and are being made use of. And Juan
has reminded me that what some of us live with is completely lost history to a whole bunch of folks. What David and some of us know is that the accountability structures that would have illustrated that for firearms trafficking and diversion were created in beginning, in the mid '90s. The equivalent of the opioid information is gun trace information that as that began to show that white folks buying guns and selling guns were in fact the pipeline of guns into the oppressed communities that we're talking about. The reaction of the NRA and the federal government was to shut down that information collecting and make it impossible even for law enforcement agencies to access their own submissions. So one of the reasons the kids know that ATF don't know is because congress has made it impossible for them to know those things. At the same time that that happened, those same folks grabbed hold of Project Exile out of Richmond, Virginia to make the case that we didn't need to go after the suppliers of guns, we could simply jack up more the end users of guns in oppressed neighborhoods. And those two things put an end to the attention to gun trafficking for a generation and created more than the federal gun
prosecution could address this problem.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thanks for having that.

MS. JONES: I think that's exactly right
and the only thing I'll add is I think the Supreme
Court only further reinforced it by doubling down on
the second amendment, making the case that we had an
individual freedom right in sort of gun carrying
such that the federal government asking these
questions and overstepping that right, and sort of a
the bridge of a fundamental right. So I agree with
all of this, I do think there have been
distinguishable things that made accountability to
respond to gun violence, in particular in the
proliferation of guns.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you for being
patient. We heard from some of your colleagues.

MR. P. HAMMER: I'm going to take you up
on the invitation that if I was uncomfortable to say
something. I was very uncomfortable about the
exchange that we had between David and Halim and
Ray. And I think that it shows even in rural
neighborhoods' faith and I also think about systems
and not individuals. To goodwill here which seems
to be happening more clearly than we are able to
think about how we deal with these patterns is to
say that there's disconnects at a minimum and the
disconnects are I think partially based upon race
and disconnects on culture as reflected to academic
values and discourse to the language that we're
trying to focus and play with and somebody who was
raised as a white male and carries all that baggage
into the communities that I try to work with, I'm
tripping over myself all the time. So I'm more
self-aware of these things on the side of saying the
wrong things often, but also given that there are a
number of communities that are willing to try to
correct me, teach me. You can't say those things,
that's hurtful or you could do this better or use
this language and not that language. I think that's
an important thing to pick up on as well as the
notion that we develop practices about how we can do
this better. We often say we want to be centering
the analysis around the people who are most
effective, but that means that we should center the
analysis in terms of language that we use, the
things that we're adopting and language does matter,
resilience, survival, right, assets, creativity,
love, community, are all things that we could be a
part of the ways that we are more intentional. So
we're going to try to reimagine justice. Part of
that is that we start to become more aware of our own racialized belief systems and biases and thought patterns and then in the process that we're going to imagining and try to be stepping out of those as best we can, which is never perfect, and never instant, but I think that's an important pattern we see here, to kind of raise that up and to reflect upon that and think about acknowledging those dynamics and addressing those in ways to try to build bridging and understanding is going to be part of our reimagining process.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you very much. So here's where we are. Thank you for that very much. An active cue, which is wonderful, and then I'm going to shut it down because we want David to reflect on the conversation, Bruce, wrap up, if you would and then take a break. This conversation continues, so don't feel that we're prematurely stopping the exchange. So the cue is Katharine, Kelly, Ray, Jahmal, and then we're going to take a break. I think I got everybody. So Katherine.

MS. K. HUFFMAN: Thank you. Thanks Jeremy and thank you for that, Peter, for highlighting that and connecting all this conversation into Ray and Coleen and David as well.
I learned a ton from this paper and just still really processing and thinking through. What does this tell us about how we can start to try not only work going backwards and fixing things, but also get ahead of some things that seem like they might be coming based on some of the things that you're talking about. You know, I was really struck by the way that you talked about concealed carry laws essentially driving an entirely new market of guns and that, you know, my not knowing a lot about it, I sort of always thought you could conceal, carry, whatever, it surfaces and goes to the bottom and we solved that, but the idea that that change in policy really created this entire new market of types of guns that are even more lethal and have all the other things that you talked about which is really striking to me. So it makes me think about, one, I'd be interested to know what the gun lobby had to do with those laws and that was sort of part Clinton, I'm guessing this although I say it as a question because I don't know.

The second thing is what is coming next and what are the ways in which new policies and changes in policy could be driving the technologies such that that is creating (inaudible), is creating
more prevalence in certain ways, that feels like something we should try to figure out how to get ahead of and then it also goes to sort of thinking about the market and the way, you know, who buys guns from dealers, who buys guns through secondary markets, you know, the different ways that those are regulated is really considerable. You know, especially as I'm again stating only what I've heard on the radio, but, you know, as we hear that more and more guns are in the hands of a smaller and smaller number of people, how does that fit into that? If people are incentivized to buy new types of guns and they're either clearing out space or they're, you know, moving their own private markets, how does that play into what's going to be happening as guns move through sort of the commerce of all that. So thinking about the connections between the policy and the market and the ways that we dwindle, intervene in it seems like something that has not just historical problems, but it feels imminent and dangerous right now.

MS. CARTER-JACKSON: So thank you. This is really great conversation and I'm hoping I won't sound inarticulate because I had ideas and then I changed my ideas and then I thought about more
questions. But one of the things I was thinking about, we talk about how mass incarceration is not really about drugs; it's not really about crime. It really is about anti-blackness and locking up black people, and taking the bottom of the barrel, the poor and black people and really making them expendable. So I'm thinking about this in terms of guns in terms of how guns is not really about violence at all. It's also about anti-blackness and about who possesses power in a way. So the story and I keep thinking about in like the early 1600s during the colonies and they're creating these codes and these laws about who can own guns and slaves can't own guns and all of their restrictions about, you know, their caveats for slaves who were hunting for their masters that might be able to carry guns in a particular amount of time or able to carry guns in their master's presence, things of that nature, but how all gun ownership or laws around gun ownership were centered around race really. There were no regulated rules for white men. It was all about who could have access in terms of black people. And I feel like I see the same thing happening over and over as we look at like all of these laws and pieces of legislation. It has
nothing to do with violence or violence that can be curbed. It's all about race and who will have access and who can be penalized or punished for not having these guns. And it's so clearly racialized, but I don't think we look at it in terms of those ways. Like that's the elephant in the room, but no one wants to discuss how guns are so racialized.

There's never -- you know, considering the epidemic when white people are being killed or shot up, or you see all of these white men and all of their guns, that's never seen as something that's like terrifying as it is to see a black man who may be (inaudible), right? And I just want to know how -- how do we change the laws, I don't know, the laws or the language or both, that give us an honest discussion about how we racialized gun ownership and power and what that looks like. Because in the same ways that we've just sort of like covered up massive incarceration, it's about drugs, it's about drugs. It's not really about drugs. Right? And it's the same thing for gun ownership. It's not really about violence. This is about what black people are able to do or not do, whether they're law abiding or not.

And I just don't know how to get to a place of honesty about -- or transparency about what these
laws are really about because they're so coded and there's so many (inaudible) like penalization or what gets allowed. That's just very -- it disturbing to me because again we've been doing this since the 1600s. So where is the change?

MR. J. TRAVIS: Ray is next and then Ron and then Jahmal and the cue is closed.

MR. R. WINANS: Amanda, Fatimah, Daniel, is this a safe space?

MS. B. JONES: Is this a safe space?

MR. R. WINANS: Are we in a safe space in this room? I mean we talk about this issue of violence, I just need because what I'm about to do or what I'm about to add I just need to make sure that Amanda, Daniel and Fatimah is telling me this is a safe space. In order to be safe are we talking about the (inaudible). It's confidential with certain people and even though we're being live streamed?

(Interruption in proceedings.)

MR. R. WINANS: Let me be very clear, let me be very clear, yes. Right, so with that being said, right, in this issue of violence, all right, when we talk about guns, I think sometimes we miss this. And, Peter, you alluded to it and I thank you
for it. The people that's most impacted by it, so with that being said, I want to do something real quick, and I got permission to do this: Duane, Mike, stand up, Peter stand up. We're going to focus on y'all real quick, just real quick. Y'all are doing positive and productive things now, y'all not too far removed from the lifestyle. How easy was it for y'all to get a gun when you'll was in the streets?

RESPONSE: Easy.

MR. R. WINANS: How easy can you get a gun before you get a bag of chips?

RESPONSE: Yeah.

MR. R. WINANS: Okay. Have a seat. Let's talk about this in a real way. Where I came from we had to resolve the issue, restore. One of our members and I won't acknowledge who it was, had a situation, two situations, previously been shot multiple times, had a situation to whereas he felt like his life was being threatened, so he immediately went and got a gun. When I checked him about it yesterday, he said, man, I had to go and get it because I felt like they was about to shoot me. So I posed that question to us, how many of us in here are licensed to carry and when we're
licensed to carry, we feel protected. Right? So we're talking about the community, right, and how the neighborhood is impacted by this issue of guns. One, guns are very accessible, you can get a gun before you can get a fifty cent bag of potato chips. We cannot continue to talk about neighborhood violence, we're not talking about PTSD. How many of us has seen a therapist? Right? We cannot and that PTSD piece, when we talk about Keith yesterday, fear, right, that fear, fear of being harmed again, right? We talking about -- and it's going to be your question, David, and I'm going to tell you which question and it goes to real quick. Are there better responses for community, communities than simply with violence or revitalization, peace, right? This young man here, stand up real quick, his friends, at least five of his friends was murdered in his neighborhood where they was putting candlelight vigils and putting candlelight vigils. Another gang came and set a candlelight vigil, set one of the homes on fire. What was your response to that?

SPEAKER: Painted the poles and we planted flowers down instead of acting in violence.

MR. R. WINANS: Instead of retaliating
SPEAKER: We painted the poles and we planted flowers down instead of acting in violence.

MR. R. Winans: With opportunities, Right?

(Applause.)

MR. R. Winans: With opportunities and anybody that know the streets and understand the streets that set somebody's candlelight memorial on fire is the worst thing you can do in the neighborhood. That's automatically retaliation. So it is solutions, but just who got to be at the forefront of the solutions? The folk in the neighborhood. When we put them before our research and everything else, then we solve the issue. Daniel, you talked about how you been working on this issue and policy for 30 years. I respect that, that's a long time. However, it has to come a time when we sit down with the people in the neighborhood, ask them the appropriate questions, get an appropriate answer and then put state policies in their agendas. And this is my academic folks. The folk in the neighborhood is taking an accelerated course in life. And so that right there, I -- and I'm going to close with this, I tell
anybody I'm up for the challenge, anybody in this room because I want (inaudible) but I can't afford to go to work and go to school, right, and manage with all these kids, right? So being raised on the east side of Detroit in the neighborhood, I'm willing to let somebody live in my home rent free, you pay for my college education and let's see who gives up first? Let's talk about disadvantage. With that being said, I'm done.

(APPLAUSE.)

Mr. J. TRAVIS: Thanks, Ray, you added to our discussion today. So we're now going to hear next from Juan, Jahmal, Ron Davis.

MR. DAVIS: It's hard to come behind that, but the only thing I'm going to remind everyone, I'm hearing the race solutions and I agree with everything everybody has said. But somebody mentioned project exile. So let's just put some things on the table we can get ready for to try to bring back Project Exile.

MR. J. TRAVIS: What is Project Exile?

MR. DAVIS: There's a push to return to the program -- it was a program that Preston mentioned, a program that was targeting guns in the community. And really went for a looking at a fancy
way of stop and frisk and being able to remove guns from the streets.

MR. D. WEBSTER: It was very focused on (inaudible) for possession. That was the focus.

MR. DAVIS: So unilateral prosecution.

MR. D. WEBSTER: Send them away to prison for a long time.

MR. DAVIS: And there is a move to bring this back. It was recently testified in congressional hearing and this is a nostalgia for the '90s and here's what's unfolding as you come up with solutions. This administration wants to go back to the law and orders days of the '90s and anything that gets in the way, they're willing to take away the funding from the police department, go after progressive prosecutors by trying to get the state to take away their power. So, when I mentioned earlier about governing, that's what I'm talking about. Understanding legislative language of the grant, understanding where your tax dollars go to the incentivized, understanding the role they can play to go after prosecutors, police chiefs, restore programs. That the only outcome is going to be, the re-incarceration, and mass incarceration of young men of color. So we got -- because we got to
call that out, but here's the thing, it provides Congress and the policymakers if not this, then what? I keep focusing on then what, is where you come in, it's people in the community, it's the leaders, everything you're talking about. But If we don't provide the then what, we don't do something immediately, then we're going to sit back and watch them kill all research. The idea that the federal government will stop the CDC from doing violence research, treating violence as a disease, is crazy but it happened nonetheless. The idea that we'll now take 4 billion dollars of grants from the Department of Justice to spend more on active shooter training, which is necessary, for reducing violence in the neighborhood. And we spend more on telling departments if you want this money, you got to enforce immigration laws, all those counter-intuitive to public safety. All of that's happening at the policy level. So this is great, but I think I'm going back to the governing, understanding how the funds are created, understanding local, state and federal processes and legislation because right now there is a significant push and they're using some of our language against us. Right? In other words, everybody wants
independent prosecution as they think about officer involved shootings, not realizing that when they're talking about independent prosecution is when Kim said she's not going to prosecute a thousand people for marijuana. Now, they want to take her power away or Baltimore and other places. So understand the language, understand the governing structure, understand the role we play, otherwise, we'll be talking about it three years from now, but we'll be so far behind the eight ball that we'll once again, again trying to recover from the '90s. This idea of the '90s is picking up steam and it's a false narrative. It's based on fear and ignorance, but it's coming alive. So I think what you guys put on the table is brilliant, but I think you're right. At some point we need to learn how to operationalize it and localize it so that its effects, as Kelly would say, it's the power to push the policymakers to do the right thing for the right reason because the community will accept nothing less.

MR. J. COLE: I was recently shot at seven times with a rifle and the first shot knocked the White Socks hat off my head. It scraped me on the left side of my head and I was face down on the ground and my sister was screaming up in Facetime
and that's how I woke up. And the first thing I thought in my head was, man, that kid has a good shot. I saw them pass me in the car. One of them was laying down like he was sleeping in the car seat and the other guy was driving and when they passed me, that's when I hit the ground and I woke up. Then they fired seven, eight more shots and I ran away, I ran to an alley, dove underneath a porch. When I had enough courage to come back out, you know, it was like one block away from a school. I was coming out of a school at 12:15 in the afternoon giving a speech with a briefcase in my hand. What's interesting is that about a couple months later, I was petitioning, trying to get an alternate on the ballot and he gave me a list of addresses. And the first address was right back on the block where I was shot at a few months earlier. So when I'm standing on porches and knocking on the door to get the alternate on the ballot, every time a car passed, I was shook, man, I went through a range of emotions. You know what I mean? It was a range of emotions I went through. And people kept on saying, when I was knocking on the doors, there's no lights in the neighborhoods, there's no lights in the alleys and it's really dangerous. What I want to
say about the kids that shot at me though, is that
it kind of goes to what we're saying, takes more
from the country and affects a lot more people than
gun violence in Chicago. I think with a gun, you
know, maybe a thousand people unfortunately lose
their lives. Like pharmaceutical companies, they
didn't care if it was pain and stress and mood
related drugs, but guns get the blame in our
community. We see business corporations. They put
these pesticides and herbicides and genetically
modified hormones in our food supplies. You look at
the size of chicken wings -- the size of chicken
wings as big as my elbow. Right. But it will be
years before we know the results of those things.
But guns get the blame, so I just want to put that
out there that I thought the kids -- the teenagers
that were shooting at me, somebody just got shot on
their block. You know, it was retaliation. They
never saw me before on this side of town on 71st.
And we created conditions that we feel like we have
to be strapped up to be safe. I didn't go to the
cops. That was one of the things. Hey, it was
like, hey, why didn't you go to talk the police
officers about, you know, being shot? I felt like,
you know, we don't really sympathetically understand
the conditions that a lot of students have to live in Chicago and this is one block away from school. These kids got to walk to school like that every day. I just wanted to share that story.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Amanda.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: Kelly, your comment, you know, just made me think about, like you were saying the way that we think about guns in the country has always been connected to the way that the U.S. state thinks about values, treats black people. And Ray, thank you for your intervention. It made me connect Kelly's comment back to a group that maybe folks in Chicago are closer to, but this group has been one of my teachers in thinking about these questions. So it's a group of teenagers called Fearless Leading By the Youth on the south side of Chicago. And they won several years ago a battle, a multi-year battle for a multi-million dollar trauma center from the University of Chicago. And what was happening was they were responding to the problem of people dying on route to the nearest hospital after being shot because there was not a trauma center that could deal with these type of acute injuries in the neighborhood. And so people were dying on route and fundamentally being
abandoned to die because of lack of health care in the neighborhoods. And so what they have taught me is there's always a punitive response. So I think what they would have been, you know, trained to call for is harsher gun laws or more police patrols. You know, there's always a punitive response, but instead they thought about, all right, fundamentally what's wrong here, about the ways that our lives are valued. And it's about the fact that we're abandoned to die for lack of health care. And so they made a radical call for care and they looked around and said who in our neighborhood has resources to give us what we need in terms of trauma care and Chicago has these glistening building, but nothing that was meeting the needs from that neighborhood. And so they got arrested, they occupied offices, they made it happen because that time it was force they exercised to force the people to give this to them, to give it to them. And so I just think that to me felt like it was really interesting the way that we value black lives. And it was instructive to me in terms of the type of organizing that is so powerful and been demonstrated by those that reigned. What can we actually demand to fundamentally value ourselves differently?
MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you so much. Thank you for listening. Is this support or was this all three of you?

(Interruption in proceedings.)

MR. J. Travis: So speaking about organizing, there's some organizing going on there.

MS. M. KEELS: Yes. What they did in that organizing and it is a health care, right? That they should have a trauma center for all of vision of rescues for health -- access to health care. So I grew up in Balinese, Canada. I've been in the U.S. for 23 years, I still don't understand that I have to fight for health care. Making me healthy is going to make me more economically productive. Like the thing that -- that Americans value so much, make me healthy, and you're going to get more of that from me. I don't get where the struggle is for health care. That aside, the University of Chicago I work loosely with the trauma center in helping them to become trauma informed, meaning what do we do beyond stitching up those wounds? So one thing that I've learned is when we're thinking about the value of gun violence, having that trauma center there makes only a marginal difference in life or death because of the legality of gun violence and
the extent to which they're going to arrive there
and beyond a point where surgery is going to be able
to save that life and there really maybe just a lot
of it just helping, supporting the passing of that
life. But also the carnage, those who live from
experiencing gun violence, they are living with so
many health care, health challenges, is that we
focus on the homicide and we focus on the death that
happened, but we don't think about, what does it
mean to live with the (inaudible) and the damage --
the damage created by the guns and by the
improvements in the technology of gun violence. And
so, yes, that is absolutely important what they did.
The guns that people have access to in these
communities are such that surviving gun violence, we
don't really understand what that means. When we
think about what that really means for the survivors
or the families of those survivors and we don't
really think beyond stitching up the body. They're
alive now but they're alive with what level of
damage? And they're alive with any new choices and
options. And so when we think about readmittance to
another violent gun incident, within a year, that's
also highly likely to happen. We do have to grapple
with guns.
MS. B. RICHIE: And can I just very quickly say, what's in Chicago profoundly changed is power on your people and that was a victory. And it didn't necessarily anticipate or be able to deliver on the long-term impact of what the harm of gun violence is. But both are true and I think part of what we want to hold is the brilliance of demanding a trauma center and all the people who were like, why do we need that, right, or who got on board with supporting, organizing and then whatever can come next because of that victory. And we have to keep paying attention to this issue.

MR. J. TRAVIS: It brings us back to neighborhoods. We've got to keep going. Sorry. We're here all day and tomorrow. I love the energy and assistance, but we're going to listen to David and Bruce and take a break. Hold those thoughts for the next session.

MR. D. HUREAU: A beautiful conversation, I appreciate it. I appreciate the challenges to me to help. Is that something I'm trying to do, right? We're talking about across some distances here and to help me hear better too. So I appreciate that. I think, you know, Kelly to your point, I think that's probably what I would want to close on is
just to say that I came to studying guns super
reluctantly. I actually don't care that much about
guns. I'm not a gun nut or anything like that. I
basically saw in guns a deep, deep form of racial
inequality. And as a sociologist I care about
racial inequality and violence and felt like I was
forced to look at that. One of the things that very
much surprised me, getting into some of the
historical analysis of this, I mean, I think that we
have a narrative about contemporary gun policy
over time being eroded by gun rights organizations
and that is part of the story, it's partly true,
it's very real, it's a very real way that David will
remind us of and Candance too. However, there's a
strong historical consequence here, super strong
that is race based, that is place based and that are
our gun policy, American gun policy has become a
policy, not a regulation, but a place based and race
based punishment and is strong. So I think that's
super powerful in how we reckon with that is
incredibly important because one of the things
that's been mentioned, one of the things that we
need to consider is not just the inequality that
comes from violence. That's super, super real.
But another part of my research recently is trying
to look at gun punishment itself and how it contributes to mass incarceration and that's very real actually, and the racial disproportionately in that is at levels that are pretty unimaginable and it all ties in with this long standing, really gun policy that's implicated in racial nomination. So I'll turn it over to Bruce for summary. He's better at summarizing than me anyway.

MR. J. CARTAGENA: Please, please, please, I'll take 30 seconds.

MR. J. TRAVIS: You got it.

MR. J. CARTAGENA: It is important for us to recognize the transnational effects of the gun industry. When we're talking about United States, from my creation and immigration and just like drugs that we consume insatiably in this country, that reeks havoc to South American, Central America, gun policy and the profiteering of the gun industry reeks havoc all south of the border. We have to recognize it. If we get this right here, we can fix gun violence also.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you for that. So Bruce, help us make sense out of it. We're counting on you.

MR. B. WESTERN: Getting in the way into
our conversation, so four quick points from me. I want to underline and I'm sure we all heard it, I want to stop by underlining what I see as the main point of David's paper. One of the main points and that is the extent of violence that we see in the communities that are struggling most with poverty and unemployment and segregation and broken institutions. The extent of violence that we see in those communities and we often talk about those underlying causes, is due to guns. And that is I think something that we have not fully internalized in the criminal justice conversation. If not for guns, we would not have the same rights as homicide and all of the injury and all of the trauma that's accumulated in communities that Ray spoke so eloquently about that Juan talked about as well, mortality rates would be much lower, injury and the trauma and everything would be much lower if not for guns. I think that is a really important point for us in the criminal justice reform conversation.

Second big point for us which is the new ground in our conversation is, so who is accountable for all of this harm? This is how I -- another layer of this conversation. Who is accountable? We talked a lot about how gun policy
is so deeply racialized. And, in fact, there is two
tiers of citizenship rights. How a citizen can own
a gun, that doesn't apply to everyone, citizenship
rights to gun ownership. The way that has
historically involved in public policy and the
rights to gun ownership really only extend to white
society. And so this is a deeply a racialized area
of public policy and Kelly spoke to it and David and
Kim, and I thought Candance put her finger on this,
is that part of the reason for this deracialization
of public policy, because of deep-seated beliefs
about violence and dangerousness of black men. And
there is a racist underpinning to the radicalization
of gun policy. The third thing is political
economy, which is a new layer to our conversation.
This is a public policy domain that has been
captured by the industry the public policy is meant
to regulate. The gun industry has a massive
influence on how public policy has developed and
they have directly (inaudible) in maintaining the
kind of liberalization of gun ownership that has
emerged and so I think this is one part of that
conversation where Lynn used the C word where
capitalism is being racism and racial injustice.
And the fourth and final point, I think in different
ways with picking up Ron's theme from the very
beginning of the day, we're struggling with, talking
about alliances of different kinds and what kinds of
alliances can be formed. One thing I take from the
conversation that David has provoked is that the
movement for criminal justice reform has to connect
with the policy activism around gun violence
prevention. That has to happen. I'm not sure how
much that is happening now, but that seems really
urgent to me. There is a really important racial
justice perspective that the criminal justice reform
side of the policy has to bring to the policy
activism around gun violence prevention. As Amanda
was saying, I think we're able to bring a language
and many policy options that a noncommunity in a
space that could be dominated by punitive policy,
the proliferation of mandatory minimums, for
example, of gun possession and so on, you know, the
seduction of doing the easy thing, and as Daniel
said, is really ripe. And Ron talked about this
too. Another kind of alliance that I see sort of
emerging from our conversation is there is a
plurality of expertise around the table. There's a
lot of different kinds of expertise and there's the
academic expertise of the researcher and the
quantitative analysis, and a certain kind of historical analysis and so on and then there is the expertise with the experience in a community and knowing in a very direct way the kinds of harms that we're all concerned about. And I think what, part of what we're doing here in our alliance building process, is figuring out how these different variety of things can come together and might produce change.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Bruce, thank you all for the great start to the day. Just super impressed by the folks around this table and the willingness to be frank with each other, listen carefully to each other, bring your multiple gifts to this discussion. We're going to take a 15-minute break. I know a number of you have been wanting to get in.

(A brief recess was taken.)

MR. J. TRAVIS: A couple things before we start the next session and hear from Beth. We have a tradition, those of you who were here yesterday, know the tradition when we open a session, we'd like to provide an opportunity for observers who have been listening carefully and have their own perspectives on this discussion, to give you an opportunity to state a question for something that
we should be thinking about and/or an observation
that you want to make about the conversation. And I
just ask you to stand in your place, if you would
and tell us if you wish, your affiliation so that we
get a sense of what brings you here and then
briefly, succinctly state your question or your
observation that applies to anybody. Before we do
that I want to recognize that we have Crystal who is
here representing the Healing by Choice Group, and
if you would just say, not everybody was here
yesterday, one of your colleagues said what you have
to offer, but if you just let us know what Healing
by Choice is and what you have to offer, it would be
great so we can make that available to our
participants.

SPEAKER: My name is Crystal and this is
Jacqueline. And we're here as Healing by Choice
practice to support the courtroom work that you are
doing. Throughout the conference we're going to be
in McGregor 202 on the second floor providing
services to help you kind of take in information, to
unwind if you need to if you're feeling stressed
out. We have basically energy work, accu detox,
which is a kind of accupuncture. If you feel like
you need someone to talk to to kind of decompress
and unwind, we have someone available for you as well. Thank you so much.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you, Crystal.

SPEAKER: And we also have a place where if you just want to do your thing. (inaudible) table and Taro cards, things like that. Thank you so much.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you for being here.

Thank you for the work you're doing.

MS. K. HUFFMAN: Just to add to that to make sure that that's available to participants, that's also available to our observers. So anyone who would like to come and take advantage of those services.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Before we turn it over to observers for questions or observations, I just want to say how energizing and gratifying it is to have Detroit represented so well in this room. We bring the roundtable to different communities in order to support and engage and learn from those communities and I feel just really fortunate that we have this representation that is evident here today, just to say what is clear is that we learn from you and those perspectives are invaluable to this conversation. So let's start on this side. Raise
your hand and we'll do it in order of those whose
hand was raised. Name and affiliation if you care
to and a question, an observation and briefly as
possible.

D. ARDMORE: I'm from Detroit. In terms
of my whole professional life being spent here,
clergyman, public health official in regard to
substance abuse primarily and then community
development, a father, community council president.
So I've dealt with this problem in so many ways
including very personal ways. But what I want to
bring out in relation to the discussion that we just
had is that the literature that I'm reviewing now on
homicide prevention at the community level suggests
that while so many of the activists and I include
myself in that, have been focusing on social causes
of violence and unjust fraud, injustices that we
want to address, we all want to address. While
that's true, some of the current literature says
that we need to focus on the violence -- lethal
violence issue itself and the gun violence part of
it in order to immediately bring down the death
rates related to violence. Some communities have
done it, some have not, and that in doing that, we
will first of all, relieve a tremendous amount of
suffering, reduce the number of personal years of
life loss in the inner city and unleash the
potential of low income neighborhoods to become
again neighborhoods of social mobility,
neighborhoods that provide nurture and hope to
people, but we have to lower the violence rate now.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Stay on this side of the
room. If there are others that would like to make
an observation?

SPEAKER: My question is for you,
Mr. Kennedy. The customer notification situation,
when you knock on people's doors and you give them a
letter from the prosecuting attorney as an outreach
worker, how do you go back into the community after
making an approach with the police as far as a
safety issue for my family?

MR. D. KENNEDY: Are you doing outreach?

SPEAKER: I transformed from that, but I
have done volunteer outreach work.

MR. D. KENNEDY: So there's a connection
to both of those comments. Some of the ways in
which we (inaudible) various and my shop, national
network has framed up a certain kind of that
content. It's just talking to people, but develop
protocols to get the right kind of information and
the right kind of engagement to those at highest risk. There's a perineal issue in this work around the partnerships that can do this kind of work. And one of those issues is always street outreach workers and their relationship with law enforcement agencies. There are a bunch of different ways to handle that and we've got people around here who can be involved in this. I wasn't be surprised if this comes up more. In some places folks have worked out ways in which to do that same time, same place shoulder to shoulder, two or three people doing it together and that works for them. In other places, they don't want to do it that way and they can stagger it so that one group makes the visit first and a day or two later, the other one follows up. I think the key in this is basically two things. One is that work—one always wants that kind of direct engagement with those at highest risk to let them know what their legal risks are, to offer them support and outreach and to communicate community moral standards and expectations around violence. And however that's organized, it has to be done in a way that the community agents are comfortable with it and feel safe. So there are ways to do that. There are also a lot of ways that
don't work and the tension you're talking about is a
current issue. Is that helpful?

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you. Stay to this
side. Other questions?

SPEAKER: Just another observation. Has
anyone participated in One Day with God here; has
anyone participated in that? Well, let me tell you
what it is. I was able to go into the prison to
Huron Valley under a ministerial group. The
children were sponsored for $180 a day. Their
caregivers brought the children to the prison and
spent all day with selected moms. When I witnessed
this mom go pick up all three of her children at
once because she was so glad to see them, that's
healing. Next point is what happened to the buy
back guns? No questions asked, we did that in
Detroit. I wish I had a gun to turn in because I
would have been given $50.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Seeing nothing else, on
this side, then we'll do behind me. Oh, there's one
more?

SPEAKER: So I got two things but I'm
going to limit it to one thing. So what I know is
that guns don't kill people, people kill people. So
like when we're talking about the issue of gun
violence, I think the root cause of it deals more so with the mindset. So I did 24 years in prison and we didn't have guns and it was an extremely violent environment. So when we're talking about community violence, there are some structural things that produce the violence in our community. And so in the work that we do now -- that I do now is I help serve that approach. And so what we know is that where the mind goes, the body will follow. So if we look at this thing from an mental, intellectual, emotional place, I think that we'll hit home. When we think of guns being the cause of the problem, I think that we're overlooking the fact that it's something deeper than the guns that actually manifest itself. Yes, there is some structural racism that is attached to it, no question about it, but still it doesn't change the fact that most individuals who are subjected to gun violence or a death that is dealing with gun violence, it is generational. Violence in and of itself is generational, and how do we begin to look at the generational violence and eradicate that and then we'll talk about eradication with regards to gun violence, if you will, or community violence. So if community violence is the issue that we're looking
at, we have to have a community and the stakeholders in the community at the table and begin to question them about what's going on in the community. So I just challenge everyone to begin to think of it in that lens. It's something deeper than just the gun in and of itself. It's the mind set and where does the mind set come from? It's generational and how do we eradicate that generational mind set?

MR. J. TRAVIS: Now, we're off to this side of the room. Any folks that would like to add to this our conversation?

SPEAKER: Can you hear me? My name is Reverend John Phelps and I've been working in public schools in Chicago and Detroit since 1973. And so out of that type of research and I also work at funerals because I'm a Catholic priest and I wind up being at funerals and I listen to the cause, but I look for the cure. And I found the cure to be the young people who are rooted in their elders who can aspire their peers through forgiveness. And so I found that formula that works. But then I got deeper into it and I wanted to know about the indirect, the principle of double effect. Has anybody here done any research on the need for housing stops in order to have housing starts and
the way to stop housing is by having gangs take over
a neighborhood and people to move out. So therefore
they lose their homes, they move away and then the
banks and the developers systemically develop. Now,
I've been on the east side of Detroit, northwest
side and southwest, but on the west side of Chicago
and the south side of Chicago and I've seen it
systemically. Has anybody dealt with the gain that
people have for housing starts and changing
neighborhoods?

MR. J. TRAVIS: This row, anybody? Yes,
I'm sorry.

SPEAKER: My name is (inaudible). I'm an
archeologist here in the city and I have done a lot
of youth work in the city in my time here, part of
which was done with Barbara Jones who is one of the
hearts of the community here. And with an
organization called Atlantic .Impact which deals
with exposing Detroit high school students to
various study abroad opportunities, community
service, other -- just other types of social
opportunities. I wanted to begin by just saying
thank you to all of you for being here today. It's
an incredible group of minds here, so I'm just
echoing the sentiments that we've heard over and
over again. I appreciate it. It's really an honor to listen to. But I wanted to comment on the conversation of healing that was brought up at the beginning of today and tie that into the territorial acknowledgement for this area. One of the voices that is absent from this room is the indigenous voice and I'm not that voice. You can probably tell, however, I think it is really important to acknowledge that and maybe try to get somebody at the table who can bring that voice here especially since the indigenous community is arguably the leading recipient of state-based violence. So the other day I was at a healing workshop that was led by an indigenous activist named Christy Gigibod, and she was introducing healing by doing her territory acknowledgments. So I want to just echo her words here today and say that if we are going to heal, first we have to acknowledge what harm has been done and the first step of that is to acknowledge the territory that we are on. So today we are in Detroit, we are in the territorial or ancestral lands. I just wanted to make sure that was stated at some point during this. And then I'm sorry this is long winded but I was hoping that one of the conversations we could or one of the topics we could
introduce to this group is just the topic of
segregation and how it has continued and continues
to continue. And I wanted to also talk about the
role of poverty in providing our military with
bodies. So I just kind of wanted to put those out
there.

MR. J. TRAVIS: So let's do a bit of an
agenda check. We are obviously, whatever it means
to say this, behind schedule, but that doesn't mean
we've wasted our time or we didn't have enough time
for discussions we needed to have. But we're going
to try to catch up some time in the next session and
I'll tell you how I'd like to do that. Our hope
still is that we'll complete this session on the
effects of violence session that will end this --
that's impossible, but soon thereafter. We'll do
our traditional sort of schedule which is Beth will
take some thoughts from her paper and we'll continue
our discussion, provide an opportunity for
clarifying questions after that and then we'll open
it up. We closed out the last session with by my
count, two people, maybe there are others, who I
asked to wait and Barbara Jones, Eric Cumberbatch.
If it feels like you want to be first in after we
get through the clarifying questions, we'll put you
at the head of the cue. If it doesn't feel that
day, that's fine too. If you'll just state
somewhere in this session that you want to get in.
I just want to make sure we give you that time.

Before we get started, Beth, I want to
just -- life is strange sometimes. Going to the
men's room during the break and I was staring, just
trying to make sense out of the world that we just
heard from and everybody is staring, not at the
mirror but at the faucet. I don't know if the
women's room has the same label right above the
facet. I thought it was appropriate. It was given
to us by the university, and it is "Warriors wash
their hands." I'm assuming that warriors are a Wayne
State thing. We're warriors, right, so we're here
for the struggle. And somehow we're being reminded
that it's important that we wash our hands. It
doesn't mean wash our hands of things, but that we
just stay healthy. So there's the healing dimension
to our work as warriors. I just had to bring it to
you. When you go to the restroom later today, maybe
you'll find this reminder of two things that are
important, to be warriors, to Wayne State and to
remember to wash our hands. So, Beth.

MS. B. RITCHIE: Okay, on that note. So
Jeremy, tell me how we're going to do this time again.

MR. J. TRAVIS: You get the same amount of time, ten minutes or so.

MS. B. RITCHIE: Okay.

MR. J. TRAVIS: And the same opportunity to ask clarifying questions and then we'll take it, wherever it takes us. We will not end at 12:30 but a little after that.

MS. B. RITCHIE: Okay. I will try to take less than ten minutes to give more time for discussion. I mean everybody is humbled and grateful to be here. I, this morning was feeling like oh, I'm glad I didn't have to do mine yesterday because I didn't really know the format. After that discussion I wish I had done mine yesterday. That was an amazing discussion. And part of what I want to first say is I apologize that my back is to so many of you. I couldn't figure out a way to do it. You know, I didn't know if we were going to change seats, but I thought I'd acknowledge and appreciate your presence here and my back is (inaudible).

Jeremy, I also have never had a chance to thank you here for your support for my work, and so I'm going to do it publicly here while everybody's
The first time I ever got any funding to do the work that I've been doing for 20 years was when you were helping to shape NIJ's work on ending violence against women. I remember a particular meeting where you invited many of us who were doing work around gender based violence in communities of color to come and I assume that part of what happened is you met me and other people around the room, but it was a major change in how the academic work on violence against women of color started to take shape. So I appreciate your leadership all these years later, both my own work but also what we understand much of what is bringing out today. Thank you, Jeremy.

I also want to lovingly ask that for every discussion going forward we talk about women and girls. I didn't hear it once in the last discussion. I tried to bring it up at other times, I didn't want to sort of be that person. But it is so important and it's important not only so that we can understand better what happens in our communities around violence, but it's -- for women, it's also important because it helps us understand
what happens in our communities around men. And so let this be an invitation to make sure we do that from here forward. I offer that lovingly. I also want to just -- again I'm only gearing up, but I also want to really say that the triggering of some of the discussion that we're going to have is real and there is both healing room and lots of community support for people if this gets tough, then I think people should take care of themselves and more importantly we should also take care of each other. So I'm not going to review the paper that I wrote very much. It was a paper about the effects of violence, at least it was supposed to be and I found that when I was writing it, I was almost in a defensive way trying to convince whoever the anticipated readers were that any discussion around violence and victimization has to include particular attention to women and to issues of gender. So when I reread it, I did feel like I was a little like, you've got to pay attention to this and a little maybe defensive about that. I apologize if it came off that way. And most of it I think is things at least in terms of the effect, things that we know. One of the effects of violence is that people disappear. They disappear because they're dead,
they disappear because they go to prison, they
disappear because we shun them outside of our
communities, we push them away, they can't be here
anymore or they exclude themselves because of a
self-imposed exile from our community, people
disappear. Another consequence or effect of
violence is an internalization and we've talked a
lot about that already. People have mental health
issues, people experience PTSD, people self
medicate, people get engaged in self harm, people
internalize and then people also externalize as a
result of violence and people become aggressive or
blame others or participate in some ways that we
create deteriorating effects in our own communities.
So part of why I think the discussion is important
around effects is because we need our people and we
can't participate or not acknowledge any people that
we need in order to move forward disappearing. Part
of why I use that frame is because in my work as an
activist and interventionist, I don't know if that's
a word, but someone who tries to do intervention,
less so in my academic work, I really try to make
sure that people aren't invisible and don't
disappear because of violence. And when I first
started doing anti-violence work at a community's
health center, this was in the 1980s, it was in
Harlem bordering on east Harlem and there was
radical politics around racial justice, around
housing, around health, around food, around schools,
nothing around gender. It became clear to me that
lots of people were disappearing who we needed
because of gender-based violence. That is to say
people couldn't come to meetings because they were
afraid to be on their streets. They would assume a
leadership role in one of the campaigns that we were
organizing around environmental justice or access to
schools and because of sexual harassment in the
context of that organizing, more racial justice,
people disappeared. And so part of what I
understood the problem of bringing gender violence
to the racial justice project was so that people
didn't disappear.

Later in my work, when I started working
with people who have been incarcerated or are
incarcerated, it was clear that we disappear people
into prisons because we don't attend to issues of
gender violence. On any given day 25 percent of the
women at Cook County Jail are there because of being
arrested around gender violence issues. Women being
arrested around gender violence issues, 97 percent
of them are survivors of gender violence, but the
way we use that long tool of gender violence laws to
arrest anybody that we can, is that women who are
survivors or criminalized survivors end up in jails
or prisons. I teach a course at Stateville Prison
which is a maximum security prison for men in
Illinois, all of my students in the last three years
I've been teaching there except for one were black
men. All of them have used gender violence as part
of their relational -- as a part of their intimate
relationships. All of them have used other kinds of
violence as part of their reason at least that they
self-described reasons for their incarceration, the
connection for them was very clear. And if we don't
address, we on the outside try to develop policy,
we're not listening to the stories of how gender
violence contributes to all kinds of violence that I
think we are allowing people who we need to
disappear. So let me just say really quickly I have
eight questions and then four frameworks. And this
is all about the violence matrix. I included the
violence matrix as a tool for us to consider that
would allow us to think about the various ways that
gender violence happens and how it's linked to other
kinds of violence that we've been talking about.
There's three forms and three spheres, there's lines, but there really aren't lines at all that overlap. It's much more messy in terms of how people experience violence that looks like it on that chart, but the reason for the chart which was developed in the community with the people who I was working with, primarily at Cook County Jail and actually started at Rikers Island, developed as a way to kind of say let's break this apart a little bit so we can figure out different strategies of intervention.

The tool does two things, I hope. First it helps name very specifically in lots of detail the ways that gender violence manifests. Two, it's a source of healing. Because if we can name people and therefore invite people back from wherever we disappear them to because we ignore the kind of trauma and harm they experience, then people can see themselves kind of in one of the cells of the violence matrix, and saying here's what we can do about it. So I think of it not only as sort of diagnostic if you will, but also opportunities for intervention.

So here's my seven questions. First one is: What would happen if we centered gender more broadly and gender violence
toward black women specifically as one of our key starting points in a discussion about gun violence, in our discussion about other kinds of violence. What would happen if women appeared, brought women in? What are the consequences of us framing the discussion of violence and victimization and harm as one that particularly or really only affects black men and other men of color, what are the consequences of that? How do we challenge the use of violence by people who have harmed other people? I'm thinking now, listening to my students, what kind of accountability are we looking for people who are in the worst condition of violence that we can almost imagine and that is the cages that they have to live in, many of them for the rest of their lives. What's accountability in that context and how do we figure out how to take wisdom from people who have used and experienced violence in creating solutions? How all -- what's the relationship -- this is redundant now between anti-black racism. I like how we've also brought in racial capitalism and patriarchy. I loved the story about hypermasculinity and the brothers going down and taking care of business when there was a sexual assault and I wanted to talk more about it. Using
that as maybe an example, how do we take advantage of reframing what sometimes looks like it's something to be criticized and embrace it as strategy? And what would have happened if women had gone along too?

MS. A. HARVEY-QUINN: They did.

MS. B. RICHIE: And they did. Okay.

Good. How do we collectivize resistance? Kelly, I've been thinking this since you talked about it.

I have worked on a lot of campaigns for criminalized survivors to get them home, to set them free. It's individual campaigns, so it's one after another after another. There are too criminalized survivors in jails and prison. Most of them are black women.

What if we collectivize that, how might we do that? And how would something like a collective response to gender based violence decrease other forms of violence? I kept trying to think how does this line up with the discussion about gun violence, for example. I learned -- this is the last point I'll make here and I'm not sure I'm doing what I said I would do, but I learned when we were talking about fights with my students that there were four words that would lead to a fight, this was inside. These are my students at Stateville Prison. So these are
people who don't have -- well, I was going to say access, but that's not true, but violence without guns. I'm not going to say the four words because of the live stream, but one begins with a P and ends with a Y. One begins with a F and ends with a T, it's about sexuality. One is just calling someone a sissy, right, and the last one didn't have to do with gender. But all of those -- I'm not talking about violence towards women. I'm talking about violence between men being about degradation of women. And so -- or at least challenging gender, right? And so my point about how serious it is that we take this up isn't just about protecting women and setting women free, it's also about how gender is not general in sexuality, so confined in so many of us. The four frames, we talked earlier, Juan, right? We have to have to bring a more conceptional lens to this discussion. Anti-black racism is important to start with. It will allow us to challenge white supremacy, but we also have to talk about hetero-patriarchy and sexism and those other experiences that confine people or at least remove people from our analysis. I wonder what would happen if we shifted our discussion from trauma informed to anti-racist feminist informed work? And
in part I don't mean to minimize trauma. I mean to say that it's more than -- or in addition to healing, we also have to be proactive, not healing or restoring us back to those traditional spaces that we've been in, but what's new, what's different, what's the world that we want to be in? And I guess that will be a place that I'll end. That I talked yesterday about the question about abolition and I do identify myself as an abolitionist. I do that now more radically, thank you, but I do that in part because I want to talk about how we heal, not just restore and how we look forward to the world we want to create, not just make sure that the world -- this world works a little better for a few more people, that's not enough. And I think then we may not be talking about guns, but be talking about something else next time, right? So to me the invitation to reimagine or rethink justice has to include gender and be focused on something that's about -- a vision of the future that's the abolition, not just the restoration project. So I'll stop there.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you so much, Beth. Thank you for your generous observation. Time for clarifying questions. (Inaudible.)
MR. H. FLOWERS: I apologize for not mentioning the women every time I step in the space, it's always if it had not been for my mother, back then, my mother is the one that loved me, continued to love me, grandmothers, my aunts, I would not be at this table today. It was because of the women beginning with my mother who loved me unconditionally from when I was an academic genius taking my pre SAT at age 11 to when I got a life sentence at the age of 16 for acting out as a thug, and the 22 years that I served in prison, it was my mother who kept me afloat and it was my mother is the reason I'm able to be here today. I've only been home seven months, to be able to scale so fast because of the resource of unconditional love that she poured into me. The three points, clarifying questions and the stories -- you mentioned stories of gender violence, right? I'm very big on qualitative data instead of quantitative data. I do believe it's power and the question I propose is: How do we capture and produce these stories of gender violence for us to hear them when women are often silenced and so that we can use these stories to amplify and assess (inaudible.) and awareness.

The second question is Angela Davis
includes transwomen into the feminist identification, so how does your paper address this issue of black transwomen, it goes back to Alia's point, brothers protecting property because we have seen a recent violent spike against transwomen of color. So how are they included in this gender violence as well? And the third point is the abolition piece, radical from that aspect, and radical means rooted. That's anonymous with (inaudible) and I'm an abolitionist as well and I want to know do you address that because -- do you address what this looks like from a radical perspective that doesn't come off like threatening, make you uncomfortable, right? Because I think that when we just say like reform, I think that we forget that when we set out to fight this bloody civil war, to reform slavery, that what we got was the 13th Amendment and this is why we have mass incarceration. And so I don't think that we need to reform the prison system. We need to abolish it because the infrastructure of it and the cost in it is too strong to try to reform it. I think we just need to abolish it, tear down the whole brick and mortar of it and build new spaces. So I just want to know how you address the radical theory of being
1 an abolitionist.

2 MR. J. TRAVIS: In the interest of time,
3 are there any other questions? Let's get them all
4 to vet the clarifying questions and then we'll open
5 it up, and keep track of all these questions. Yeah,
6 go ahead.

7 MS. C. COLON: Well, Beth, first I want
8 to just thank you of course for bringing gender up
9 and your paper is amazing. And really look at, you
10 know, the generation of curses that women live with.
11 You know, we don't look at that as a whole. Women
12 by nature, we're nurtures, we're the village
13 keepers, you know. When you're in your mother's
14 womb, that's the first voice you hear, when your
15 born usually the nurses are woman, your caregivers
16 are women, your teachers, 90 percent of them are
17 women. So women always play this huge role as
18 village keepers, as the nurturers of the future
19 generations. And we don't talk about how the people
20 that are, like I'll go back to the systems that are
21 in place that come in and are certified to draw a
22 line kind of in the sand and decide what neglect is
23 and what poor choices are for some women. And then
24 when that happens, a lot of women, and I just came
25 from a conference, the National Council for Formerly
Incarcerated Women and Children. There was 936 women there from all over the world, from Kenya, from Sweden, from the Dominican Republic, from all the Latin countries. And one thing that every woman spoke about was that the unprofound curse, that generational curse that we as women carry from generations to come that's embedded in our DNA and how we're looked at as bad moms when we make a poor choice and that stigma stays with us forever and it becomes generational harm and it's added to our children. It becomes a burden that they shouldn't have to carry but they do. An example that I'll give you, if someone calls DCSF for whatever reason, we need to be co-workers and you don't like me and so you decide that if we have a beef, you're going to make an anonymous call, that call, whether you're found with, you know, doing something wrong or not doing something wrong, that stays on your list of bad things, right? It stays on a registry for the rest of your life. In some spaces whether they find a finding or don't find a finding, you're on this list. In New York it's 28 years, in other states it's 20 years, in other states it's for life. You can never chaperone, you can never volunteer at a school, you can never be that mother or that
grandmother, that child that works raising our future leaders. And that needs to be talked about. Who creates these things and why are they created? I mean, we all know that answer but these are questions that I have. And it's like what are the alternatives to really examining the impact of incarcerated children because there's not a lot of data about that, there's not a lot of research done on that, right? The impact of examining family violence because that's what it is, you know, what are the alternatives to placing blame on women for everything? We -- that's my question.

MR. J. TRAVIS: So, Eric, your time is up. Try to get questions to Beth. That will answer (inaudible) and then we'll open it up more broad.

MR. E. JONES: So thank you for your work and you know, it stopped in like the other cities our primary focus on our gun violence is through cease fire or gun violence intervention and those committing the most gun violence are usually 18 to 24. Can you talk more or just summarize the link between those that commit gun violence and gender violence lens or gender degradation?

MS. B. RITCHIE: So I'll start -- I'll attend to all of them really quickly. There is some
empirical evidence that suggests that some portion of gun violence, male-to-male gun violence is about gender relationships. And so at a minimum, that's just at a minimum, we need to figure out how control of women factors -- or the desire to control women or possession of women factors into why two men might be using violence toward each other. And I think we don't know about the ways that young girls, It's International Day of the Girl by the way. We don't know to what extend. Not gun violence that leads to murder, but the use of guns or the threat of the use of guns is part of how girls fight as well. So that's a very short answer but there is some evidence. Transwomen, especially trans black women are the highest risk group of violence now, and that is so important. I really appreciate you bringing that up. I'm going to talk not only about -- when I talk about it, I not only talk about the disability -- talking about a disappearance population, right? Transgender people and transgender women in particular. But it means that we also have to in our own black communities figure out what we are going to do and say about sexuality and about transgender politics more general? And to me the question about impulsive heterosexuality is
part of the answer. Don't have time to go into it, but I do think the question about gender relationships and sexuality in our communities is part of this discussion, has to be and it's part of the hypermasculinity that we talked about. I didn't say this, but I think there's also a way that we have to factor in the long-term effects on women when we think about the mass incarceration or masculinization of men. The women who visit, the women who lose partners, the women who aren't raised with fathers and again being careful about the compulsive heterosexuality, that would be your family dimensions that that brings forward, but the disappeared people affect the people who aren't disappeared, and that's important. I don't know where else I can go with -- yes, there's a shadow carceral state that is targeting women through child protective services, through welfare fraud, through punishment of kids not going to school is usually punishing mothers because they don't get their kids to school despite why they might not do that. So there is, I think, a pattern of targeting women with certain kinds of crimes that end up to have us not being able to participate as activists and leaders or any other community based organization responding
to violence and those are targeted gender policies. And they lead to violence and they are violence. So I think we need to bring those into the discussion as well.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you all, thank you, Beth, for taking those questions. We'll let your agenda (inaudible) about how we have to look with Sukyi's help, thank you, Sukyi, rearranged our time together slightly. We're going to take lunch at one instead of 12:30. We're going to ask Paul Butler to start his discussion at two rather than 1:30. We'll take a break at 3:15. Justice in Detroit essentially stayed pretty much on schedule at 3:30. Just stay in that and the rest of us should adhere to that schedule if we can. So less time for this discussion, shorter wrap up from Bruce and Beth. We'll give you that opportunity. If it's something that's really pressing, we'll just schedule highlights and then we'll still have some time for very, very important observations or contributions from Beth's paper. So remembering that Barb and Eric have, if they wanted, first claim to some time, but I'll let you decide if you want to exercise that. Other than Alia is first in with her name tag up. So I'm told again and again that I mumble. If
you can't hear me, just let me know. Rather than
let it be something that simmers under the surface.
So I'll do my best but I'm one of those people that
has to be reminded as I remind others.

So Alia, will start and anymore come in?
Okay. Alia first in and then Barb.

MS. A. HARVEY-QUINN: Well, I really
appreciate your work and I appreciate this
conversation overall. I've got a bunch of questions
and I'm hoping to load my gun, so to speak, so that
I can go back and have more forceful conversations
about this topic with my folks. So this is a
really, really complex issue because there's like a
legitimate history of trying to produce docile black
men. That's something that modern activists really
gloss over that has been legitimized in our history,
right, that's actual fact. But not addressing this
issue is actually self-serving for our brothers.
Right? It's like that easy space, right? Another
dynamic to it is like there is an argument that
these conversations need to happen in such a way
where they're interracial but there's no real forum
or mechanism for that outside of like street
justice, right? Which is like I'm going to call my
homie and more direct to violence, right, that's the
exact violence that you were talking about, right?
It is often over a woman, right, so that's just like
a cycle. And then the fourth piece is that there is
a strain of thought that people who would seek to
take down, you know, like all of our brothers are
using Bill Cosby as an example and how other folks
who committed similar acts were not prosecuted as
vigorously as Bill Cosby was. And, you know, my
argument, so this has been like my fight in my
communities for a long time. And so I actually
stopped fighting them when they went down to Pride
Prayed. I was like good, I'm going to make y'all
dinner. But I really would like to know how you
would like -- within the framework that you
presented, how you would address some of these, you
know, nuances, right, and does it just lead to more
people disappearing when you actually call the
police for these types of offenses.
MR. J. TRAVIS: So the cue and I'm
going to cut the cue with the last name that I'm
about to read in the interest of time and ask all of
you to be as brief as possible because we do want to
hear Beth's reflections. Barb, Beverly, Bruce and
then Eric and then Amanda and we're going to cut it
there and continue over lunch. If you want to find
each other for a discussion over lunch, I encourage
you to do that. So Barbara, you're up next.

MS. B. JONES: Thank you Beth, for your
paper. I wanted to go more in-depth and ask you
what about black women murdered by the police as it
relates to the focus on invisible. Human
trafficking as it relates to black women and black
girls and women missing, disappearing just from
their communities and their neighborhoods and the
nonmedia attention or amber alerts or, you know,
however the community should be notified or the very
small piece of 30 second sound bite in media that
continuously makes us invisible.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you. Beverly.

MS. B. TILLERY: Thank you so much for
this. I was thinking only yesterday that the same
thing that you were thinking about her community and
I'm often in these spaces to queer them up which I'm
happy to do. But it's nice not to be the first one
to queer up the space today. And, you know, so I
think I will start by saying that I say to people
all the time that 90 percent of my work, working in
the anti-violence space in and out of the Q
community is about gender race violence. So when
I'm working with gay men who are attacked because of
who they are, it's because of how they present that
is not conforming to our societal expectations about
gender. When transwomen are attacked, it's about
gender. And so there's so many people that have
disappeared I could put on the list, black and men
and definitely transmen we don't hear about who are
experiencing violence but might not be murdered at
the same rate as black and brown transwomen. So
many things that I could say but the one thing that
I wanted to put out is I think in your interrogation
of this issue around gender violence is part of the
solution because I think that -- we can give so many
examples around the table of the power of the voices
and actions of black women to address ending
violence in this country. And it is discounted over
and over again, but we are reminded over and over
again how strong the voices of black men, women are
and the actions of black women are. And so I just
went through a process of honoring two family
members of black and brown transwomen who were lost
to homicide, black and brown women, mother and a
sister who have come forward as really amazing
strong vocal advocates against violence against
transwomen. People who before their sibling and
daughter were killed were silent on the issue in the
community, but felt like they needed to say
something after the deaths and their voices are
strongest advocates that I've ever seen. And we
need to figure out how to harness those voices, how
to have those conversations. Some of those hard
conversations that we're afraid to have in community
to get to those voices that can really be about
creating something strange.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you. Bruce,
discussion as the synthesizer.

MR. B. WESTERN: Yeah, I want to kind of
seed my discussion time too effectually as we sort
of reorganize the schedule. I think it's such an
important discussion we want to give as much space
for it as we can. So this is my question: I've
learned so much from your work over the years, Beth,
and I was just so pleased that you were able to
participate in this meeting. And I think a really
serious foundational gender analysis of the kind
that you're providing, it issues such a profound
challenge to how we conventionally understand mass
incarceration, how we conventionally understand
community violence. And built on our conventional
understanding, we have sort of a whole political
program just from that conventional understanding
around mass incarceration. Everyone around this room knows the implications for sentencing reform, the re-entry, in addition to violence and so on. If we were to really take on this foundational gender analysis, how does this political program change, how does the people in the program change? And I have specific ideas about that but I'd like to hear you on that.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Small question. Eric and then Amanda and then we will ask Beth to round it out. Eric.

MR. E. CUMBERBACH: Sure. So my question -- well, it's not a question, more so just in a frame and I think it's more of a Beth-David mash up around best responses and key strategies. As we sit around this table I really want us to understand that for years communities have been re-imagining how to stop violence and bring people to healing services and resources and their actions doing that. And what we know around how to do that is to really be hyper-localized and really have deep and personal outreach work and that's what we heard from the young brothers that were here earlier and I definitely want to recognize and value them. Whether that's what's happening in New York City
with Crisis Management System and Chicago Global
with Cure Violence, Cease Fire out of David
Kennedy's shop or Chicago Ready, we know that that
intensive engagement from community members
themselves is the key to bringing down violence and
delivering quality resources and services to young
people. In terms of bridging this gap where we
spoke about academics and researchers and
practitioners and people with life experience around
the table, I don't necessarily think that that work
is valued in this space and recognized as this is
a way that human nature has always operated. Us as
people allowing each other to fail, allowing each
other to make mistakes and then lifting each other
up, being a supportive network for each other. I
believe in our positions here it is our job to
recognize that, to empower community, to resource
community and allow community to actually create the
change that they want to see through their lens and
for us to take a step back and sustain what that
change is for communities. And that's when we'll
actually see violence diminish and people linked to
culturally competent care. And the areas where
we're doing that or just areas that are doing that
currently across the country have seen significant
decreases in violent crime and people are linked to appropriate trauma resources.

MR. J. TRAVIS: You wanted to get it, so we're going to ask Amanda if she'll allow our colleague, Antoine, to make whatever caused you to wave at me.

MR. LUCKY: Quick. First of all, I want to say thank you for this work and I know that the stats are way higher because we know that women don't report much, so I know it's much higher. But I just want to offer this: I think the key to addressing gender violence specifically to women is I'm going to jump out here with this, is black men becoming more vocal against violence against women. When black men are silent, especially particular African-American women, silent on this issue, it sustains that institution of violence against women. In Dallas, and I'll be quiet, we started a movement where we had men addressing domestic violence and I lost a lot of friends leading the effort to talk about domestic violence against women, but I do believe that black men have to be at the forefront of this issue of violence against women, specifically black men. Told you I'd be quick.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Quick, but powerful.
MS. A. ALEXANDER: Thank you. I heard the paper and (inaudible). My question is very specific. I'm wondering what do you see as some of the most promising ways that folks are addressing gender violence specifically without relying on police or incarceration? I think different strategies, (inaudible) but I'd love to hear what you see as the most promising work?

MS. B. RICHIE: Yes, thank you for that question. Shall I just go?

MR. J. TRAVIS: Just go.

MS. B. RICHIE: So check out a Call to Men. Check out GEMA. These are like, you know, you go find them on the internet. Look at the Critical Resistance Insight Statement which is two activist groups, one looking at mass incarceration, one looking at ending violence against women of color, came together to write a joint statement saying we commit to the work to end mass incarceration as gender violence, anti-gender violence activists and you were working against mass incarceration, have to take gender violence into account as part of that work. Project Nia, Creative Interventions, all of these are localized, under funded, and maybe that's a good thing -- programs that are really figuring
out on the ground, led by people who are most affected, how to respond to the problem of gender violence without feeding the prison nation. They are imperfect, they're not -- what do they call them, empirically tested, no. They're just working and people are testing them, they're stepping out trying again when they fail. And I think the best examples of what's happening on the ground in little tiny community bases where people are stepping out and saying we're going to take responsibility for this. And I think a Call to Men is a national organization that is doing that brilliantly, not only talking about gender-based violence in the kind of traditional, if you will, heterosexual context but also really speaking out around queer and transviolence too. Very important. That's the first thing.

The second is that I think this is sort of to your question, Bruce, it's a small take on it, I think the ways that people who were working against gender violence in communities of color, especially black women, working against gender violence in all its forms as described on the violence matrix are really I think creatively challenging the kind of reformist reform dimensions
of the criminal legal system. So for example,
Jeremy, when you were talking about the bathroom,
these are groups that are saying it is not enough to
put your -- take the urinals out of women's prisons
in the spirit of some gender responsive treatment so
that women when they get to prison are treated
better. It's looking at the fundamental ways that
prisons are violent, they in many ways mimic abusive
relationships, arbitrary controls, someone else
making all the decisions, fear driving people and,
and the resistance that happens inside of prisons.
So I know when I go in and, you know, my -- the
little hair I have, stands up and I say, how can you
survive this. Girl, I'll tell you how you survive
it. The following ways, and people are surviving.
I'm not going to say driving, but surviving both in
abusive relationships and prisons. So I'm making
that analogy to say that I think there are some
exciting leadership of people who have been inside
and advocates for people inside, particularly women
inside about not participating and building up the
prison in the name of reform.

The third thing is that I'm very clear
that my visibility in leadership does not need to
predicate steps of men's visibility in leadership.
There is enough work to do that we can all do it. And so be -- again that sort of what someone said yesterday, that so invoking, and I don't think to most of us there's scarcity of opportunities or leadership in our community is -- I'm not going to buy it and I don't think that people have to be diminished in order for other people to lead. That's a model that we don't have to take on.

Lastly there's R. Kelly and Bill Cosby and all kinds of other names that we could name. So this is the short answer to that very long question. And I'm glad that we'll end after this. I'll take it right to 1 o'clock so there will be no more -- so I do not think that women are safer because Bill Cosby is in prison. I don't think that gender violence goes down when a black man goes down. And part of why I don't think that is because most women that I know who have experienced gender based violence in any form, harassment or trafficking, they want the violence to stop. They don't necessarily, because I think the experience of trauma teaches you someone else in a cage that you felt like you're in a metaphorical cage doesn't set you free. You might get a temporary relief. I certainly know in the experiences of people close to
me who are hurt, I want the violence to stop and I
want it to stop right away and whoever can best do
that needs to get there quickly. Don't run over her
again in your car, get there quickly and make that
stop. But whether as a long-term strategy that
relies on incarceration, I'm not convinced. And I
say that after almost 40 years of trying to figure
out good solutions. I think the solution of
incarceration doesn't work and the problem is that
we have relied so much on that as the only thing.
If we were all to use our phones now and call a
hotline, the first thing they would say is call the
police if you're in danger. And in a space like
this, we know that what people do -- some people
say, okay, let me call them and if they're white and
middle class and heterosexual and perform the good
victim thing, that the police might come and help
them temporarily. But anybody else is going to say
oh, you know, that's not going to help me at all so
where am I going to go for help. We have to fill in
that gap and provide some kind of help. I'll end
with that by saying that the term I want to throw
out here and that I use a lot now in my work is
carsofeminism and I use that to mark the ways that I
think mainstream white liberal feminism has become
part of a project of anti-black racism and not one
that's about necessarily or even really at all the
liberation of our people and the bringing of our
people home. And that's what I care about and so
the carsofeminism and the summary of cautionary tale
is what happens when you rely on the state to do
work that's about liberation and, Audrey Lord,
remember she told us the masters' tools will not
dismantle, right, the master's house. We have to
come up with something else. So I'm tempted to keep
talking to 1 o'clock, but it's only a few more
seconds left, so I'll end there.

(APPLAUSE.)

MR. J. TRAVIS: So, Beth, we needed you
for this discussion, and you, as you always do,
provided that. It's almost 1 o'clock. So in the
remaining ten seconds we're going to take a break
now. Lunch will be served. We'll be back at two to
start a discussion with Paul Butler. Another great
discussion, great morning to be continued. We'll
then break for the Detroit discussion, in Detroit.
But thank you so much, all of you for just a rich,
thought provoking and -- yes, Katharine.

MS. K. HUFFMAN: Echoing thanks, yes.
Just to -- because we do have a lot of additional
guests coming at 3:30 for our Detroit discussion, I'm going to ask people please shoot for ten to two to be back over here and starting to get into your seats because we want to make sure that we do have time to have our conversation with Paul and then have enough time in the break to be able to add more chairs around this table. So 10 to two. Shoot for that in your heads.

(A lunch recess was taken.)

MR. J. TRAVIS: As we're finding our seats, I want to extend an invitation or more accurately as Katherine has extended an invitation, I was struck by the number of people who in the last session were making specific references to work they were doing, programs they were running, initiatives they're aware of. Amanda's question, listing off and maybe people were taking notes fast enough, maybe not. But it just struck me that there's a lot of knowledge around the table. And in some ways more than other Square One roundtables, it's been a discussion that has brought specific expertise and experience from different cities into the room. You talk about guns projects and Eric as well, Cumberbatch, back. So what we did over lunch was to think about a way to allow this group and observers,
anybody here, to share that knowledge with others
just to make this a learning opportunity, network
building opportunity. So Katharine, what are we
going to do?

MS. K. HUFFMAN: So as you all know
anything that's mentioned here is captured, but we
wanted to invite everyone to please send an e-mail
to Sukyi. Many people in this room have Sukyi's
e-mail address or just the info and on the website
sharing the particular names and if you have a link
to information or if it's not something that's
online, just programs that you're mentioning, the
word hyperlocal Eric that you said is really
resonant. So we want to try to be, want Square One
to be just one of the vehicles for sharing that
information. We'll actively send out -- a
compilation back out to this group. But we're in
the process of putting together a new website as it
feels like we always are, and that new website will
actually have a part that will be intentionally and
only for featuring the work that's happening all
around the country already. So inviting you to
please do this now, things you've mentioned today
are things that you've thought of, but then also to
know that they'll be sort of an ongoing portal for
nominating things in and then also for being able to access them on the Square One website very soon. That will be very helpful. Thank you.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Any questions about -- this is self-explanatory, to message Sukyi or directly to the website.

MS. K. HUFFMAN: Either way it will get to us.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Okay. So we are reconvened and our next topic is Violence in the State and Paul Butler is with a paper to help frame that. Paul will take ten minutes or so to get us started. We will give people the usual opportunity for clarifying questions and then we'll open up a discussion about the paper, but this is the invitation to think about the aspect of violence.

Paul.

MR. P. BUTLER: So Victor Harris is a 19-year-old kid in Atlanta. He's speeding in his car and the cops try to pull him over. He should have stopped, but the knucklehead kid kept going, leads the cops on a high-speed chase through all these different neighborhoods in Atlanta. The cops can't stop him. They think he's posing a danger to other folks, so they decide to kill him. Atlanta's
professional Police Department, they have protocols about not shooting at cars and so they see him coming to this area in Atlanta called the Bluffs, just like it sounds, a bunch of cliffs and so they decide the way to kill him is to ram his car over the cliff. They do that, the car bursts into flames, Mr. Harris survives, but he can't use his arms or legs anymore. The question before the Supreme Court was can the police do that? They were just trying to stop him for speeding and they actually had his ID because they could see it from his license plate. The court said that the police had acted perfectly constitutional because Harris was posing a risk to others. What happened to Ms. Atwater wasn't as bad. She got stopped by the cops in Texas for driving without a seat belt and she got locked up and taken to the police station, booked, mug shot, fingerprint and all of that. What she tells the Supreme Court is it's crazy because even if I'm guilty for driving without a seat belt in Texas, I can't get locked up. The maximum punishment is a $50 fine. So how in the world can you get arrested and taken to jail for a crime that even if you're guilty of, you can't get locked up. Supreme Court said no problem, what happened to
Ms. Atwater was perfectly constitutional. You can get locked up for anything. So if you remember that horrifying image of Eric Gardener in the choke hold in Staten Island, you can connect the Harris case, which certainly allowed the police are allowed to use deadly force anytime someone is posing a deadly risk. And you can also think of the Atwater case like how are the police allowed to arrest somebody for a minor offense like selling (inaudible)? Atwater said the police can arrest for anything. And I think it's also possible for us to understand those as acts of violence, certainly the Scott versus Harris case, where the cops again deliberately tried to kill him by making his car crash, that's violent, right? And I think most of the folks in this room can also understand the arrest is a violent act by the state. But let's expand the lens and ask, well, what is it that the cops were doing where Eric Gardener was and where he was in Staten Island was in this little park right when you get off the Ferry. Staten Island is actually an island. A lot of people take the ferry to Manhattan, and he was in this park. It was kind like a hang-out spot, and some people sold loosie cigarettes, some people may have sold weed. It was
kind of a no-man's land people, people just
basically walk through when they were getting off
the ferry. But it has the amazing view of the
Manhattan skyline. So some developer got an idea,
we need to develop this, we need to put up some
property here, that's going to make some people some
money. So what do the cops do? The cops started
the zero tolerance in that little patch of land and
they were taking back that land. It wasn't as
violent as what the Europeans did to the native
folks did to get this land, but it had the same
effect. We could also ask, well, why was it that
Mr. Gardener was allegedly selling Halseys? He said
he wasn't that day. He might have some other days.
It has to do with the mortgage banking crisis.
Federal government spent all this money bailing out
all these banks. Not one of these guys that stole
all of these homes, none of these guys went to
prison, but it cost a lot of money, a lot of
government money. The mayor of New York said he's
not raising taxes and that's his campaign pledge.
What does he do? He puts a tax on cigarettes. The
cost of cigarettes expands exponentially. If you're
a poor person who wants to smoke, you can't afford
to buy cigarettes. So there's this market that
develops that people sell individual cigarettes for a dollar, cigarettes were a dollar and that's what some people were doing in this park. So if we can also think of that kind of genderfication and that kind of economic coercion as a form of violence as well, as a form of state violence and we can imagine as a form of state violence the fact that for every one dollar a white man earns, an African-American woman earns 61 cents and a Latino woman earns 54 cents. So let's think about another kind of violence, private violence isn't the best way of thinking about it, but I mean violence by nonstate actors, and you can think about black on black violence and as soon as I say that you get how it's raced because we don't have a concept called white n white violence even though white and white crime is as interracial as black on black crime is. And people earlier today thought about there's something about anxiety about black men that's embedded into our criminal legal process, I think that's right. So David mentioned this fantasy academic term called racial invariance, that's the idea that a factor might impact one race different from another. So being raised by a single mom or not graduating from high school might have a different impact than let's
say on a black man than it does on a Latino man or a white man. The news area is actually encouraging. It turns out that a lot of times African-American men have better outcomes than similarly situated white men do. It's sometimes a version that people of color talk about among ourselves. We say what would white people be like if they had to go through what we went through? If they had to go through what we go through every day. Man, they would be buck wild, right? It turns out that some of these racial invariance studies, has some evidence that that's right. There's actually something that's redemptive about black masculinity. Sometimes I think the question should be why are black men likely to commit more crimes? There's something that redemptive about blackness. Why are black women able to support the community in the ways that they have? There's something I think that Ray used the term resilient, our communities are resilient. We need to keep that in mind. And one other thing in mind equally as important and that's in terms of private violence, African-American people are at way disproportionate risk. Men are, as harm doers, men as victim. African-American women, including transgender women are at way disproportionate risk
as victims and survivors. By disproportionate risk, I mean that black men are about 6.5 percent of the population, but we're responsible for about half of murders. So we commit more murders than white men who greatly outnumber us. We commit more murders than Latino men who slightly outnumber us. And so one question is, well, how should we respond to this? What should the response of the state be? And that's where I'll end by thinking about different forms of response. So if we think about the response of the state to state violence, so we can think about the overt violence like what the police do to us or we can think about the structural violence. So one question is can the state reform itself? It's the state that's promoting this violence, right? Can it really cure its ownself? I think to think about that we have to also understand the state's a bunch of different actors. So, yes, and Donald Trump is the state, Bill Bar is the state, but Kim Foxx is also the state. Ronald Davis is also the state. So what should be our realistic expectations of the state? I think the structural violence especially I think what you think the function of the state is, why you think the state exists. So people like Tarnhartsi Pultz (phonitic)
say there's something about anti-blackness that's embedded in the state that if we could truly transform ourselves and not be anti-black, that we would not be the United States of America. We would be unrecognizable. So we're never going to get rid of that kind of violence because that would be getting rid of the United States of America. That's a theory. Maybe that's what we think. Maybe we can talk about that. Specifically what the state has done with regard to state violence. So with regard to police violence, I think about that in my paper. One response is the Justice Department coming in and, quote/unquote, taking over a local police department and when you look at what actually happens, what you see is about half of the time police violence goes down in the short-term and what that means is that the police stop killing and beating up as many people as they would if the department hadn't intervened, so that's good, that's good news. The way the state responds to private violence is, you already know, it's more violence. The state responds to private violence is to put people in cages to punish them. So we could think and have here people who work with the state to reduce violence. And we've got some of the most
effective folks doing that work here so I'm looking forward to hearing about their programs. So, David is the implementer, the creator of the National Network for Safe Communities. Danielle, Common Justice, I lift up both of those programs in my papers because what they're doing is making a difference here. They're reducing human suffering, they're preserving human lives. So when I say in the paper that that's triage, that it's harm reduction, I'm not trying to be shady. I think that's true, but it's incredibly important because it's saving lives, but it's not working on the structural violence that's killing way more people than black men do, right? So when I think about what we could do there, some things we could do in the margin that actually might make a huge difference is gun violence. So even if you think that a big part of the problem is anti-blackness, let's look at Western Europe. So I spent some time in western Europe, my sister lives there. I don't think Western Europeans love black people living more than Americas do. But their police don't kill nearly as many people. So one astounding statistic is that there were 55 people killed in the United Kingdom, in England, 55 people killed in 24 years.
U.S. cops killed 59 people in 24 days. So what's the difference? The difference is guns. So it's not that folks in Western Europe are less violent than Americans, it turns out that they're not. So when we get conditions of violence, like arrests for assault, same thing, which is that with guns which we have and they don't, violence is a lot more lethal. And so again, I'll end just by remembering that story that Jahmal told this morning, remember he was talking about walking down the street and being shot at seven times. And what he connected that to was the fact that there's a Church's Chicken in his community and that's like, well, what does that have to do with it. I get why you didn't call the police. But Church's Chicken. So what Jahmal was understanding is that the kind of environment that we see in these high poverty segregated neighborhoods, it promotes violence. So you don't have a Farmer's Market or a low-cost Whole Food, but you do have a Church's Chicken and McDonald's. And Church's Chicken and McDonald's are also killing a whole lot more people in African-American communities. And so the question is what's the resistance, what's the transformation that's not going to do the vital triage work of making the
police stop beating up so many of us and killing us
and helping African-American men and others stop
killing us and beating us up and sexually assaulting
us? What's the transformation that's going to
impact the most harmful form of violence, the
structural violence.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank, Paul. Welcome
back from lunch. So open for clarifying questions.

MR. H. FLOWERS: The question is why is
our black men so violent compared to other men, I
say is the clarifying question. Most violent
offenders are beforehand victims of violence.
Historically the state has been a primary source of
inflicting violence upon black men and women. This
is the clarifying question. Does the historical
reality of state and white vigilante violence
against black women and men has struck black people
to act to violence first to resolve their conflicts?

MR. P. BUTLER: So here's what we know,
we know that black men don't disproportionately
commit crimes because we're black. We know that
there's something else that's going on and by
disproportionately make black men commit crimes, I
mean certain kinds of crime. Some types of violent
crimes, homicide, armed robbery, not sexual assault.
Hard to get data on that at least on the amount reported, but no evidence that black men disproportionately commit that crime. For other crimes again we know for example with homicide, high poverty segregated neighborhood plus easy access to guns, that's a recipe for homicide. Seven out of eight people who will live in high poverty segregated neighborhoods are black or Latinos. The government created and sustains high poverty segregated neighborhoods.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Are there clarifying questions? Okay. We're ready to use his paper and his introduction to this topic as a platform for discussion about the state's response to violence.

Mr. J. CARTAGENA: Paul, you mentioned that your view of the instances in which the Department of Justice went in and (inaudible) as a result had half good, half bad, half effective in the police use of force and half -- was it because police use of force is the same or worse or after the Department of Justice Intervention? So I wonder if you know which department (inaudible.) I know for a fact that the issues regarding police use of force was super important kind of work that I did in Puerto Rico, kind of what I did in Long Island and...
we also had a mixed bag of results, especially in Puerto Rico who consistently uses police use of force to clamp down on non-violent approaches. So I just want to know if you know which of the larger district has the side effects.

MR. P. BUTLER: Los Angeles is often held up as a success story. What happens in places like Los Angeles is the Department of Justice comes in, they require certain kinds of reforms from the police department and again when we look at what happens, looking at the data, in about half of those jurisdictions police violence goes down, which means that the police kill fewer people, they beat up fewer people. The other thing that we know is that that's a short-term effect. There hasn't been a whole lot of empirical analysis, so it may be just that there's not enough data to measure what happens over the long-term. The data that exists is just that it's probably a short-term impact. We know that it's contingent on whether there's a Democrat or Republican in the White House because these are federally sponsored investigations. President Trump says that he's not going to do it. His first Attorney General sessions says that he doesn't think that the federal government should be involved in
local police departments. There are some brave judges who stood up when the Trump Administration tried to get those investigations dismissed after the Obama Administration had started them. Some judges wouldn't allow that. But again the best evidence is that they work about half the time in the short-term.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Other comments to get us started here with this topic?

MS. CARTER-JACKSON: So I, and I don't know how much you'll be able to answer this, but I was thinking about how you were talking about how in Western Europe, the number of police killings are not as high as they are in the United States and you attributed that to guns. But I'm wondering if guns are the only reason that those numbers are lower or is it also -- you know, when I think of the United States I think of our proximity to slavery, not that France or England doesn't have slavery because they do. But there's a removal in the Caribbean from slavery, that they are opposed to slavery and that's intrinsic throughout all of the United States and then also the fact that United States has Jim Crow segregation and all of these, you know, cultural racial codes that, you know, in place that are
different that Europe has. To me I'm wondering is it just about guns that these numbers are lower or are there other historical factors that come into play that keep these numbers lower and is it also just about murder rates being lower or is physical assaults and police brutality just as high but because the number of guns are lower, we don't see registering of murders as we do as police assaults.

MR. P. BUTLER: Yes. So it's a specific data point about gun violence by police and also by private actors because it's much more difficult to get a gun in most countries in Western Europe fewer people are killed by gun violence. In the United Kingdom there's been a spike over the summer in knife violence, so people die that way, but it's a lot harder to kill somebody with a knife. There are a lot fewer homicides overall by private citizens and the result is that the police aren't as afraid as they are in the United States of losing their own lives, of needing to use deadly force. Right? So the police in some places in the United Kingdom don't carry guns and places where they do carry guns, they don't use them as often. So again part of this is daunting and scary, but part of it is just if we want to save lives, then doing
something about the availability of guns in the United States, first starting with private actors and then taking them away from the police or allowing police to use them a lot less would make a huge difference.

You know, with regard to the other factors, you know, sometimes it's harder to know. France, for example, doesn't keep data by race. Again, I spent time there, I have the sense that, you know, for things like stopping the press, black and brown people are way disproportionately at risk for that kind of police violence, but there's no data. France intentionally doesn't collect information like that, so it's hard to know.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Ray, I'm going to ask you to hold for a second. This has to be under a cue and then we'll get to (inaudible.)

MR. DAVIS: Thank you. This is just a response to your question about the guns. I think we may be a little bit too generous about the guns. I think you may be right about a historical context. One of things we work on in (inaudible), but like Scotland where they have a lot of stabbings, a lot of knives and they're still assaulting the officers, but they don't have anywhere close to the amount of
people getting shot by armed officers with knives, right? So we still have this kind of context in the United States that out of those thousands of shootings a year that occur, a lot of them are unarmed or they're armed with things other than firearms. So the firearm concept may explain some of it, but some of it is just plain fear and the idea that are you fearful of the person before you even engage them and now the person has a knife. So we've been trying to work on issues of copying what they're doing in scouting others where you create time, distance, coverage, de-escalate. Some of this, I think Paul's right about the gun culture contributes, but I think there is a historical context even when you take away the gun factor, there's still a disproportionate amount of shootings that have nothing to do with firearms.

MR. R. WINANS: Appreciate you dropping the bars in the paper, man, right? When you think about these questions, I want to (inaudible) from the questions in the room. Traditionally, and I can only speak for the community in which we serve in Detroit, when it comes to the issue of violence and communities try to take the lead on it without law enforcement, what we find is it becomes a
retaliation thing with law enforcement. Right? So, again, one of the things that Pierre didn't mention is when they went and did the polls, right, man, I didn't know he was coming in. But when he did the polls, now, mind you these were the candlelight vigils where they lost friends, right, and they had alcohol bottles and teddy bears and things like that, and red rags around the poles. So they got in a fight. They never had a problem with the police. The moment that they painted it red, black green and yellow and put flowers on it, the police came up and started running up on guys in the neighborhood, came over, asked them if they were selling drugs. And more importantly, guess what they said about the poles? They were destructing state property, city property, right? So that was the intimidating factor, right? Police running up and they giving out tickets saying now y'all loitering. And so when we talk about that issue because we made a conscious and intentional decision and effort, right, to say the police can't intimidate us to stop the violence but we're going to take it upon ourselves to sit down and realize that our lives are worth living. And we brought the police into the conversation just to let them know that here's what we did and that
poses a bigger problem and I think sometimes we need
to be able to really have this conversation on how,
right, do the community get the opportunity to
actually lead the work and allow the state to
support it without necessarily getting the credit
outside of saying, thank y'all, right? Because that
happened and that ain't even been two months ago.
And so that's still fresh in a lot of the young
people and then what they do two weeks ago, hey,
come on, you want to go to Capers and get a steak.
Man, you want us to go out and eat with you, but you
didn't have any intention of anything else. And so
let's take a deep dive into that, but the state law
is to support the community not to lead the work
because the state ain't in our community gang
banging and shooting us. And so we take care of the
instigator, we need support, but I mean, I'm saying
you as in y'all, but the state don't need to come in
and say, well, this is our effort. Community led
city and government support and giving the community
the resources to lead the work without having fear
of retaliation for them not getting the credit.

MR. J. Travis: Community led government
supported, I'll accept it. Okay, Daniel next and
then Halim and Beverly.
MR. D. WEBSTER: I just want to make a very quick point to underscore the point that Paul is making about the role of firearms in this. The comparison said U.S. versus Western Europe, we know that those are stark comparisons, but even within our own country, there's a body of research showing that the relatively small number of states with the strongest gun laws not co-incidentally, had far fewer murders generally, but less police violence going in each direction. So fewer law enforcement officers are shot and killed and vice-versa. They are shooting fewer civilians as well. So the context of firearms in the environment matters tremendously. I'm not saying it's the only thing but the main thing I wanted to underscore is not to just think that, well, maybe we're not going to get to Western Europe, right, but even within the United States there's really gross, gross differences, three and a half times difference between the states with the highest levels of gun ownership versus the lowest gun ownership in terms the rate at which police kill civilians.

MR. J. TRAVIS: And I'm sorry, I missed what was different between the states that had a higher and had a lower gun laws?
MR. D. WEBSTER: Well, both with respect to the rate of gun ownership in the home as well as the strictness of gun laws. Gross differences across our states that also connect to all forms of violence, including directed by and against law enforcement. So parsing back to David's important comments and work about, you know, guns are just one of many forms of racialized policies that have created environments or lethal violence is far more common in (inaudible.)


MR. H. FLOWERS: The first comment you stated that segregated and high-poverty concentrated neighborhoods are created and sustained by the government. If this is a fact, this goes to a conversation you and I had earlier, Ron, and I persisting from the government being more private led, is it realistic for us to even seek relief from the state? That's the first thing. And the second thing is the comparative analysis that you give the Western European states, they have a very homogeneous population. And they do not have a population for forty million African descent people in individual countries nor do they have a violent history of Africans on their homeland of those countries as
whites do in the mainland of the United States. So, I think a lot of times we look at those statistics about state violence in respect of African people in western developed nations, we fail to take into account that the reason why a lot of these could be -- a lot of these laws dealing with penalties for crime and violence in the state, the statistics are so low is they have a very homogeneus or predominantly white population. But I guarantee if you probably look at the statistics of how they treat the Arabs or people of color in those nations that don't look like them, that's what I want to see those numbers right there. And just historically they don't have the violent relationship in England, in France, in Germany, Norway and Sweden with institutions like (inaudible) institutions go to study criminal justice in prison culture in these nations, but they don't have high populations of African-Americans like we do. We have an African descent population in America of over 40 million people. So I think sometimes just -- I don't think that it does justice to use those western developed nations unless you really look at how they treat the minorities. And one thing my favorite author, James Baldwin, said that in Paris, what we call the nigger
in America, is the Arabs. So we have to look at how
the Arabs are treated, but these are the people who
get the brunt of the force of the state in those
western developed nations.

MR. J. TRAVIS: So let's get this
discussion going and Beverly will be next, then
Alia, then Juan, then Joe and then Beth and we'll
cut it there just to see where we are.

MS. B. TILLERY: So I appreciate you
bringing the capitalism economics into it again and
that really resonates with me because my
understanding of, you know, and thinking about your
question could state reform itself. My
understanding of policing is that police systems in
this country were built not only from a very strong
anti-blackness sentiment, but they were also built
about protecting money and resources and assets of
merchants, right? So that was really what it was
all about and I think we still see that playing out
over and over again. First thing, I don't believe
that you can reform that. I do think something else
has to be built alongside it. And so I'm kind of
thinking about this as I, what can we build on the
side that our dependence on the state system is
lessened over time? And I think as people have
said, we have some of the tools, right, we know how
to interrupt violence in different instances. One
example that I would give, you know, just sort of a
local example. We recently had the first homicide
in the school system in New York City in 30 years, I
believe, was committed by a young bisexual Latino
men who had been bullied for years in the school
system and brought a knife to school to protect
himself. And he was bullied by two young, black
men. This was (inaudible) situation for anybody.
So, you know, the incident happened, the homicide
happened and, of course, the response was to put
this young man away because of the violence, but,
you know, not that many, but some people in the
community were saying state violence, state
violence, right? The state failed all of these
young men that were in this system and actually
didn't care. There was no response to the bullying
because nobody cared about what was going to happen
to any of them. And so left them to their own
devices to take care of it themselves and that's
what happened. And so we knew lots of ways that we
could have intervened in that situation without the
state, but there wasn't the pressure of anybody
having to, in the school system, having to actually
recognize the interveners from the community as
valid or needing to be paid attention to. So how do
you change that dynamic when you know that there are
people who live in this community that can provide a
resource to intervene but there's no acknowledgment
that anybody has to pay attention to that. So that
makes me think about the economics again, and so how
do we create a dynamic in which it is too -- it is
economically important and viable for these
institutions to get these resources for the
community. So what if there was some philanthropic
support for, you know, investing in these schools
that are going to have, for instance, have to
interact with community members to intervene in
these situations? How do we put money behind
alternatives structures so that people are not
having to rely on the state for the interventions
that are not working because they're really
ultimately based in the system and doesn't care
about them in the first place? So that's some of
the things that I'm thinking about, how do we bring
the community control back in and I think we need
more money and investment to really give community
members the power to do that.

MR. J. TRAVIS: I'm just going to play
back something that I heard which I thought was very important in framing of the issues that we're facing here, which is first and foremost (inaudible). So that's a question that started with our discussion yesterday morning. And if it can't, are we giving up on the idea of pushing the state to do more, or is it just like it's never going to happen. (Inaudible).

The second frame that you have given us was what is community-led state support look like, and one of the resources as we discussed over the past two days that are (inaudible). Keeps reminding us is that we need to think about is being the value, the valuable and it should be supported and made a part of the equation, which is one and the same issue. To me that's almost patronizing. So a central part of response, while we're -- as we said yesterday, Fatimah, in the meantime, doing something else. I said so you would just help me, and I just want to play it back because this is a framing of these abstract questions we're faced with here about violence, but it's really about the community and community involved and community life and the role of state in life. So Beth really waved at me in a way.
MS. B. RITCHIE: Very quickly, master topic and foundations in the mix who in some instances become quasi-state actors and influence the policies. Of course, none of the foundations are around the table, but there are some -- those of you from New York can understand this, right? Who create policy by untrue, not the proper funding. So I think the not-for-profit question as an intermediary is important to me.

MR. J. TRAVIS: It's sort of interesting. It is a hybrid, but they are extensions of public policy are executed. A member of our executive session, Bruce, and I were talking about this over lunch (inaudible) who community wrote it as a thesis.

But the non-profit sector in New York is being this nonstate or outside the state or supported by the state, and he's done the interstate work, it's really important to the crime of violence in New York City. Now, that's a really interesting thesis, along the lines of what Beverly suggested, what is nonstate, but is state supported? It looked like it was community led. That's not quite community led, because they're really institutions of their own. Right? Did their own history and
those were public dependency, but it's not direct
government. So -- something just happened here.

Turn it over to you, Beverly. Let's
just listen carefully to what she's got. Okay. So
I'm going to tell you who's on the list, and name
card, whatever is up. Keep it up for a second. But
ahead of you are Alia, I haven't forgotten you,
Juan, I haven't forgotten you, and Joe. Beth, is
there something else you want to say? No? Okay.
And Eric, we have two Erics here so the Eric closer
to me. Is there anybody who feels like they don't
want to keep their place in the cue? Okay.
Everyone else keeps your name tags up and we'll come
to you if we can. Alia, you're up.

MS. A. HARVEY-QUINN: I just want to
underscore the impact of poverty in all of this work
again and say that like the most money in our
communities are concentrated within governments.
And so while I think it may be ideal to think about
like small efforts that impact a larger hole, I
think those small efforts will have to be trying to
fight for government to reform its methodology. I
also want to mention that in the instance and to
raise a point, in the instance of when the guys were
able to organize, develop foot squads and go out and
talk to the community to chase down a federal sexual predator, that was in Detroit, that never met the news. Right? So there is no narrative about how community can solve its own violence problem, and that's like an important narrative to shift. So I think it's really, really important that the message gets spread out broadly that community can impact as a leader this way.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Juan is next.

MR. J. Cartagena: So I appreciate the reference to how previous immigrant groups in the country had a source of criminal enterprise in order to survive. In fact this morning, that part about in terms of face of Chicago contaminants. But I just want to make sure you'll to understand it's quite different today to fast forward, you know, a hundred years later. Now, the face of immigrants is darker, browner, and as a result we live in shadows. In fact, most of the data demonstrated that immigrant populations have a lower (inaudible) towards criminal behavior and we market these so lower. About a year or two after Jeremy and Bruce worked on their amazing volume with the National Academy of Sciences, which I now understand (inaudible), another volume came out from the
It's an excellent source of material. There were three areas where both the research and the immigrant groups dominating within the field today in the United States talk about how being in the United States actually affected them negatively. Number one, diet, Number two, composition of family housing, Number 3, crime. So that's some of the research quality is simulation of paradox. Latino, especially those Latino immigrant groups that stay in the country longer, paradoxes, they started adopting behavior that they otherwise didn't adopt when they rejected it. So the question now that I raise is for me as you mentioned, Italians and --

MR. P. BUTLER: Jews and Irish people.

MR. J. CARTAGENA: And the Irish, and of course the federal loss of memory of those people, right, the historical of how they were treated when they first came to this country and how they were vilified and not allowed to participate or assimilate as quickly as they wanted to. But when (inaudible) holds back what's happening today, it's the presence of Latinos in this country that's criminalized. And that criminalization of presence results in not being able to do anything that you
expose in any way, shape or form what is happening
to make a living, bring back money home and send
money back to your own country. And I love your
suggestion before, Beth, make sure we talk about
women and girls. What's really also manifested is
causing the criminalization presence so rapidly,
especially in that Latino women do not take
advantage of whatever police opportunities there are
for their own safety and domestic violence
complaints have gone down dramatically in this
administration. People, women don't even go to
court because they're afraid of being picked up by
ISC court. So this entire level of being enforced
to hide in the shadows the lives will be safe for
the manifestation of criminal behavior.

MR. J. TRAVIS: So while we're giving out
reading assignments, our hope for the roundtable and
some of you were there, including a very exclusive
focus on immigration policy as an example of
criminalization just the way we spoke about it and
the paper commission there, which is on our website
(inaudible) was an absolute eye-opener for I would
say myself and I'd say most of the people in that
room and it was like a parallel history of our
import on mass incarceration, and the increase of
criminalization and immigration, immigrants,
immigration policy and the federalization of those
behaviors in terms of federal control. So I wouldencourage people that we have not talked about
immigration enough I think into this conversation.
Bruce and I were just talking about this over lunch.
We encourage you to take a look at that paper and as
you notice from our film that one of the members of
the executive session (inaudible) the leader
movement. So thank you for bringing that in and I
just encourage people to take a look at Jennifer's
paper and that part of our discussion. So here's
where we are. We're almost at 3 o'clock, we have
Joe, Beth, Eric. Keeps those tents up. I'm going
to ask each of you to really be brief. I'm going to
do some prioritization. Many people have spoken,
not everybody has. Those who haven't or as in
Beverly's case, ask to be recognized, I mean that's
a privilege because you want to speak for the last
time and I want to give them priority, if that's
okay with everybody. So in terms of those who
haven't spoken. You're first up. Danielle hasn't
spoken yet today, you're next up. Mr. Berry, you
haven't spoken yet today, you're next up. All
following --
MS. B. JONES: I'm Barbara.

MR. J. TRAVIS: All following Barbara.

Usually coffee helps. And Ray, you're last. We'll go around this way. If there's somebody else after -- it's called the cardinal sin of facilitation is to forget your cue. Joe, Beth, and then Eric.

Everybody here, correct me.

MR. LUPPINO-ESPOSITO: I'll be brief and sorry the lines are being a little disjointed. But, yes, I have a few things to say on Italian-Americans, so obviously being I might, that's my background and actually had I been here earlier, I'm glad you just mentioned it again, in a lot of ways what we saw from the Mafia was in some form self-policing of the community. Right? If you go back historically, go back to Sicily and Southern Italy where the governments were a complete disaster, the people didn't trust anybody there. They had to rely on somebody. This was essentially a private force that they could rely on. They brought it over here as well. The same thing, they did not want to be bothered by police in America. They didn't trust anybody. They had a disruptive government overseas. So in a lot of ways that's why a lot of people in the Italian American community
were okay with, essentially okay with as well.

They're going, they're keeping it away from me and I'm paying them to keep it away from me and I'm happy with that. So in a lot of ways, they were their own police force. But, of course, at some point everybody said, oh, now it's getting a little too much and it took awhile to eradicate that and, you know, it took Guiliani to say, right and as a prosecutor and as an Italian American to say let's eradicate this, right? So the Italian-Americans, and I think, you're right, a lot of people don't remember this and don't remember what that was like, but we try to remember that. But there are other forms and Beverly mentioned it earlier, the essential first formation of professional police was taking what was a private force again, which was simply just dollars and cents, I'm going to hire security to protect my business and then eventually that became a state sanctioned way. We want to protect the commerce and industry, let's find a way to do this and economic benefit across the board instead of having private people paying for it. And if you really go to sort of the extreme, libertarian sounding on this, there are some people who will turn around today and say, well, car insurance is
something that we can reinstitute at a national level. Right? We can say if somebody has a violent act against your vehicle, right, there's car insurance, and you have somebody dealing with it, okay, a smashed bumper equals this much and these companies deal with it. Obviously, that's an extreme version of how we would take this current version of policing and make it entirely private and put a premium price on things, putting a price on types of violence and putting a price on other wrongs under each other. And I don't think -- that's not assuming that's something I advocate for but something I want to put out there is sort of there's a national extension to where some of the things we're saying could go. But ultimately I think the problem with all of these other forms, including the current state system that we have now is it a lack of accountability? Who is accountable that these things get handled? So is it going to be the courts, is it going to be state, is it going to be the politicians? I think ultimately a lot of what Paul is saying and I think going back to what he was saying about the consent decrees or other things where the federal government is stepping in, they're trying to make the police force accountable
but at some point those end and we lose count. Right? So no matter what it is, I think the ultimate problem is accountability and who we trust to do that, whether it's a community group, whether it's some sort of like an insurance company, whatever it is, they need to be accountable and who they are accountable to is obviously the people in that community, but who's going to enforce that? Which I don't want to enforce that all the way around. I guess maybe the state's got to do something. Maybe they do. We need to look at how those are all being interacted to keep everyone accountable.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Eric.

MR. CUMBERBACH: Okay. So I want to circle back to the one portion we spoke about, all about the police departments have either a consent decree or a negotiated settlement agreement. I think it's was over half, short-term reductions in deadly shootings and the uses of force. I think it would be good to also look at, and I imagine this is much more difficult, but those police departments who have voluntarily undertaken a fair amount of reforms in a lot of the same ways. And I do think there's some emerging information out there to show
that police departments that are doing things like Ron talked about, the escalation training, looking at doing our force training a totally different way, looking at doing trust-building efforts, not really having a record taken before, looking at policy changes, have seen reductions. Right? We happen to be one of them. And you know, in looking at not just shootings, deadly shootings and use of force, but also citizens' complaints, officer wellness, worker comp reductions, just a lot of things to make a department healthier and safer for themselves and the department and the community. And I just want to give a shout out to the National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice, one of the six pilot sites, David led that work. The Urban Institute, my friends from Urban did a -- I think it was the largest undertaking in American history to look at why does mistrust, we all know here, but taking a deep dive, why does it exist in our communities of color and how can we actually measure trust and look at doing things differently and making improvements. So I think there is some new data out there that's sort of helpful for all of us as we move forward too.

MR. J. TRAVIS: I'm going to ask for
Barb, Danielle, and just to be a minute, maybe two.

We do have guests who are coming from the Justice in Detroit. The discussion we want to be punctual setting that up.

MS. B. JONES: Well, I would have to go after Eric, the last name Jones, sitting right across from each other. But when we talk about trust and thank you, Paul, for talking about the interracial aspects in your paper. But what has been a time where for pretty much slavery reconstruction, Jim Crow, lynchings, the Civil Rights movement, talk about Black Panthers, the War on Drugs, stop and Frisk, racial profiling, now technology, facial recognition, these are all just a few that I named and everybody has talked about there has never been a time where there has been positive relationships as it relates to trust with the community and the police. Period. And now technology has been introduced to where facial recognition is a big deal here in Detroit, I'm quite sure a lot of you all are following the issues and conflict where the community showed up, showed out and the community was not listened to. The community members, some of them are in this room sitting at this table. So that's another form of
issues where the relationships are just not there
because of the flawed technology that's behind how
they view black and brown people. Period. So
that's on top of it. This was -- this is what's
going on now, but at the same time we have community
members who are afraid because of the violence, the
violence in the community and they need the police.
They want their loved ones homicide solved as well.
So I'm sorry, that was more than two minutes.

  MR. J. Travis: Much appreciated.

Brent.

  MR. B. DECKER: Good afternoon, everyone.
Thank you for responding to that. I think there are
a lot of examples, not necessarily in this country
but in the Caribbean, Latin America, Brazil and
other places where communities have really taken
center stage in terms of violence and the way that
has almost side-stepped the statement. I think that
those are important examples in the history and
places like Brazil or Central America where you're
talking about at the break, are far, far more
violent in this country and contributed quite
substantially to that. So to the group, I think
there are a lot of examples and perhaps in terms of
just really thinking about Latin America and the
Caribbean as kind of models for us. When you think about Western Europe, there's a problem. Thinking about other countries that have had kind of colonial and slaveries histories and what communities have done in that situation I think is much more informative to us than thinking about Europe or other places that don't have similar histories and some have immigration struggles and the colonials and Euro-colonials. So I would just add that to the group. I think this is an important thing for us to be thinking about.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Danielle.

MS. D. SERED: Thank you. I feel like it's really (inaudible) questioning your paper and whether the state and white supremacy can ever be separated from each other. And to Beth's point, that male supremacy actually ever be separated from each other when we understand that the state was formed by a bunch of white men defining what their relationship to one another and their relationship to white women and their relationship to black men and their relationship to black women would be and building institutions to enforce those relationships in a way that would ultimately mean the interest of their power, economics local and otherwise. And I
think of the core modes of white supremacy as see it usually happening in escalated fashion as control, punishment and extermination. I had a conversation with Fatimah Muhammad about it because that's the first person I go to check if I'm incorrect. And I think of (inaudible) what we do to each other and I say that because I think those modes of operating are never and have never been about people of color. Right? They're about something endemic to whiteness in the way we do ourselves. And we do that to each other in ways that are really parallel to what we do with people of color, like those things as I always look at my family. He has to look at 500 years of history, and that was another example of white privilege. When I think about it, so part of me when I consider the degree to which those things -- these systems have been built to embody, and like we say the principle of (inaudible) termination may not pretty well, but if you think about control, criminal justice system, and part of me definitely is maybe we have to let it all burn. For the part of me that would like a pathway for any of us through this that doesn't require all of it burning, I don't believe if that reform absent accountability will do much of anything at all. That the only
force I know adequate to bring about transformation in any way equals the harm that's been caused is accountability. And it's a process of people owning the harm that has been done and engaging in repair of that harm, which is distinct from no longer doing that harm anymore. So I think to the degree there's the possibility of transgration, in my view it is absolutely interdependent with a process of (inaudible) for what has been done and engaging in repair for that harm, if it is repairable. I think, take up in the meantime question which keeps getting asked which I really want to hone in on it and I think it's really telling that a lot of the time when people of color and white accomplices are in power in the state system, so often the things they do is strink, like Eric advance money to the ground, Candace closes all the jails she gets to run. Kim declines prosecuting in a ton of cases. Right? There's a lot that does not think about the state doing something better and different about the state doing less. I think in some ways to me some of the most promising forces are ones that are about like valid, like strengthening the footprint of that machinery while we debate or acknowledge that whether or not the community will ever acknowledge
that.

MS. M. KEELS: Kind of Beverly's comments, but that triggered my thoughts which were around again if we're talking about violence, we're talking about guns and all those things, you talked about the schools, but it was also almost as if the school was given a pass as a state actor. Again, what I'm asking is if we held the schools accountable for the intergeneration, playing a role in intergeneration transition of violence, play a role, if you think about it, in state sanctioned violence in terms of what happened between those boys at the school when everybody knew it was not a surprise, it was not the first incident, but we're not holding our educational institutions accountable for the way that we are attempting to hold them (inaudible) accountable for that. Just to think about that In the Generation of this (inaudible) violence issue we're trying to attack, I would say that you probably have much more access to schools to be able to change schools with regards to some of these issues and also I wanted you to think about this I guess in the way that I do, in that you're trying to change systems and there's all these policies that you're working on, but for the people
that are going to be taking up those systems and
those are the kids today, and so if you're not
changing their schools, if you're not changing their
experiences there, what you do in that context is
going to have a dramatic effect on whatever violence
issues you have to solve a generation or two
generations from now is going to have a dramatic
effect based on that. So if you're re-imagining
criminal justice, you need to also re-imagine your
schools and your health care system in connection
with that and do not give the schools a pass in that
context.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you very much. Get
the final word before we get back to Paul for a
couple observations. Bruce, the floor is yours.

MR. K. WATTLEY: I just need to clarify
your position. Several people have mentioned this.
I picked up one several times in the last two days,
Hyper-local leadership is state supported somewhat.
As Alia talked about, this community solving its own
violence problem is not an effort we hear enough
about. We're trying to do this inside the prisons
and we're trying to support and train people who are
currently incarcerated to work toward healing each
other while in prison. It's a program developed by
my non-profit and by people in prison. We are ultimately going to make the prisons safer and bring a lot of people home with skills that can transform their own communities. The -- I guess the extensional question we have is are we complicit? Are we perpetuating a system that will send people to prison to be healed? That's where it's happening, and that's where we are and that's where the work is at, but that can't be the answer. But that's our meantime. In the meantime, we're trying to do that. How do we do that and reconcile that with the idea that we don't believe that prison is for anybody? It's just something I struggle with.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Why don't you ask an easy question? Paul, concluding thoughts from what you heard, as briefly as you could. And we'll ask Sukyi to talk about where we're headed next.

MR. P. BUTLER: Okay. Ray said earlier that state isn't in our community gang banging and shooting us and I want to push back against that. I think that's exactly what this state in our community is doing. I think it's doing that with the poison water in Flint and Pittsburgh and Newark. Again, if black women and native women are three times more likely to die while they're pregnant than
white women, again I think that's the state in our community doing us violence. And so then the question is: Can this state reform itself? And we can think about reform and we can think about transformation. And I think for reform, when we've got a couple of test cases in the room, so ladies and gentlemen, Ms. Kim Foxx, ladies and gentlemen, Ms. Candance Jones. And one of the interesting things about what's happening with Ms. Foxx is the resistance that she's getting from other actors in the state for reform, not even for transformation, but for reform. So near the end of his presidency, Barack Obama had kind of an exit interview with Coats, where Coats again floated his theory that there's something about anti-blackness that self-integral to the United States' identity as a country that without it, we wouldn't be recognizing. And the part two of that was he had been the president for eight years and in material ways black people didn't seem to be any better off and in some ways we were worse off with regards to homeownership. And what about that, Mr. President? And one of Coat's things was, you know, his reparations, which President Obama had already opposed. So what the president said was I don't
like the reparations, but I could see Marshall plan
for high poverty communities, so the Marshall plan
being a hub influx of resources into the countries
in Western Europe that were devastated in the Second
World War, so maybe that. So our question is:
Would that work, would that be reform, would that be
transformative? So again I think we have to ask
ourselves all of those questions, but I do think --
again, we already know if the question is can we make the police beat up fewer people and kill fewer
people and can private citizens work with the
government to do that? We know the answer is yes.
If the question is: Can we make private citizens
stop killing each other and beating each other,
sexually assaulting each other as much as we do, we
already know the answer is yes, that's the work that
David is doing, that's the work that Danielle is
doing. But I guess the last thing is, again, I
think we heard a comment again that the community
can solve its own violence problem and, in fact, the
community can't solve its own violence problem. I
don't think it's realistic to expect black folks,
Latino folks, other folks of goodwill to do
something that's going to, just with our work reduce
the risk of black and brown people for early death,
that's going to reduce the risk of black and brown people from profound suffering. We have to have the same kind of apparatus that every other group has in order to prosper. We need the support of the state.

MR. J. TRAVIS: How interesting. We have a couple of people who want to just do --

(Interruption in proceedings.)

MS. C. JONES: I want to draw on what Paul said in the beginning and what you just said, which is one of the things that struck me that sticks in my head always about the Obama Administration wasn't the bank bailout. One of the things that we really dispensed with quickly was allowing bankruptcy judges to renegotiate mortgages. And the fact that we took taxpayer dollars to bail out banks but then would not give judges the ability to face those same banks and give wealth back to regular people, which would have had a real financial impact on not exclusively on black and brown people, but because of the way the mortgage crisis was structured, it certainly would have had an impact there too. And I think that's an example of sort of a state. It was a failure of a state response and I heard the point of being like we should turn away from state, we have to have some
individual responsibility. But I actually find that troubling because it's like one thing about a democratic government which is what we sort of, you know, today this whole point of whether or not that was constructive. But at least if we want to sit under the guise of it, it's ours, we pay for it. Like the government is run, last I checked, with our money. No, I'm not going to turn my back on it and just be like we should go do something else with separate resources exclusively like it's mine and I think going back to the conversation yesterday about violence and taking things by force, that's the reason why I refuse to say not only will we be sort of like polite about it, but I think there's something from communities of color that's sort of demanding that accountability there and taking back of something that is by design is supposed to be our own.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Eric Cumberbatch, then we go back to Bruce.

MR. E. CUMBERBACH: So respectfully and I don't know -- I know what neighborhood I live in and I live in Bedford side of Brooklyn. The resiliency, the intelligence, the heart, the will of the people, the spirit, it's amazing that black communities even
exist through the torture that they've experienced
to this day and exists in the fashion beyond
surviving, beyond just being, but actually thriving.
And for us to believe or think that we don't have
the power to transform our own communities is a
myth. I'm not a researcher, that's a myth, because
we have done that already. That's why we're around
this table, that's how we're around this table. How
can I be dismissive of the people who came before me
and built my community and built opportunity for me
to be here on their shoulders today? And what we're
doing, not just in New York City, I respect all the
brothers and sisters from Detroit, Chicago, you
know, all the other places that are in here as we
talk and build, but we're creating history, we're
making history everyday and building our communities
everyday. And when I say that, I just don't say on
the ground. I put myself, we put ourselves in
spaces, very intentionally so that we can be the
ones that's driving, whether it's state resources,
whether its foundation philanthropic resources into
the community and we're the ones that's growing and
planting seeds in the young people in community and
cultivating leadership to make the change. That's
us. So in no way -- and I got the utmost respect
for you, brother, I thought your paper was on point,
I love how you articulated everything except --
until that last part. But I just want to be clear
that we are -- listen, if we're talking about, and
the terms have been thrown around, African-American
people, are you kidding me? We are the strongest
people on the planet, we survived boats of respect
across waters, the weakest were thrown on boats. Do
you know what's in your DNA? We built pyramids
that's in line with the sun and we talking about we
don't know how to save us? Please do not fall for
that. We are at the forefront of building our
communities and it will be led by us, it will be
sustained by us and it will be in our hands and it's
up to us to do that.

(APPLAUSE.)

MR. J. TRAVIS: I'm going to extend the
time, as they say.

MR. R. WINANS: But I'm going to be fast
and I got to be very clear.

MR. J. TRAVIS: And then Paul, you may
want to offer some observations?

MR. R. WINANS: Paul, you did a damn
good job on the paper when you said what you said
and got my attention, brother. So here's what I
need to do. I need to get your attention real quick. Eli, please stand up, please, real quick. This is a whole different group, right, this is a whole different group from earlier and I know damn well, the state ain't helped none of them, but we did from our community and we helped each other. Have a seat. We prevented the violence, going back to what you said, and so when I state the ain't in our communities gang banging, trust the community with the resources because it's not going to look the way the government think it look. The community knows how it's supposed to look. They want to rebuild, we want to rebuild our communities, right? And so even, and David knows, I love him, got good letters of recommendation, but here's the thing: You take a cease fire and I'm going to speak on it, because I spearheaded it. When you can bring a group of guys in, mandate them and tell them either you stop shooting or you going to jail, right, or get these services, right, if I accept these services, the police are saying, we reduce violence. If we don't accept the services, y'all driving the violence. Come on, let's be real about this. We got to be honest, this goes out against you, David. So the community, when I say community led, put the
resources in the community because we know guys on
the block may not understand the data, let's educate
them on that. Like we sit in this room, there's
going to be a research paper that somewhere, somehow
we handled it. Right? How do we become co-authors
on this versus contributors?

(APPLAUSE.)

MR. R. WINANS: Let's be real about this.
So we want the same thing, man. We in the D, we got
to be real about this because it's a problem for all
of us. If it's not about us, then there's no
research, there's no data, there is none of that.
So how can an institution give 5 million dollars to
research us we don't get nothing but a contribution?
With that I'm going to drop the mike.

MS. A. HARVEY-QUINN: Excuse me. So
before Detroit leads research efforts that are on
the ground that feed nonprofits and organizations
that are grassroots that do the actual work and we
don't get money for rehash. Nothing has ever
authorized or supported our research, but we are
quoted and leveraged. So we don't even get --
although we are the leading authority and the voices
and the leading authority in how to express the pain
and the impact of this work, we don't get
acknowledgement as the authority and that's an important note and an important distinction. We don't want to be case studies, we want to be able to use our voice.

MR. J. TRAVIS: So Kim Foxx gets the last word before Paul and Bruce and then we break.

MS. Foxx: Very quickly. Listen, I appreciate the energy around this portion of the conversation, but to come to Paul's aid a bit, I mean, I think the point being, I hear you and that is why when I started my conversation today without having had the benefit of being here yesterday saying that I wear a title as a prosecutor, but I come with a bunch of experiences, I come as a survivor, I come as someone who has witnessed things, I come as still having families in communities like we talked about. So all of this is mixed in. I also am in a profession where I am a counsel from less than one percent of the land of prosecutors, and women of politics, five percent of prosecutors of women of color, five percent of elective prosecutors are people of color. Seventy-nine percent elective prosecutors are white men. When we're talking about these historical structures that have existed for hundreds of years,
absolutely the community can and should care for itself. We don't get to these shores and thrive with all that has happened for me to be in my position, I come from a legion of folks who have endured histories of abuse and torture and yet I am here. I know who we are, what we can be. We are not communities that are lacking. We have been deprived. We don't lack, we have been deprived. That being said, we also from the boat that Danielle talks about, in the meantime we have existing structures, we an absence of people who have those experiences in those structures. It's an inside-outside game and I appreciate the outside gang and I know what the outside gang can do and it's absolutely needed. But to Paul's point, when you get an outsider in the inside and try to do the transformation from the inside and they try to keep you out, you need that on the inside. You can't change structures. We can't stop prosecuting people for criminalized poverty if we are not in those positions to do it. We can do all this on the streets and if you have people who do not care because they carry with them the history of white supremacy and patriarchy and this is what this is designed to do and is doing what it's done just from
the outside, we're going to keep having this conversation for a really long time. Because history has told us in the hundreds of years that we've been here, yes, we are better than where we were before, but this re-imagination that we're trying to do requires us to have it both in and out. So what I would say, I think the articulation was that, yes, we need for our communities to step up and be the answer that we know they are and have been and at the same time we need our state actors for us to not be complicit and just simply say that they can do it because I'm telling you that they can.

MR. P. BUTLER: Just quickly, I mean, I love race intervention. This morning to David, don't say disadvantage and I love David's sensitivity to it. And the word I was thinking was under-resource rather than disadvantaged. But the word that we moved to was oppressed, oppressed communities and I like that even better because I think that that word oppressed is an accurate description. And so then the question is: Let's focus for a moment on African-Americans. Can African-Americans by ourselves resist, fight back, overcome oppression by the United States of America?
And respectfully I think the answer is that we can't. I think it's an issue of power and resources and that our community does not have those power and resources. So we can be extremely important interventions on the ground. We can make the police stop killing us as much as they do, we can help each other, keep each other to be safer as opposed to harming each other. At the end of the day, again, what we need to be truly safe to fight oppression in a meaningful way, we don't have the power and the resources to do that. I say that based on my own experience. Again, I'm from Chicago, my people come from Mississippi, you know. They worked their asses off fighting all kinds of terrorism to get to Chicago where they did a little bit better in some way, in other ways not as well. If there was anyway to do it, they would have done it. I know lots of black people and true members with the same kind of story. So I think that resistance is a form of survival, but survival is different from thriving. And so when I look at that side, when I look at African-Americans all over the country, I don't see driving. When I look at the risk of African-American people dying from homicide, from suicide, from pregnancy, when I look at the risk of
black people not graduating from high school at
their risk of going to jail and comparing that to
other people, I don't see the thriving and I don't
at all attribute that to something that we're not
doing right. If we're doing everything that we
should be doing, but we're facing tremendous
oppression and I think we have to be real about
that.

MR. J. TRAVIS: So Bruce, what would you
like to add as an overview to the time we spent
together, we appreciate some thoughts and I have a
brief observation.

MR. B. WESTERN: I did a breakthrough
conversation in a lot of ways. I think we're also
revisiting Kelly's panel at the very beginning
yesterday. I thought -- I mean, Paul's paper is
just so gracing in its clarity and I don't want to
lose sight of what I took into your major first
point, which is the state is a significant agent of
violence, particularly for communities of color.
And I think in this discussion we shouldn't lose
sight of that reality. When we've talked about
other kinds of violence, not state violence, we've
talked about that at this table as presenting the
twin challenge of healing and accountability.
Violence presents the challenge of healing and accountability and it raises the question for me. So what does that look like, the state violence, what does the twin challenge of healing from state violence and accountability for state violence look like? Are the hands of state violence the same as the hands of private violence and I think they're different and I think healing from state violence is different because those harms are often unrecognized. And we didn't dig into that, but I just want to plant that seed of what it looks like and what it might mean to harm -- heal from the harms of state violence. And, Danielle, on accountability, Danielle spoke directly to it. She said reform absent accountability went for a meaningful change, and I thought that was a great way of framing the question Paul posed. We spent a lot of time on can the state reform itself, and I think the question that he asked is fundamentally right. Are the police specifically and I think we could throw in courts and the Department of Corrections as well, are the police so closely entwined with the history of white supremacy that they can't be disentangled and there's no meaningful possibility of reform. I think I was really
interested in the consent decrees discussion. I think the question for me is not so much whether consent decrees on average have reduced the use of force and had a variety of positive effects. But under what conditions where they have been successful, what was happening in those cases that allowed them to be successful? I want to understand that point. And it was for me that we pivoted to the idea that maybe state reform is -- is the state reforming itself not possible? Maybe the state is so deeply implicated, the police are so deeply implicated in the projective of historical project of white supremacy that we need alternative structures, parallel structures, community-based structures for controlling and recovering from violence and I thought Beverly spoke so eloquently to this and Ray and Barbara and Keith and Alia.

And then this final discussion which was provoked by Paul's conclusion, I thought it sort of got us to really the right question ultimately, which was: What are the politics that could lead to the transformation of state structures, and that's how I heard this whole conversation between Ray and Paul. What are the politics because your -- as I heard you, Ray, you're making a claim for a certain
kind of transformational politics and for me Ken was 
super instructive and super helpful on his 
describing what this politics could look like. And 
there's an inside game and an outside game and both 
of these, to secure transformation, we need to do 
both. And just sort a small footnote, when Paul 
said, you know, I'm not sure communities can 
transform themselves, what I heard him to be saying 
is that's really hard because the state and the rest 
of the project of white supremacy has got its boot 
on the neck of these communities and that's how I 
heard you. I actually think we have landed at a 
tremendously constructive place and finally I think 
we're having a discussion about politics which is 
where we need to be.

MR. J. TRAVIS: So thank you, Bruce and 
everybody for that last ten minutes was just 
electric. Sitting in the seat that I sit in, 
there's the after-lunch effect, it was really slow 
at the beginning of this session. Lordy, Lordy, how 
are we going to get some energy in this room? I 
then sort of counted on you to sort of reverse that 
dynamic, and look what happened. We keep 
transcripts of all of these. The transcript of this 
session and the way that you captured this last
discussion has provided so many framing stigmas that I think we'll see what it does for tomorrow, we'll see what it does for the Justice of Detroit. It was really, really great. I congratulate all of you. So we'll now listen to Sukyi and Amanda, I think you were telling us where we're going next. Now we're going to the Justice of Detroit. I get to take a break.

SUKYI McMAHON: Yes, for a little bit. Oh, the people, we're ready for Justice in Detroit. We have to set the table. We're going to add, we're going to add about eight chairs. It's going to be beautiful and cozy, but you'll all need to step away for around eight minutes.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: I'm Amanda Alexander, the founding Executive Director of the Detroit Justice Center, I'm a member of the Square One (inaudible). I'm really glad to have this conversation. So to give you all a sense, this is the Justice in Detroit part of the program. It fits into a three-day meeting that we've been having with people, local experts, experts from across the country who have been thinking very deeply about questions of violence and harms and implications for justice policy and other types of policy. And the
idea for the next hour and a half or so is to talk about how some of these things play out here in Detroit and to really start to surface because some of the directions that folks here in Detroit are already going in when it comes to addressing questions of violence and harm or what it takes to build justice communities, we will talk for about an hour among ourselves and then we'll open it from our visitors from across the country to talk about, you know, what are they doing in their cities that seem similar or complementary, what could we be learning from each other. So to give you some more context and then I'll go and have a few introductions as well.

For the past two days we've been talking about questions of violence at many different levels so. Questions of challenging violence. This has not been touched about nearly enough, someone from the floor, from the community wanted us to acknowledge the fact that we are on the ancestral land of the people of the three fires, so the Ottawa, the Pottawatomie and Chippewa. So our discussion has been somewhat informed, but not nearly enough, the questions of founding violence and genocide and colonial dispossession. We've also
talked a bit more about the history of slavery and the ways that anti-black racism and other types of racism have formed what justice and questions what the violence and harm looks like in our country today. We talked about structural violence, its relationships, capitalism, federal patriarchy. I think that Detroit is a prime example of these questions of structural violence. I would say the way that I describe it is that we have seen a severe retraction of all the positive public welfare functions of the state here in Detroit. So for a very long time you could not at all count on the state to provide your child with an excellent education or even access to clean running water on a reliable basis. We know that many people are living without running water in our city because of water shutoffs. You couldn't count on streetlights being on and be able to see your block by walking down it and yet you could count on DCFS showing up to take your kids away if your home was blackballed for not having water. You could count on police pulling you over and picking you up on those warrants for driving under a suspended license. So in many ways what we have seen is a complete retraction of the state and all these positive public welfare
functions and yet it doubling down on the state apparatus that criminalizes, prosecutes and cages people.

We've also been talking about interpersonal and community violence quite a bit, particularly the role of guns in that and we have been talking again, not enough, but Beth Richie, very usefully intervened and helped give us more language about how all of this has gender violence and the role of understanding gender and the particular impact of violence on women and girls.

So between all of these conversations last night we were also treated to a night of Youth Visions, so activists who have been through poetry, through the entire policy visioning, coming up with what they would they offer in terms of their visions for building a more just Detroit? What are they willing to fight for in their communities instead of just what they're fighting against? This is work that we do quite a bit of at the Detroit Justice Center. So we have a just cities lab where we invite people to imagine what could do we about rebuilding, instead what could we be investing in the place of police, jails and prisons and what it would look like to actually building out some of
those things. So to give you a sense of where we're going in this conversation, essentially we are here to talk about justice questions in Detroit, what is working in terms of community-led solutions, what are the challenges, what direction are we headed in and what are some really promising alternatives and what are some of the solutions that people are already bringing to the table and need to bring more of to the table to reduce violence in Detroit? So we know that again there's been all this deep investment in a particular type of public safety. Yet there's a growing movement to reframe what truly makes communities safe. So the idea is to think about who needs to be part of this solution when it comes to re-imagining justice. And then giving the opportunities, funding, other types of support, what would they need to become really the bringer of community safety?

So I'm going to have the locals who are here in the room introduce yourselves, but first to give you a sense of who you're introducing yourself too,

**brenda, I think you start here there's about 30 people here from across the country, academics, practitioners, activists,
people who bring a real range, the assistant actors, police officers, judges, prosecutors, others who have been wrestling with these questions and they understand the very high stakes of these questions. Many of the folks are experts from across the country who have given these three days and thank you. We really appreciate it at that time. For our locals who are joining us, I think also the locals who have been part of the conversation the last couple days, so if (inaudible) So if you could say your name and your organization and why you've committed to being part of this conversation. So I'll give you a second to think about that but to give you another sense of the format, so we will have until 5:45 and that's when most people hop on the shuttle. We're supposed to have two hours. We will have a little under that. We will talk among Detroiters until about 5:10 and then we'll open it up to other folks from other cities as well. And just to let everyone know, this is being live streamed and there are viewing parties, viewing watch parties in other parts of the country watching and listening in to the conversation. It's all being documented as well. So there is a court reporter there who's been doing an incredible job.
The way that we've been doing it is if you want to say something, I'll keep a cue and just signal by putting up your name on a tag like this, so placing it vertical and then I will place you in the cue. If there is an immediate question or a immediate point that we need to make, feel free to wave and we can make that process. But that is helpful to make sure that for transcription purposes we are able to not talk over each other. Let's go ahead and introduce ourselves, your name, your organization and why you've committed to this session.

MS. A. CARTER: Hi, everyone. I just want to start by thanking you so much, Amanda. The Detroit Justice means a lot to me and I think to a lot of people that I'm working with. So thank you and thanks to everyone for being here. My name is Ashley Carter. I'm a Senior Staff Attorney at Advancement Project which is a National Racial Justice Organization based in Washington, D.C., but I'm from Detroit and I'm here often partly because my whole family is here, but also partly because we're doing a lot of work here in Michigan. Advancement Project works by partnering with
grassroots organizations and supporting their campaigns around ending the school to prison pipeline, voting rights, mass incarceration, policing, immigrant justice. And we provide communications, legal and community organizing support.

I'm really grateful and happy to be a part of this conversation but I'm choosing to be a part of this conversation because I really deeply believe in the people who are here in Detroit and I believe deeply in amplifying and lifting up the experiences of people who are being oppressed by a lot of the systems that we have in place here, particularly the criminal legal system and I have personally chosen to use the platform on this basis that I've been given to address to see what I see as social harm and to try to make a difference that I can in re-imagining the communities that we live in and providing the space for people to share their experiences as well.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: Nicholas.

MR. N. BUCKINGHAM: What up, Doe. My name is Nicholas Buckingham. I'm a statewide campaign director for the Michigan United that is working on building a leadership capacity of
formerly incarcerated people and to simply abolish
some of the issues with the criminal justice system.
Why have I committed to be part of this
conversation? For many reasons. One, I'm a person
that is directly impacted by gun violence in the
last year and a half. I have lost a total of six
friends, including one baby to gun violence, a baby,
a mother was shot 16 times and the child caught one
bullet. The mother lived and the child died. Also
just with my own experience, I'm also formerly
incarcerated, I spent seven years in prison for
armed robbery. Whatever expertise I'm able to frame
and the reason why. I would like to bring that to
the table in the conversation as well.

    MS. B. MCCORMACK: That works. Thank you
for inviting me to a part of this and I'm grateful
to you, Amanda. My name is Bridgett McCormick. I'm
the Chief Justice of the Michigan Supreme Court. In
addition to its traditional decision making function
the court by our state constitution is charged with
administering all of the courts of the state and
over three million people interact with our district
courts every year and a lot of members here are
interacting with our district courts because of
violence that they have been the victim of or they
are accused of, the ways violence has interfered with their lives in important ways. And I take that part of the job incredibly seriously and don't believe I have all of the ideas for how to do it well and so I'm here to learn because I believe that I can get some good ideas from this conversation. So I appreciate your inviting me.

MR. R. WINANS: Ray Winans and I serve as the Executive Director of Detroit Life if Valuable (inaudible). I'm here, one, because it's my community, it's my role and responsibility. I went to thank the young people who have nominated me as their leader and so thank you.

MR. P. HAMMER: I'm Peter Hammer. I teach law. (inaudible) As I said earlier, we really believe that structural racism is our generation civil rights challenge and so there are blind spots that you have in your own professionization. A lot of our work early on was looking at the intersection between structural racism and fiscal austerity as manifested in the bankruptcy and the fiscal emergency, the water shut offs and the tax foreclosures and we grade these issues questions around that central logic. In the back of my mind, well, where is criminal justice, where is mass
incarceration? We'll just have to add that as a
document, another document, our legal (inaudible).
It was really only re-listening to Dr. King's speech
when he came out against the Vietnam War and listed
three evils of racism, militarism, and materialism,
it dawned on me that it's a separate logic. There
are people in the room that have spent their whole
lives on this. (inaudible) but really realizing
that we had to develop a whole new issue cluster on
the intersection between racism and militarism.
Once you had that core logic, it was very easy to
see mass incarceration, (inaudible) phobia and
militarism and private security and facial
recognition and so this is really part of our
mandate we're trying to flush out on how this fits
in with the paradigm of structural racism logic. I
told my students as you get an understanding so you
can engage in strategic action.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: Sheryl.

MS. S. KUBIAK: Good afternoon, everyone.

My name is Sheryl Kubiak and I am the Dean of the
School Social Work here at Wayne State University
and I really am very grateful to be here, so thank
you for inviting me. Why it's important for me to
be in this space is that over 30 years ago I started
working with women who were incarcerated and pregnant. And in that experience, of course, as many of you know, children get removed from children at birth and I was so taken aback by having young children of my own at that point around that state sanctioned violence about separating a mother and an infant for things that women were caught up in that I also had been caught up in different parts of my life. And so, you know that feeling of there before the Grace of God go I, and that feeling that there is everything that I wanted to do with all of the gifts and talents and resources that I had to prevent anyone from going in when it was unnecessary. And so I am currently working with the Center for Behavioral Health and Justice here on campus to work around this state at preventing any individual's mental health or substance disorders from going into confined space. Thank you.

PASTOR B. RANDOLPH: My name is Barry Randolph and I'm the priest and pastor of the Church of the Messiah in Detroit. I come here representing those sometimes who don't have a voice. The Church of Messiah is a mixed race congregation of about 300 people. Sixty percent of our congregation is African-American male under the age of 30. Every
member of the Church of Messiah knows somebody who
was a victim of gun violence, so we do a lot around
gun violence, but we do a lot to make God tangible.
Now, I am a preacher so I believe in the impossible,
I believe a virgin had a baby. So if a virgin had a
baby, we can change our community, we can change the
mindset of people in the neighborhood and community.
So we do that by the work that we do. We make God
tangible. We have 213 units of housing in our
community. We've invested forty-eight million
dollars in the community and neighborhood and this
was done by one single church on the east side of
Detroit. We have an employment office where we
specialize in getting jobs for those who are
formerly incarcerated. We have a work force
development center, we have tea beverage company, a
clothing line, video production company, candle
company, we have a doctor's office, all of this is
created by the people in the community. We are also
the internet provider, so you got AT&T, Comcast and
Church of the Messiah and we took people out of the
community and neighborhood and taught them how to be
internet providers, at the same time teaching them
to be community activists. We also have a 84 member
marching band on Sundays at 12 o'clock. East Grand
Boulevard and Lafayette.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. A. HARVEY-QUINN: Always grateful to share space with Pastor Barry. Y'all know me. My name is Alia. I'm the Founding Executive Director of Force Detroit. I forgot to mention that we're a project of Faith in Action and our work is all under the umbrella of the National Live Free Campaign. So I work closely with Pastor Mike McBride. I'm here because, a little bit more gently, I feel like it's super important to center directly impacted people as the experts of their experiences and the pioneers for positive change and I feel like this needs to happen in a variety of ways and they need to be empowered with both data, both empirically and with, you know, story, episodes in multiple ways, but they need to be empowered to lead the change, they need to be empowered to do the research, they need to be empowered in every way possible.

MR. BERG: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Terrence Berg and I'm a United States District Judge. So I'm a federal judge here on the bench in Detroit. I was appointed by President Barack Obama in December 2012. In thinking about my job on the court, I want to take a moment if you'll
indulge me, and introduce our Chief Judge who is here, I don't know if she's already been introduced but Judge Denise Page Hood is right over there. Would you stand, please? She's our Chief Judge. (APPLAUSE.)

MR. BERG: And one more little shout out regarding our bench, I'm very excited that this conference is co-hosted with the Damon Keith Center. Damon Keith was a judge on our bench. For those of you who are not from Detroit and you don't know who Damon Keith was, you're really missing something because he was a great hero, and I commend you to read (inaudible) book, "Crusader for Justice," which is a remarkable biography of an unbelievably wonderful, man, Damon Keith, Judge Keith. So why am I committed to this? So first of all, I was a prosecutor for most of my career in the U.S. Attorney's Office here in the Department of Justice and partly in the Attorney General's office. So I care a lot about the criminal justice system. As a judge I have the very difficult and somewhat unfortunate job of sentencing people and so I'm deeply interested in the whole question of criminal justice and the consequences of prison systems and knowing that each person is an individual and so
that's part of it. So I have a professional interest and I also have a personal interest in gun violence. I was the victim of gun violence myself in March of 2015. I was shot during an attempted home invasion, so I know what it's like to be a victim of gun violence, just like many of the people that I sentence actually are also victims of gun violence. It's almost always something that you'll read about in the presentence report about the individuals who are prosecuted and end up coming through our court system. So I'm very happy to be part of this. I want to thank you for giving me the invitation to be here and also I hope to learn as much as possible. Thank you.

MS. B. JONES: My name is Barbara L. Jones, I am the Community Dispute Resolution Specialist for the Center for Peace and Conflict Studies right here at Wayne State University. I also am faculty, I teach Social Justice Activism and based off what that is, I teach the theoretical framework of why social movements come to be based off all of the conflicts that's happened historically up to present time. Justice and healing takes place when the truth is honored. And that is one of the reasons why I'm just grateful to
be here, to be able to be amongst the truth tellers
and I hope we continue on this trajectory in order
to get to a source of healing that is going to
benefit each and every one of us. I am also the
victim of, survivor of a murdered son, 23 months
dead. So this is very new to me. Thank you.

MR. FANCHER: My name is Mark Fancher.

I'm the Staff Attorney for the Racial Justice
Project for the ACLU of Michigan and speaking truly
for myself, not for the ACLU, the question of
policing is very personal to me. You know, I know
that my ancestors were kidnapped and brought here,
brought to hell and they recognized it as such when
they got here and from the beginning their struggle
has been a struggle for liberation from hell. And
there have been occasions when, you know, people
have become confused and begun to believe that they
can integrate into this system, but eventually
clarity prevails. Even Dr. King said toward the end
of his life that he had been trying to integrate but
it looked like he was trying to integrate into a
burning house. And during this sojourn in this
hemisphere, a war has been waged against African
people and the soldiers who have been waging the war
for the most part have been police. And so the
struggle has been on two levels for African people, once a continuing struggle for liberation but also a struggle for survival so that they're able to wage that struggle. And so there are so many issues implicated by the relationship between community and police both -- with respect to both struggles and that's why discussions of this kind are so important.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: (Inaudible). To kick it off we're going to watch a short five-minute video that is an interview with a young person from Detroit Life is Valuable Everyday. This is Ray's organization and they have had a presence here over the past two days in the Observer, but also sometimes comments from the floor, but I thought it was important to start off with an interview clip with a young D life member, what they call (inaudible) and to get some context for this clip, so it's part of a film that Danielle's organization, Common Justice, is putting together. It's called Ever After, and the idea behind the film is to really shift the narrative around, you know, survivors of violence, given more opportunities for people who have survived harm and also in some cases caused harm or both, to be able to talk about their
stories, talk about what they need and what they want moving forward. And so this is an interview with Demarko and then I'll turn it over to Ray to textualize it and talk more about what D Life does and open it for conversation. Let's go ahead and hear from Demarko.

(Video played.)

MR. R. WINANS: Thanks again. So again D life, it's the first hospital based violence intervention program in the state of Michigan. Its spearheaded by myself, Calvin, Medical Director, Dr. Shanewey, founded April 8, 2016 over at Sinai-Grace hospital which is located on the west side of Detroit. Sinai received more violent penetrating trauma than in any other hospital in the state of Michigan. And so when we birth D life, D life serviced the population of age groups 14 to 30 and we meet individuals at the bedside the moment that our trauma pagers go off or we get a call from anybody in the hospital letting us know that somebody had been violently injured that fit our age group. I asked Megan, who is one of our women in D Life that was predicated off a comment when I heard Beth, I actually had to apologize to her to say, hey, we're an all-inclusive organization that does
not acknowledge the women who have been harmed and I do apologize because we have women in our program that D Life serves to even individuals from a health center approach, right, to service them on anything that they need around social determines of health, housing, DJC and I make no apologies about it. It's like our favorite community partner, right? They provide the legal services, right? Got a phenomenal relationship with Pastor Barry, right, one of our partners. I mean like literally everybody in the damn room for the most part that lives in Detroit has some type of relationship with them, hey, what's going on, right, even the judge, right? But even being able -- glad he came here, right, being able to take an individual to court and Larry has been phenomenal in saying, hey, you know what, if you believe in this individual, we believe in them. So where normally would be a punitive outcome, right, the judge is actually cutting breaks when we show up to court, right? I'd be remiss without acknowledging my entire staff, right, because these are the individuals that we would not survive plus the individuals to get to and from their services or their follow-up appointments, right? We actually provide Lyft, Uber or actually have somebody from
the team to actually pick our D Life members up.

When we say trauma informed, right, we focus on resilience. We're not a deficit framing organization, right? We want to know what you aspire to be. Right? And the thing that I love most about D Life is we don't just service the individuals, we service the entire family. We have members that are currently incarcerated serving two to three years. We actively send them money. While they're incarcerated we still provide services for the entire family, right, who is most important too.

Historically in the city of Detroit, once a person has been violently injured, their chances of being re-injured increases up to 45 percent within the first two to five years, primarily happening in two.

Right?

Today I thank God for it, D Life has less than a two percent reinjury rate on the folks that have fully engaged in the process, right? And so we also know that in our community when we talk about the issue of violence, retaliation is huge. And so we focus on retaliation prevention. We design a retaliation stream for them. And so if an individual has a high probability of retaliating, we call it dosages. At that moment we need to give you
as many high dosages as we possibly can rather than 
relocating you so you don't feel the need to 
retaliate, right, and we're not an organization that 
centers around ways to find -- to make you 
ineligible. All you have to do, fortunately, is 
come to Sinai-Grace or Receiving, and you're 
automatically eligible for all the services. Right? 
So we're not trying to go and find out what your 
income is in order to get you supportive help. If 
housing is the issue, guess what? Then we're going 
to figure it out. We had a young man -- by a show 
of hands, who in here done already got their 
apartments in the last six months? Raise your hand. 
But Duane, you don't know this new group, but, 
Duane, he placed like seven young men in the last 
six months in homes. Right, Duane, who raised his 
hand, I use him for an example if it's okay, right, 
because he has a history. He was fifteen years old 
when he came to us. He's 18 now. Right. It was a 
moment that he was disconnected. He came back and 
said, hey, I want to get involved. And we said what 
does it take in order for you to feel whole and he 
said the environment that I'm in is toxic. Well, 
traditionally they say, what monies do we have to 
come in? I said, no, we're not trying to figure
that out. We going to get you a damn place, pay your rent up as long as we need to to ensure that you have adequate resources to get you employment, to focus on your education. Right? We understand that toxic stress is real. I don't see Travon as an individual that's been vitally injured twice. Right? And that was the young man that we did the intervention on. So our biggest thing, our biggest thing is really providing a safe space for individuals in the community to heal and not at a rate that we feel an person is supposed to heal, but at a rate in which they say, go on this journey with us in order to heal. Right? And so to have a young man in our organization for three years, sometimes that's unheard of. Right? To say, okay, well, at what point do you cut him off? Well, we understand adverse childhood experiences and trauma is very real and so there's no time frame on how long it takes to pull back the layers in order for healing to take place in a young person's life.

I'm going to close with Megan. And the reason why I'm going to close with Megan is because I asked her for permission. Megan was shot and when she was shot, I received a call and I responded. I actually got out of my bed, right? When I got out of
my bed and this was just three and a half months ago
and I sat at her bedside with her. She didn't have
anybody at her bedside. Sitting at her bedside, I
made a commitment to her. I didn't know her, but I
knew that she had been violently injured and she was
afraid. And so I sat at her bedside with her until
Ms. Berry got there, which is our -- she was the
Director of our healing -- our women's program, and
sitting at Megan's bedside I was able to find out so
much information about Megan, not because I was law
enforcement trying to investigate, but I needed to
understand what can I do to help her. So I knew she
had a son, I knew her father had been murdered, I
knew her best friend had been murdered. Right? So
all these traumatic experiences, and I told her one
thing, if you want to be a part of D Life, you have
a family who will support you, and not only support
you, support your child. Right? So Megan has been
successfully following through with her therapy
sessions and leaning heavy on D Life. This is what
D Life is about. Right? We're not -- it's a
ministry. At the beginning of the day, end of the
day for us it's a ministry. In our group text in
the morning, we praying. It's a ministry. We
cannot solve spiritual problems with natural
solutions. But when we allow our members to see the
God in us, then and only then will they heal and
start to manifest itself in most cases, and I think
that's Demarco walking in. You on the big screen,
homey. And his mom should not be mesmerized by this
guy's smile. So, yeah, that's what D Live does, and
we couldn't do this without our partners here in
Detroit, like seriously in a real and a major way.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: So welcome, Demarco,
welcome. You're right on here on your own video,
Demarco. So we're kicking it off with the Ever
After video and then we're going to open it up to
conversation. So let's see if it works this time.

(Video played.)

MS. A. ALEXANDER: Thank you, Demarco.
Anything you want to add? No pressure. You've said
plenty, but feel free to jump in now.

DEMARCO: I'm just happy to be here,
that's it. I'm excited to be here. I ain't got too
much to say. (Inaudible.)

MS. A. ALEXANDER: Thank you, Demarco.
And you said plenty, but I really appreciate about
that video is the way you have imagined what a
disjustice conversation looked like and what would
you want out of that and I think it shames me that
that isn't a process that we offered right now. So we don't know that worked, but what an imagination and what your generosity you gave in offering us that vision of what it could look like.

DEMARCO: It emphasizes that in just a lot of ways you think about stuff, a lot of ways to fix stuff. It ain't got to always be negative.

(Inaudible.)

MS. A. ALEXANDER: The other things was something that I've heard other folks say, is that hurt people hurt people and there's a friend of mine who's a movement lawyer in Seattle, Peter Oliver, who says that hurt people hurt people. I have to believe that the inverse is always true that healing people heal people. So I want to use that as a pivot to open it up for many folks in the room who are doing that work of healing and helping. So I want to pose this question to everyone and feel free to go ahead and start cueing yourself up, jump in on these questions. What is it going to take to build a more just Detroit, what are some things that you're doing that are working? You have a (inaudible) level or whatever level in your court and how can we kind of just further those solutions along? I also want to offer Larry Williams, can you
go ahead and just say your name, your title and then why you've committed to this conversation?

MR. WILLIAMS: Good afternoon, everybody, sorry I'm late. My name is Larry Williams, I'm a Judge at 36th District Court. Right now I serve as the Chief Pro tem. And now I just want to say thank you for inviting me and I've had a chance to listen to a little bit of the conversation today and you know the topic of restorative justice is very important to me. Just some of my background, before I was a judge, I served as a prosecutor at Wayne County. Two of my divisions were Domestic Violence Division and Juvenile Divisions. During that time you know, I saw the need for what exactly we're talking about. You know, why are we here, you know what kind of outcomes are we providing for our kids, our victims and the people that come through our system? Are we locking them up and throwing away the key or are we making them better people because of this process? You know, I want to sit, I want to listen, I want to learn about things that help people as opposed to hurt, you know, heal as opposed to destroy. Right now at 36th District Court for example, we have our Homeless Court or Human Democracy Court. It was started by Judge Miller and
some of the folks like Jay Patel at Street Democracy. Right now I'm the presiding judge of that program. And what we try to do is disentangle some people with unstable housing from this -- almost from this prison of tickets, of cases and things like this that prevent them from participating in society, getting stable housing or being able to work and get ideas and things like that. And I think that's what we should be doing as a court and I think that's what we should be doing as all of the serious stakeholders in this community. So I'm happy to sit back and listen and learn and thank you for having me.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: Who wants to jump in first on that question? Yes, the question of kind of what are some things that folks are already doing to address these questions of harm and violence? We've heard like the D Life example, we've heard quite a bit about that. What are some other examples that either, you know, your organization could be doing or that you see happening in the neighborhood that are ways of addressing violence and harm in communities here in Detroit? Detroit first and then we'll get to folks from other cities.

MS. A. CARTER: So there's a couple
different answers to this. Some are more complicated than others. One of the things I really appreciate about the work that I'm able to do is that we work through an abolitionist framework. And while there are complicated questions like how do we end white supremacy, there are less complicated questions that require people to be asking of themselves. I think that as a society we spend a lot of time investing in systems that don't work instead of taking the actual time to just ask ourselves if these things are working to give us the results that we want to see from them. And one of the ways that we interrogate systems is by partnering with organizations on the ground to answer some of those questions. So we work with Michigan Liberation which I greatly enjoy because we are an organization, my team is -- my team is mostly lawyers but we can't just come in and stew all of our problems away. That doesn't necessarily build the sort of power and the sort of community that we actually want to see. So I would say one of the things that we're able to do is come in and partner with organizations and amplify and lift up the work that they're doing that actually builds power instead of just maybe, you know, maybe like one
court decision, which is important, but it's not the same as building power on the ground from the people with these experiences.

PASTOR B. RANDOLPH: One of the things that we do church wise and we work with Ray, we work with Nicholas, we work with Alia and we work to make a difference by filling in the gap. Like I said before, which is unusual for a church, 60 percent of our congregation is African-American male under 30. And one of the reasons for that is because we're filling that gap, we do the employment, we do the affordable housing, we provide the jobs, the training and it is putting those things together to make sure that our young people have exactly what they need to be successful. Most of them are brilliant, it's just that they lack the opportunities and most of the time especially with us being church and it's hard to mix church and state, but we go by faith. I don't deny church, I don't deny my belief in God or anything like that, and a lot of times faith is missing. And that's what attracts people. It's because we are a church first and we actually reconcile people back to God and back to their greatness. One of the things we've done is through our marching band which is not
just a marching band. It's actually a literacy program to help young people get into college. And over the last six years we got 309 kids in college through the literacy program because all of the directors are actually teachers and instructors and professors and the band is a front. Music is the draw and then it brings them in and then we help them to achieve their greatness. And so it's filling in the gap. And one of the things that I would love to see for funders, I would love them to actually fund the people actually doing the work. I mean, a lot of times they come to us -- Church of the Messiah gets used all the time. We get used, we get pimped. That's just the way that it is. But it's one of those things where people come in, they see the work, and they say yeah, but you're a church. And I'm here to say we can do it because we're church and we need the funding and the money because we are church because we have a congregation that looks out for the least of these and looking out for poor people. There's a lot of lax. So I don't have a lot of tithe payers. I have a lot of people come in with needs and we meet that need, but it is done through partnership and working together to actually make that happen.
Mr. N. BUCKINGHAM: Thank you for raising the point about (inaudible) conversation.

PASTOR B. RANDOLPH: You know the preacher going to bring up money.

Mr. N. BUCKINGHAM: There's a lot of things that's working, for example, this conversation that, you know, we and the folks that come across the country and also come across the city to talk about gun violence, the thing that is not working is the location of this conversation it's happening in. When we talk about gun violence, you know, I think this conversation needs to take place on the grassroots of Seven Mile, it needs to take in the areas of Brightmoor and on Mack Road so that we can incorporate those folks that have been impacted by gun violence and move from body to body every single day without a portion of healing. I know we talk a lot about healing again, I know with the Church of the Messiah and with Detroit Force and with Ray. That's always going to be a conversation coming up. And I would just like to take down some notes and think about what does healing really look like in my community when a one-year old child is shot and, you know, the police officers that left all of the evidence right there on the street and
the bloody gloves, the yellow tape and that evidence
will sit there not for a few days but for months,
right? It will sit there for months with nobody to
come and clean this up. And here it is that our
community has to constantly wake up, walk past this,
go to the store, stand on the corner and be
remembered by the type of violence that is happening
in our community. It has become a norm to us and we
have become numb to it. I remember when I was
young, gang banging and doing all the crazy things,
we heard gunshots in our community, we didn't
run away. We were trying to figure out what type of
gun did that person use, was it a Mag 9, was it a
Tech 9, was it an AK, was it a Glock, any of those
things. And it just shows the perspective that we
have and how misconstrued we are in the head around
healing and gun violence. I just want like to say,
like one of the things that Michigan Liberation is
doing is that we're working on the back end and
we're looking at re-entry, what does it really mean
for people that are spending time incarcerated in
some of the most traumatic places in the world,
prison and to come home after ten years, 20 years.
I think right now we have somebody on our staff who
just finished up twenty-nine years and she's a
woman. We asked one important question, what would it take for you to come out to be productive and successful and not go back into a life of crime, a life of violence or to recidivate and go back into the prison system and its resources? We're trying to figure out what the hell does resources mean. So, we're just saying, you know what, we're going to pay, we're going to pay you a salary, wage that the rest of us make because we understand what it would take for you not to go back into that life of crime and a life of violence:

MS. A. HARVEY-QUINN: I think that we're clear on what has failed and I think that what is working is, you know, literally like the opposite of that. Right? So what has failed is we know that force doesn't lead to freedom. Right? Our communities are not safer because we criminalize and incarcerate people. Right? And so as we build out these models of what healing looks like and innovations to safety, it's also important to make sure that we're not embedding like those capitalistic notions, those senses of like individualism and competition within the spaces that we build. We have to sort of think broadly and cohesively and stretch ourselves not to compete
against each other. We have to stretch ourselves to take on enemies that are far greater than us. I think it's working for us to be -- to coordinate and be unified and be forceful against a monster that is bigger than us. So when we shut down a gas station as poor people in the community who may be stealing a bag of chips, right, but somebody ended up shot and when the result of stealing a dollar bag of chips is somebody's potential loss of life or the hospitalization of, you know, a human being, working together to shoot them down -- I'm sorry, working together to shut down the gas station, right, and exert force and then negotiating with the business association of gas stations, it's working for us, right? And then the coalition that is leading that work doesn't name individuals successors. We work cohesively as a group and take that success as a unit. So I think that's, you know, that's a huge thing. And the other thing is just like public education, right? So while we have a thorough analysis of what's happening in our communities, it can't be lost upon us that we are operating in a city that is devoid of education that will allow us to peer into the structures that are impacting this violence against us. So that -- those things are
clear to us in this room. Our babies may not fully understand why they feel inclined to bust bottles to release their tension, right, why they may feel inclined to like enact violence on each other as a way to release their frustration. So we have to get out of our silos and broadly create narratives that lead to structural ships.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: Mark.

MR. FANCHER: I think one of the things that's duly important for us to do is not fall into a trap that I think the enemies of oppressed communities frequently say and that is to cause us to believe that every young person of color is engaged in pathological violence. I don't spend a lot of time in Detroit Public Schools, but whenever I'm there I find some of the most studious, well behaved, courteous and respectful young people that I've ever had occasion to meet. And I've also had occasion to read in the media about how murders were committed on school grounds when in fact they were committed three and four blocks away. So there is a deliberate effort to paint with a very broad brush young people of color as people who are lost, who are violent and were confused. There are many who are violent and confused, but in their minds, I
really believe that they think that when they kill someone, especially someone who looks like them, that they're performing a public service. So deep is the self-hatred, and they have reason to hate themselves because at every level they're told that they are worthless. They're told that through the popular culture, they're told that by news analysts and talking heads. They're told that by so-called psychologists. They're told that by everybody. So that they come to believe that they have no prospects for success in life, that they can make no meaningful contribution, that their lives are worthless, that the best that they can do is to live as fast and hard and as well as they can for a few years, and if they take somebody else out along the way, then they should get a medal for that because they're worthless too. And the only way to reverse that is for the community to do it itself. Nobody knows the community better than the community. The Black Panther party was very successful in setting up a network of social service agencies. There was nothing like that at the time. The social safety net that we come to know, the network of nonprofits and charitable organizations, they were the ones that established the prototype for that and they did
that without any foundation funding, without philanthropists contributing at all. They did it by financing it through the community itself and it was totally independent. And what made it a threat was the explicit explanation to the community that these were programs for survival pending the revolution and it's that last little bit that caused great concern and fear among the powers that be. So what has evolved out of that is a non-profit industrial complex where non-profits function based on an agenda that's set for them by people who give them money. And the agenda that they're given is always one that does not contemplate revolution. It is one that is designed to contain the community, to direct the community in certain ways. If you'll notice and I watched this a long time, when non-profits are given money to begin projects that can be very useful for a community, once they begin to have success in that area, then all of a sudden the agenda and the priorities for the funding is changed radically. It's over here now. And so someone who wants to remain in operation, a non-profit that wants to remain functioning in order to get funding now has to satisfy funders because of their fickle taste and they redirect the energy and the focus
that was here and that was very effective to
something else and it's a game that's being played.
If we're going to solve this, then it's the
community that's going to take it by control and
with God's help and involvement in this would be
very helpful, which is also something that is always
discouraged, especially in communities of color.

MR. R. WINANS: Going back to what's
working in the city of Detroit, there's a lot that's
working. Right? I'm going to be intentionally
specific. Everybody in this room for the most part
that's from the city has a half degree of separation
from the Church Messiah. All right. At some point
me and Nick may be pissed at each other, but we all
know Pastor Barry don't tolerate that, right?
That's just the community noble. Whether you east
side, west side, whatever, you in the city of
Detroit, everybody knows the Church of the Messiah
and Pastor Barry. Pastor Barry got people in the
church that don't even like each other, but
everybody love him and so at the end of the day, and
in the day you show up for that 12 o'clock service,
you already know, right, that you got to go
downstairs at evening so you're going to be at the
table with somebody who probably, ordinarily
wouldn't even sit next to, right? And everybody answered Pastor Barry's phone calls to find him. We know who he is. Right? Distant and short timing, like I said I'm going to take this moment to talk about what's working on some personal issues. Right, and reflects our organization, D Live. I met her, we had conversations, but it was still because of my trauma, I'm always in fight mode, right, I'm always ready to fight because I've experienced that much harm. Right? So getting to know her, I'm like, damn, right, what you asking me to do? Right? I can start letting my guard down, right? And it's that consistency, right, folk able to vouch. And I say, Pastor Barry, what's up with her, he like she good people. So instead of me having both eyes on you, I'm going to put one eye on you, right? And then allow that to manifest itself. You know what, you good people, you, Amanda, right, the first conversation we had, like I don't know, man, gee, I don't know what the hell going on, right? Where like this new organization come from? Right? Like they really going to do what they say they going to do. Right? But you all are favorite community based partners. Judge Larry Williams, right? It's
working, I bet he'll do things and man, if there's anything I can do to help you. Right? So he being able to show and let the community reflect the things that's thriving, right? We talking about healing. Guess what? The community is healing in a real way. It's going through this process. Our community is going through a process and so it becomes our responsibility to understand the assets that's in each individual in our community, right?

I'm going to come back in front of you real quick, Pastor Barry, right? Because again we're talking about what's working. The circles, the circles are actually working, right? Folks getting in these circles and getting in these rooms and sitting at the tables and just having a real honest conversation. Right? It's uncomfortable as hell. It's uncomfortable for me to be like Nick and I mean, and what the hell you doing? And he like, man, y'all going to focus over there and we going to focus other here. But being able to have that conversation and knowing that I got an ally in Nick. Going back to your point, Mark, with the funds. Being able to have real conversations with our funders. To me, I mean, it's working. But the highlight of it on my healing journey is the mothers
in our community. And when we talking about this
issue of violence, for me morally I cannot morally
talk about violence without acknowledging women who
have lost their children, mothers of murdered
children. Barb, yesterday it blessed me and that's
part of my healing journey. Barb, can I share? She
came up to me and she grabbed me and she hugged and
she said, Ray, it's been two years since I seen you.
She said, but I know you know you've been thinking
about me and I know the work you've been doing with
us in mind and I know you haven't forgotten about
us. So when I go to get my justice or do my
restorative justice with the individual who took my
son life, Ray, you got to go to Denver with me.
That was an honor. I took someone's life. So to
have someone who lost their child to violence come
and say, man, you're the one that I need to go on
this journey with, that's huge for mothers of
murdered children to say, Ray, we want you to sit on
our board, that's redemption. So for me to be able
to look at my partner, Cal, normally we both, we
have a strategy. I said, no, we can't be in the
room at the same time or we going to blow this up.
Right. So for now, we can't do that. We can't blow
that up and I'm like, bro, we too mature for that.
He like, damn, man, we don't even like them. We like everybody now. Right? I told my staff, listen, it's not our job to not like people anymore. Right? It's our job to find ways and work with everybody, right? And that's the healing process. That's what healing look like, it starts with the leaders. If we out here gang banging based on our organization and it's not profitable, that's what we expect the kids to do.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: Thank you, Ray. We've heard a lot of what is working. I'm curious about what is it going to take to enhance some of this stuff? We could take that a lot of different directions. There's, you know, funding, not necessarily a good thing. I think a lot of skepticism about external resources, and it's not that they seem to be more funding necessarily. Is it legislation, is it more open as to certain things from the courts? You know, what do we need in order to enhance what's already working? Ashley, Terrence and then Alai.

MS. A. CARTER: I think one of the things that resonated to me earlier is with when Ms. Foxx was talking about the inside–outside strategy and a necessary major of that dynamic because I get very
frustrated and very angry at a lot of the systems that we have in place but also acknowledge that right now they're controlling a lot of the levers of power. One of the things that we've been focusing on a lot is re-entry and the way that the parole system negatively impacts people's lives particularly poor people and women of color. And so one of the things that I've noticed on my journey in this work is a lot of the people that are in positions of power really don't understand how things -- how policies are manifesting the lives of the people that are under their control. So one of the things I care a lot about is raising consciousness and awareness with people and being generous and assuming that people's intentions are not ill and that they really just don't have a fundamental understanding of how things are working for people.

Another thing that I really care a lot about is shifting the way that we spend money particularly in this state with the Department of Corrections because one of my colleagues said this week that budgets are moral documents and they really illuminate what people in positions of power care about and what they value. And so one of the
things I'd really like to see is a shifting of what
we're funding and an acknowledgment that a lot of
systems that we have in place to control people
under the guise of public safety which they
absolutely do not, would be better use in helping
people and what I've heard you say it's like
providing a welcome mat home for people, a welcome
mat for people coming home from jail and prison. So
shifting resources away from oppressive state
systems towards a community based resource system
that actually gives the people what they need to
survive in a way that we as a society demand that
they survive or exist in order to stay out of jail
and prison.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: Terrence, Alia and
Bridgett.

MR. T. BERG: Thank you. I feel like I
might want to defer to Barbara if you're going to be
responding to anything that (inaudible) said. Would
you like to go first? Okay. I was just going to
mention that we have a program in our court called
Restart which is an alternative justice program.
It's still very small at this point. It's been in
operation for about three years. And so our
Pretrial Services Department, we have a very good
chief of that named Patty Traveno, and she along
with our chief judge who was just here, Chief Judge
Hood and one of our magistrate judges, Elizabeth
Stafford, have spearheaded this idea. So they will
identify individuals who are charged federally,
usually a small number, let's say seven or so who
they think might be good candidates for this
program. And so instead of having to go through the
regular criminal justice system, they have an
18-month program. And to tell you very quickly
about what happens is they'll meet once a month with
a team which would involve the chief judge, the
magistrate judge and also the Pretrial Services
Department and someone from the U.S. Attorney's
Office and also someone from the Federal Defender
office. And they talk about their response to what
they've been charged with, they are under what they
call close supervision by pretrial services so
they'll have certain conditions that they have to
meet in terms of let's say not using drugs or trying
to maintain employment and then once a month also
they'll go to training, in what they call cognitive
training behavioral training which is very effective
and our pretrial service chief is kind of a
visionary in this area, and then they kind of go
through sharing with one another. They build a little bit of a community themselves, sharing the experience that they've had in their lives and also the experience of being part of the criminal justice system and it's been relatively successful so far. As I say, it's a very small program, but if they complete it successfully then no criminal charges are brought and they're able to go back into the community and hopefully not have a criminal record as a result. But, as I say it's just a small drop in the bucket. That's an example of an alternative that might, you know, might possibly catch on or be available for other courts to consider.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: I had Alia, Bridgett and then Barbara.

MS. A. HARVEY-QUINN: I want to address the conversation about what we can be doing better. I think it's a fair statement to say that Detroit is a punchy little city, right? We're a bit spicy. And the solutions and leaders that resonate with the people are not always politically correct, they don't always resonate with the elite, right? So when Coleman Young was, you know, cussing folks out, we were like, yeah, that's for us, right. And then when Kwame didn't take out his earring, we was like,
that's still for us, y'all. And, you know, even
when Zeek from New Era, you know, fusses people out,
most of the city is like that's for us. The
solutions that resonate with the people that are the
most at risk aren't cute but they are actually
working and we don't embrace them because they're
not cute, because they're not politically correct,
because they're too at risk. I heard us earlier in
the day like venture off into the fact that the
civil rights era wasn't really anti-violent but we
never really said that the folks that were given an
anti-violence platform leveraged the proposed
violence of their peers, right? And so that's a
real thing, right, like, if I'm saying, hey, we got
some solutions over here, you going to have to work
with me or else, yoo, so and so is going to punch
you, we need to do that a little bit better. I also
think like internally Ray spoke to this and I think
it's, you know, we need to lift up that conflict is
not -- so internally, right, as organizers and folks
that are on the ground trying to create solutions,
we have to acknowledge that conflict is like the
precursor to intervention. It's like what comes at
the middle of two harsh angles is something new and
potentially beautiful for our people, right? So
when we end up in those hard conversations, we have
to lean into them and we have to have enough of a
relationship to, you know, to cuss each other out
and keep going so we can do both of those things
better.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: Before I get into the
next comments, what we're going to do after those is
open it up to everyone that's here. So folks from
other cities, we want to get a sense of how is this
landing with you in terms of what's happening in
your city. It might be instructive to things you're
doing, whether it's cautionary or encouraging or
complimentary, we want to hear how this is happening
in other cities. Bridgett.

MS. B. McCORMACK: Thank you. The
conversation about the complicated strings that
funders put on community organizations is
interesting. I think there are also complicated
restrictions on so many interventions that are
available, some of the healing programs that are
currently available in our courts because the
conversation about what those restrictions should be
are not including the voices of the people who
probably have the most to say about them. So just
for one example, we have 188 treatment courts in and
Michigan treatment courts connect people instead of sending them to jail, give them opportunities to connect them to services that they wouldn't otherwise have access to and it's a tremendous advantage to the people who want to take advantage of them. But the statute that governs who is eligible for them says that you are not eligible for treatment court programs, drug courts, mental health courts, veterans courts, there's a bunch of others as well, the family courts, you're not eligible for those courts if you have been charged with a crime of violence when in fact it probably is the case that those are the folks who need it most. A number of states have already made this change and in a number of states their treatment court legislation does not prevent people who are charged in crimes of violence is defined incredibly broadly, incredibly broadly in Michigan. It's a simple change in a way, but it's not made in the communities where people might understand why people with those charges need access. And so it's another example of where we maybe could do better if we could find a way to crack that nut. I'd like it cracked.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: Barbara and then Larry, Eric and Sheryl.
MS. B. JONES: I want to go back to a couple things that Ray said. Ray and I met years ago, well before I lost my son to violence, and it was based off of our work together with the Detroit Violence Prevention Initiative. That’s where we go back because of our focus on how to teach young people, how to teach young people how to resolve their conflicts nonviolently. And based off of our interaction and based off of our meetings, I run a summer camp here called the Ralph Bunche Summer Institute that Dr. Fred Pearson started years ago and we bring 25 to 45 young people on campus to have a rich dialogue, a rich, rich dialogue to talk about the issues of the historical harms that have brought us to where we are today. I’m not going to go into full detail yet about the program, but when we talk about restorative practices and when we talk about restorative justice, I think we need to look a little bit deeper on how we frame restorative. And I’m going to use myself as an example. I was doing this work and didn’t need to find my purpose after I lost my son, I was already operating in my purpose and in my gift before I lost my son, and this still happened to me and my family. I purposely relocated my son out of the city of Detroit because of the
levels of violence that my son was experiencing inside of a Detroit public high school, that's where I got my chops to really talk about and deal with the system, the systemic issues within our schools and within our judicial system, but no one wanted to listen to me, they just wanted to punish my cognitively impaired son and I don't even like using that term because my son was very uniquely, just different from everyone. So we need to abolish that term, you know, as well. So when it comes to restoration and I'm looking at Judge Berg here and sitting next to him as a survivor, there's so many survivors in this room, my life, my son's life and all these young people and Demarco and everybody who has been a victim of gun violence, my son's life can never be restored. There's no restoration and there are no winners in this what we call restorative justice and restorative practice. Maybe we need to rethink on how we frame our language and call it more reconciling, reconciliation healing because when we all leave at this conference, who's going to continue to reach out to who in this room after we leave outside of the people that we know that we can call. I can call Ray, I can call Pastor Barry. I know now I can call Alia. Judge Berg said, you
know, I definitely can call him because of his vision. And Soledad said day before yesterday, the platitude, we got to get rid of the platitude that if I tell the prosecutor who prosecuted my son's case because I'm seeking justice for everybody, myself, my daughter and everyone who has suffered from this. And the prosecutor tells me, Barb, what you want to do, you cannot do. You can't do that. So why am I here? Why am I doing this work if the prosecutor tells me that I can't hold a restorative justice conference for the young man who -- one of the young man who is now convicted of taking my son's life, then where is the reconciliation if I'm not allowed to do that because we can't force the system to do this. So when I say forcefully, passionately what I'm being told from the criminal justice system who not only I work with, that now I'm a victim of, I'm a victim of it, and where is my power? Because you all expect all of us to have the power to make change, but when it's time to really deal with the system, my power doesn't mean anything. I'm silenced, I'm censored and so are so many other people that cannot be a part of the process when we talk about restorative justice. Because that does not -- if you tell me that I can't
be a part of this problem, then how am I supposed to heal? How am I supposed to begin the healing process? And that's just only one aspect. So when we talk about these things as it relates to the court and the system on what we're being told as victims and as perpetrators, as well and the expectation, you must heal, you got to get over your grief, you follow the seven steps of grief, I mean, we're being set up for something that we know ain't going to work. If I know it can't work as it relates to justice for my son, what is going to keep me inspired here at this table to work with every one of you that's empowered for me not to give up doing this work? We got a collective responsibility. If you want to see my healing, if you really want me to heal, I need for you to help me. Not just help me because my help -- because what you all expect me to do is, Barb, you're expected to help somebody else, that's the expectation that's placed on me that is so hard when I'm not even healed. I haven't even started the process because I'm still involved in the judicial system as it relates to my son's case. And my son was the 26th homicide in the state of Colorado Springs, Colorado. I purposely got my son out of
Detroit because I was a victim of violence, being robbed at a T-Mobile store just trying to pay my bill. And when I had an AK 47 put to my head, I said no more of this. If I can't get out of here, I'm getting my kids out of here, period. So they can look and see the opportunity of just being able to thrive in an environment that is minimal violence. I got a huge story to tell along with everybody else that's not being considered because I'm in the middle of dealing with the criminal justice system and I have to be silenced. That's a mandate that I have to follow those rules, but I'm expected to forgive, to heal, move on with my life and still continue to do this work that you all expect me to do. So when we have these conversations and I was talking to Jahmal and he was talking about being shot, I had to step out of the room when Jahmal played his story, just for a second, just to get that self care because I'm looking at him paralyzed in that chair and I'm like, wow, my son, Conte, is no longer here. I would have been able to deal and live with him being paralyzed. Would the community have supported me and supported, you know, Demarco and what Ray is doing? It goes far deeper than this. And when we walk out of here
today, I'm just going to be labeled again as a mother of a murdered son, not for the work that I do or that I've done, that works, but it ain't working for me, and I want it to work so bad in order for me to stay engaged. So this truth in these conversations is what I appreciate and it's painful and it's hard and the disagreements and the conflict. That's why we're all here. I'm a certified conflict resolution specialist but I can't mediate my own conflict. I need somebody to help me with that.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: Thank you so much, Barbara.

MR. L. WILLIAMS: Just to kind of piggyback on some of the comments that I heard today, you know just some of my own experiences in the criminal justice system and this goes out to, you know, people involved in that system in the room, the judges, elected officials, anybody involved in law enforcement, you know sometimes some of our, you know, pre-packaged solutions are not the answer. You know, we talk a lot about incarceration, and that's one aspect but you know even something that's, you know, as probation or other court, the court options are what you say, you
know, go drop, you know, two days or randomly this
week and that week, or do this program that it
doesn't help anybody. I think we all have to listen
to what the community is offering. You guys have
talked about today things that work, you know, your
own programs, you know, you're own connections with
people in your community that, you know, are making
a difference and I want to be a part of that and I
want my court to be a part of that. So what I want
to tell you is I have an open door and most of the
judges in my court do as well, if you got solutions,
if you got plans, Ray will tell you this, I'm open
to it, we all are. You know, come at us, give us an
alternative to, you know, these prepackaged
solutions which, you know, I'm starting to come to
the conclusion are just weighing us all down. You
know, we can do better, you know. I'm asking you in
this room to help me out with this and I want you to
know that I'm listening. You know, what you have to
offer today is kind of helping me formulate some
things in my head and you know what you're already
doing, I want to help, so let me know.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: Thank you. We'll take
you up on that. Eric.

MR. E. CUMBERBACH: First and foremost, I
just want to give my sincere condolences to all of
the survivors that are in the room and let you know
it's not on deaf ears, blind eyes and my heart is
with you in spirit and why I'm here and why we do
this collectively, so I do want to make that clear.
I also want to say I have a lot of love and respect
for what you all are doing in Detroit. I think
you're doing something really special and you have
all the key ingredients, so nothing but love and
respect to the brothers and sisters that I've met
from Detroit, Chicago, DC and my New York comrades
that are here with me as well. I feel like this is
like I'm coming off the stool like this is round ten
of a heavyweight fight. I'm exhausted, but it's
like if I lose this round, I might lose the fight.
So I'm going to hit you all with a lot in a very
short period of time. And I think it would be
helpful, not boastful, but I think there's a lot of
ideas, energy and strategy where I could be very
helpful in this space. So thank you all for giving
me the opportunity.

One of the things that we're doing at the
core in New York City is redefining what justice is,
not just in our own space but amongst DAs, amongst a
police department, a very large police department,
amongst several systems that have direct impacts on what criminal justice looks like in New York City. When I say redefine healing, redefine justice, we're intentionally putting healing at the core, healing environments, healing those that have been harmed and healing those individuals that are alleged perpetrators of violence and also recognizing that city agencies and city government requires a great deal of healing itself as it produces a lot of harm across community. This isn't done by my own expertise or genius, I don't consider myself to be either. We have some of the most fierce advocates in the country in New York City, great advocates that represent all five boroughs. At any given moment those advocates, activists are at city hall, city council, across the country really lobbying and painting a picture of what the needs are in their community, what they demand, what they're willing to expect, accept. And who they're willing to remove from power and/or place in power. I look at myself as a child of that movement where people have embraced me and lifted me up into a position of being able to be their asset, their ally and their advocate for New York City.

The second piece I'll share is great
political will, how do you cultivate and nurture great political will? So we have a mayor that really supports community based solutions towards ending violence. We have a city council that is also on board with how do we end community violence from nonlaw enforcement approaches, less arrests and less prosecution and how do we invest in that. And I believe someone very articulately said, you know, a moral contract, a moral bond. You know we have that in process and in progress currently. With that, what we've seen in New York City is and I'm dating back towards 2013, we've seen a decline in the number of arrests, a decline in the number of summons, criminal summons that are issued, a decline in and almost cease of stop and frisk and the lowest number of jail beds in Rikers' Island. And at the same time that that has happened, as police and judges and prosecutors have taken their foot off the gas pedal, what we've seen in New York are three years of the lowest rates of violent crime in the history of New York City. So as we're seeing less enforcement, as we're seeing less I want to say someone said disappearing people, harsh prosecution and punitive remedies to simple solutions, we see that stop and we see violent crimes stop as well.
And this didn't happen by accident, it's because there's a large investment on community based solutions to create the change that communities want to see and for government to act as an ally in sustaining and supporting what that change looks like. So in my role I'm the Executive Director of the New York City Mayor's office to prevent gun violence. Our office is a coordinating office. We coordinate amongst about a network of over 60 community based organizations that we fund with city tax, levy dollars. We coordinate among city agencies where we understand that community has to be embedded in every single agency structure that has a touch point with our young people. We coordinate against -- amongst every government agency or office that we need and we pull all of those levers and resources with the understanding that public safety has to be co-produced and it has to be led by community. Because other than that, we're just being paternalistic and we're piloted into your area and we're telling you what's wrong and how you should fix it or how you should feel sorry that I have to be here to fix it and then I'll leave, and that's not sustainable and we'll find ourselves in the same situation that we find
ourselves in decade after decade after decade.

Our office's primary function is the
development and the deployment of what we call the
New York City Crisis Management System. At the core
of the Crisis Management System is the Cure Violence
Model and then supporting the Cure Violence model
and we've really put Cure Violence on several leads
where we have mental health services for all people
that we touch through that Cure Violence direct
street outreach. We have actual job training with
stipends for the individuals that we engage with
through that street outreach. We have actual job
set asides, we have New York City's only year around
employment program and the young people that we
employ are selected by the outreach workers that go
out into the community and know who are the young
people that are most likely to be harmed and/or
cause harm. We have school conflict mediation so
that we can be in schools with our young population
and I think the sister here spoke on it very well
and this is why I posed the question. Licensed
mental health counselors versus culturally competent
individuals, we're in the setting with those young
people. We're in the city jails with community
members being guides, shepards, mentors, workshops,
you name it, discharge planning, we're in the two
cities, juvenile detention, secure detention
facilities and a number of group homes close to home
facilities. So we strategically aim to be at every
touch point where there's young people that have
risk factors in our lives. We didn't just --

MS. A. ALEXANDER: I'm just going to have
to cut you off here just in the interest of time.
There's such a wealth that you're bringing. I know
there's more but --

MR. E. CUMBERBACH: Can I just end with
one thing? It will be 20 seconds. I say all that
and say there's cost savings for everything that
you're doing to the city of Detroit. So if you have
evidence that you're decreasing the amount of people
that are coming into trauma centers, there's a cost
savings that you're creating for the city. You all
advocate to the city to reinvest those cost savings
into your programs and you have funding to be
successful.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: Thank you. We have
Sheryl and then Danielle and then Bruce is going to
tie things up and then we will need to get out.

MS. C. CUBIAC: Thank you. I'm really
excited, overwhelmed. I also want to say that in
the city right now I think one of the things that is exciting is that I do see some change at a higher level that some of the policymakers, the chief judges, the police chief, community members are starting to get together and to discuss change. It feels like it's possible for the first time in a long time. And I think that there is an energy there that we can all capitalize on and work together and I also want to say that the problem solving courts and, Barbara, to your point as well is that we spend so much money on all of the different problem solving courts that I would love to see a day when every time someone walks into a court, it is a healing experience and that we're looking at what does that person need, whether it's it resources, whether it's counseling, whether it's help. And the sanctions are for those we worry about public safety and not anything else. I really feel like there's an opportunity and I really look forward to working with you and I just want to say there's so many times I have sat in a prison and heard the same thing from people who are incarcerated about how much they would like to make amends or apologize and they also are stopped from that process because of the system. And what a
terrible lost opportunity and that hopefully those
are some of the changes we can work into the system.

MS. D. SERED: I wanted to respectfully
disagree with Eric, that he's not a genius, but I
think the capacity of his office to move resources,
like government resources to the ground. Not to say
we need like large scale nonprofits are the people
that we have been elevating and talking about and
bring some of you here. So I really want to lift up
that motto as one that just not in its vision but in
its administration has figured out a way to move
money to little people with the necessary vision
that's really extraordinary. I'll offer just as a
point about what we know is possible, not just
another idealistic way but completely the Common
Justice, the organization I've directed for over a
decade diverts serious and violent crime on
stabbings, shootings, gunpoint robberies into a
restorative best as possible. We do it in
partnership with the Brooklyn District Attorney.
We've had fewr than eight percent of our people
terminated for new crimes and only a handful of
those were after our first two years of learning.
And so we know that it can be done. We know the
cornerstone that Demarco wanted. We offer also an
intervention for the person who shot him that would be likelier than any cage ever will be to prevent him from hurting somebody else. And so I say that to those of you who are planning for this sort of thing here. That part of our hope is that Common Justice becomes a proof point for other places moving toward that same kind of work. So that when they look at you and say that you're silly and how did that work and it's too much work and and not for violence, that we know that it's possible because we do it. And then the one thing that I would say from our experience and to underscore what Eric said about political will is I don't think there's been anything that's accelerated change in New York faster than the election of new prosecutors. And get you a Kim Foxx, get you an Eric Gonzalez. It's just that as we have stopped doing trials in this country, the concentration of power in the prosecutor's office is so extraordinary that when we met with an extraordinary person willing to work from the belly of the beast, the number of possibilities that open up are amazing. And the thing that has made him, both Kim and Eric Gonzalez extraordinary is that they won through organizing. I'm confident through the people that who spoke in
Detroit, that through the people who do practice
today who would answer you because of how you have
shown up for them, that you probably have that
number, I imagine exceeds the number of people who
vote in the Democratic primary in an off year. Win
it, please. And I know it's winnable. We know from
our experience it's winnable and I think we did so
much through persuasion. And Amanda Jones, learned
this from the Black Nationalist nun in Chicago which
was obviously the most reliable source of knowledge
anyone could invoke.

I think in New York many of the things
we've done have not been because of persuasion.
They've been because of power and it's totally
evident in any of us who had the honor of spending
the time in your city that you have built that power
in a way that is really enviable to us and that I'm
so excited to watch and learn from what you do.

MR. B. WESTERN: There are so many traits
in this conversation. Yes, Square One is a project
that is national in scope and in the executive
session and in the roundtable convenient we're
drawing from a national community of people who care
about reforming justice. And in this roundtable,
every six months we get to go to a place and test
our ideas and learn from the deep experience of people who are working in a local community. And every time we've done this, this is our third meeting now, I feel it's a gift that we get from all of your participation and certainly this afternoon I very much feel like we've received a gift from you and I'm just incredibly grateful to all of you for that and grateful to Amanda for orchestrating this conversation. So the dominant thing that I heard in this conversation this afternoon and it's been one that we've been grappling with all day is the relationship between system and community. I feel that was coming up over and over again. So just a couple of quick take aways: Communities can do things that the system can't do. I think it's worth trying to be specific. I think communities have much greater tolerance to risk, and the system has very little tolerance for risk. And why does the community have greater tolerance for risk? Because it's rooted in history and relationships, in personal relationships. I don't mean that in any metaphorical level. I mean people literally have known each other and having a history of dealing with each other. And the system does not have that. And so communities are woven together with a
relationship and a history that our criminal justice agencies do not have and that gives communities enormous power in solving many of the problems that face it.

The second thing that I think I heard from around the table is that communities can work and community organizations can work with enormous authenticity and legitimacy in a way that's meaningful for people who in many cases and the system is terrible at working with authenticity and legitimacy for people who are in process. Just listening to the conversation, that's sort of something I take away is the power of the community.

The final point and it was right at the surface of our previous session that Paul led is the issue of politics. I think in different ways Eric and Danielle also spoke to this. And so when I think of politics I think of two things: Organization and alliance programs. So building coalitions and organizing and politics, so much of politics boils down to those two things. And there's enormous organizing, enormous potential for organizing to happen here. But I also think that Danielle and Eric and all of us from other places around this table, all of us now Square One network,
we have to be a resource of Detroit as well, right?
We have to be part of a larger coalition. So what's
happening in New York should be part of a larger
coalition that connects to what's happening in
Detroit and to the other localities in which we know
there is so much creativity and energy and
innovation. So that's where I want to stop.

I now have got some business bullets. I
want to invite everyone to join us for our -- the
next phase of our meeting which the shuttle is going
to Wright Museum. We have our keynote reception
which starts at 6:30. It's a totally fascinating
topic. I feel we're all ready for it. We're going
it think about, enjoy, celebrate the relationship
between the arts and the Project of Justice and I
feel we're all probably ready for that at this
point. Thank you so much.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: Thank you guys so
much. I feel really excited coming out of this
conversation. I knew coming into this that we had
everything we needed to do the work that would make
future generations proud. Thank you all.

(Proceedings adjourned about 5:51 P.M.)
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MR. J. TRAVIS: We're going to do a few things this morning that intended to help us make --
get best value out of our last day together. I made a commitment yesterday to allow observers to encourage us to think about things that we perhaps haven't given sufficient attention to, and I'll do that in a second. We always like to start the day with reflections from the day before, reflections in the sense of two questions, what's important that we want to underscore that we should focus on today that we took yesterday or the day before and relatedly what have we not covered.

So I want to do that as well and I want to also start with the version of where we started, which is that we ask each other or make commitments to each other, things that we wanted to see our hopes for our time together, and that was the first assignment from me to you, so just take a moment to express your reasons for being here, your hopes for our time together and what you thought would be of value to you by being here at the roundtable.
So here's what we're going to do this morning: I'm going to ask observers just to throw in some ideas we may not have covered and then I'll give you a version of that same assignment, which is to ask you what do you want to make sure we talk about before we leave, is it something that we're missing. So you have some time to think about that. We have some of our trustee observers here that might want to say something. If you do, stand up and introduce yourself.

MR. D. NORTHAM: I'm Dennis Northam. I have a background in public health, community development and family life in Detroit. And there were four issues that I identified at 2:30 this morning when I was trying to sleep.

MR. J. TRAVIS: When this morning?

MR. D. NORTHAM: About 2:30, 3 o'clock. Just get up and write it down. So anyway I'm going to try to sum this up very concisely. One, there is a challenge that I haven't heard spoken to very clearly about the attention between massive long-term multi-trillion dollar investment that we all want to solve some basic underlying social problems, that's one thing.

The other thing is, we want homicides to
come down now and can a focused investment be put
together on that separate from the other. And can
we have these two issues on their own separate time
lines. Secondly, isn't the reduction of lethal
violence in our urban communities itself address
this issue. If we could do that, wouldn't that be
an overwhelming contribution to social justice,
whether or not we're simultaneously solving every
other problem known to man.

Thirdly, some of the strategies that have
been shown to be effective in reducing lethal
violence have involved very intensive work by
especially targeted groups of police and
interventionists. That kind of work requires sort
of an enhanced degree of intrusiveness of the police
in the very communities where these problems are
concentrated, the very communities which have great
sensitivity about the role of police in those
communities. Can a social compact be worked out so
that this can happen and we can go forward?

Fourthly, the social political decisions
that have to be made, the kind of consensus that we
have to develop at that broad societal political
level requires a language beyond a touchy feely
thing, a mutual respect thing, the politically
correct highly sensitive language that we've been
talking about here. It's the language of public
health, for example. We need to talk in documenting
this problem about years of potential life loss,
that's something we can calculate.

In Michigan I've looked up the
calculations. We get 2000 years of potential life
loss for minority males in this state per hundred
thousand population per year compared to 93 for
white males, okay. That's one way of telling the
story that other people can understand. We need to
talk -- be comfortable with economic language, yes,
a human life is a human life, but there are methods
for the various people to come up with for saying
this is the social cost in dollars to society for a
homicide, and those estimates raise from 7 million
to 17 million. Multiply that by the number of
homicides, you see the net cost that we're already
experiencing for these problems, let alone, talking
about the corrections budget and so on.

In Michigan numbers, that's three and a
half billion a year cost to society using the
minimum estimate, and then the budgetary language is
the return on investment. If we spent X millions of
dollars, what would be the return, so those issues I
feel belong at the discussion.

MR. J. TRAVIS: You did good work at 2:30 in the morning. Any other observer comments.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good morning. Two quick notes, observations, one was ironically the gender violence conversation was the one that was most shortened in the context of the other conversations that we had. And the conversation that had opposed that conversation went over. So from the observer's table was we had enough time. And so it was just interesting in the context of making that the seat of our foundation we still kind of bulldozed over it in a way.

The second observation is that it doesn't seem like we talked enough about resources and if we have we talked about the same types of resources we always talk about which are in some ways still state run, state controlled, 501(c)(3) dollars are state controlled dollars. So when can we have the conversation, particularly within the philanthropic space, of what does it look like to be more innovative about the type of money that is raised? And what does that investment look like? What does that mean and how important is it to solve the issue because it might mean different types of businesses,
not social entrepreneurship investment dollars.

Different type of money, some very interesting risks and not any type of government, or 501(c)(3), (4), anything that has a tax code associated with it. So it would be just interesting to talk about, are philanthropic institutions bold enough to even take a look at their charters and say, what more can we do to actually apply some real resources and flexible risk for resources, much of what the community actually wants to be able to address these issues.

MR. J. TRAVIS: And from behind me and to this side, any observer comments, questions? Seeing none. So here's the assignment to everybody at the table, it's a two part assignment and everybody gets to play in this game, so I'm not going to ask a few people to step out. First is what have you taken away from the past two days that you want to underscore which is important and many of you have come up to me and Bruce and others and said this to us. But it's important to share -- reflect, what have you -- the one thing that you learned that's different or that was elevated in importance that you want to continue to underscore, that's the first question and just in a sentence.
The second is a different question, what do you want to make sure we talk about today before we break, have we missed something or haven't given it enough attention. Maybe set an agenda for some of our discussions so that we want to leave today feeling like, the first two days were great because we learned something and that's the first question, and today you want to make sure we don't leave without having talked about something important.

So just take a minute with those two questions and then we'll start with -- Ron Davis will be the first, just so you know.

So when I call on you please answer both questions.

MR. R. DAVIS: So, good morning everyone. Let me start by saying thank you for allowing me to participate in these great discussions and the work of this room. What I would say what I got out of these last two days. Would be that when we talk about reimagining justice, I think one of the things that I didn't think of greatly is that, I think the first step to that is that we have to basically first reimagine ourselves and step away from our own successes and failures. That we're still very much driven by our own experiences and until we can step
away from that, and I'm finding myself struggling with a lot of concepts we might experience telling me otherwise. But we need to push away from that to reimagine.

So, I think what I got out of the two days is people pushing the envelope, pushing the ways of thinking that do make us uncomfortable but I think the fact that I am uncomfortable is probably good thing. The one area I would like for us to focus on and this is just probably technicality is to make sure that we have a glossary of terms in which we are using that we agree what the terms mean. The interchange between violence and force, and some other words and concepts we just need to make sure that we all mean the same thing. It's not a question if they're right or wrong, is at least if we're talking about it, we should know. And I think other people have brought that up. I think I would like to leave us and most importantly those that are watching, making sure they understand exactly what we talked about and not to be misinterpreted.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Katharine.

MS. K. HUFFMAN: One thing that I've learned, I've learned a lot in the last couple of days but one thing that I learned that I really am
thinking a lot about is the power of neurobiology
and of our actual physical brains to get in the way
of some of the things that we've been wanting to do
but also a potential opportunity for grappling with
violence and the way that people respond to
violence, heal from violence. I feel like there's a
lot more that I want to think about and learn about
there as a potential part of our path forward.

And one thing I would love for us to talk
a little more about is, you know, we've started to
think some and we've heard about some examples in
Detroit and New York and otherwise where there is a
real change going on and communities are finding and
taking and in some cases being supported in having a
new role in creating safety and in creating health.
And what I want to talk a little more about if we
can is how is that something that becomes a
sustained shift in power and not a short-term swing
of the pendulum that will swing back.

MR. J. LUPPINO-ESPOSITO: Actually I had
some thoughts on this I was thinking about this
morning that are similar to this and kind of touch
on what Ron said and also what some of our observers
said as well. I think Peter mentioned it
specifically yesterday but particularly when we
started the conversation yesterday and David said
the word, disadvantaged communities.

    I will readily admit that it took a good
20, 25 minutes until I think Daniel finally said,
I'll say, impressed; that's the word. I didn't
know, right. And I think Peter, you know, made it
clear yesterday, and I want to underscore that, that
there are a lot of allies that are trying to
understand this stuff because as far as I remember
that was okay like ten minutes ago. But -- and I
thought that was all right, I really didn't
understand what was going on.

    So I appreciate that Peter mentioned
that, and I was just trying to collect my thoughts
on it yesterday to figure out how to say it best.

    And at the same time I want to underscore
that, until our first observer said it as well, is
that the language that we use in here, obviously
somebody coming from the right side of the aisle, I
don't hear a lot of this, right. Everyone's trying
to get better at it, but I don't hear it a lot.

    And I think when I go out sort of
especially when I'm on the hill or talking to people
who are on the right side of the aisle, if I explain
things the way we explain them in here, they will
literally not understand what I'm saying to them.

It goes a lot further if I can say certain words, if I can just say, yes, if we change this then murderers will get out of prison, right. You know if I could say this will help defendants, that's a big difference.

And it's also very empowering. I think that's something I under want to underscore to kind of transition to the second half thing I want to do today, is talk about some of the other allies that are out there, but because maybe we are literally not speaking the same language we're not going to be able to work together with them.

And I think that's a problem, right, because for me I'm going to get into the technical, legal aspects of it with due process. To call someone a defendant is actually very helpful, because the earlier I can call someone a defendant the earlier they can get more rights attached to them when they go through the prison system, right, through from when they're first picked up, if they're a defendant that's very helpful.

Along with that I also want to point out sort of going back to what you mentioned earlier, you know sort of what our hopes were for the event
as we came in. Mine was to try to focus on sort of nontraditional private or nongovernmental solutions. And I really thought I was going to have to really push on that, but that came up very naturally. And I think that's something we need to really need to focus on because again a lot of talk about shrinking the government, talk about not liking unions. Some people are talking about maybe taking up arms, that's a very split difference here, right. But, hey, you start to sound like a lot of republicans I know. So let's think about ways we can work with nontraditional allies in this space and speak that same language to them, as well.

MS. B. RITCHIE: I think for me one of the learnings has come from the process. I mentioned this to Jeremy and then also to Bruce that I think this is one of the first meetings that I've been in in a long time where academics and nonacademics had an equal place at the table. In fact, I feel like the leadership of the expertise of people who don't work inside universities has been very moving to me, and it's shaped the conversation in a very, very profoundly important way. I appreciate whatever happened, and I assume that that was intentional to make that
And so I'm leaving both with some ideas about how to have more meaningful collaborations, more kind of real talk. I'm leaving very moved by what's happening in Detroit and the leadership of that is here and kind of thinking about openness to different kind of linkages.

I think in terms of what we've missed, and I don't know if it's possible to do today, I want to echo that I think there's something still a little imprecise about our definition of violence. And I think it's not nuanced enough, it's not broad enough. That, of course, is linked to the questions that I think I was trying to raise in my paper, but even beyond that.

I think we -- and I think the imprecision is both a practical problem but I also think it's a political problem. And when we talk about reimagining justice, which I know we want to do, I think we have to have some political clarity about what violence means in that.

And the second part of that, I think, is linked to something that has also been imprecise for me, which is the relationship between short-term and long-term strategies. The vision of what we want as
a long-term strategy, I think we sometimes walk up to, but then we slip back to short-term strategies that will help us kind of recover or deal with whatever we have to in the next day or so. So I want something about that.

MR. J. TRAVIS: David.

MR. D. HUREAU: So I'll echo what Beth said about the quality, the space and the process, what Beth said, so thank you.

As far as what I've taken away, I think I have an appreciation for the need to do more reimagining of the relationship between state and community. And we have models for that. I think they're just more models, there's much more reimagining to do. The folks in this room have some great ideas.

As far as what I would like to discuss today -- I'm not sure if it needs to be discussed today but I want to see more discussion around it, more thinking around it, is this question: What institution, what level, right, is there responsibility for responding to community trauma and what does accountability look like in that responsibility?

MS. S. McGRATH: Thank you. So I've
learned a lot and just from an asset lens, I think
what's been reinforced is that there's -- we know a
lot, actually. There's a lot of knowledge and we
heard about what doesn't work, not necessarily
within the systems that we're accustomed to working
in, I think, and that's what's been revealing.

But I think it would be a productive way
to move forward to -- Alia and I were talking about
this yesterday that to really do an exercise when
we're thinking about what do we agree upon, what do
we know works and where can we agree and start from
there. It's okay that we disagree on a lot of
things, because that's how we can actually move
forward.

What I would like to talk more about --
and I don't know if it's today or a continuing
conversation because I think this is the beginning,
I think it's scratching the surface and this
conversation with these kinds of people at the table
needs to continue. And I do believe the criminal
justice field is ready for it, but we have to keep
it going is that tension between the immediate need
to reduce violence and the long-term process of
reform, of reforming the system, our system.

And I would love to talk more about the
alliances that are necessary to do that. Ron mentioned yesterday, I believe, what that looks like and what it means to bring different allies to the table and the role of law enforcement and how we can get to a place where we are aligned and moving forward to reduce violence.

MR. A. LUCKY: Thank you. First of all, I thank you for inviting me. I will say this has been very informative to me. I've learned a lot in a generation of transmission of violence to a gender specific violence lens that normally don't come with our work. So getting that information is something that we'll definitely start thinking about in terms of our work.

What I want to see is more solutions, solution-oriented type of discussions when we talk about what we're doing. And as I said yesterday, marrying that with active things.

One of the other things I would like to see is more truth in a real respect in a marriage of what Beth said, universities with people on the streets, it has to be a true respect even in the way that we interact with each other. Because a lot of times body language, all that stuff matters. You can't say I love you, that I'm for you, but your
actions show different. So when you really have a
radical influence on people, you push the envelope.

I thought it was very impressive to see
that brother Ray brang all those soldiers from the
streets here on numerous occasions, you know, a
different group. That says to me that that brother
has the key to the streets, that he's doing work.
So that kind of work has to be uplifted and really
integrated, not just in observance, but integrated
into this. We can't -- there's no ammunition, but
we have to interact with the people that we study.
We got to really interact with the people that we
study. We have to really interact with the people
that's on the ground that's doing the work, because
they are the closest to the issue. And so seeing
that is very important, and I think we'll get there.

But also the collaboration, having the
types of collaboration that speaks to that real
collaboration what we respect one another, what we
really trying to learn from one another, what we
really practicing radical empathy for one another.

So that's what I'd like to see. But I
think overall this has been great, it's been a real
great experience for me. I got a lot of information
that I'm going to take back. I'm normally not this
quiet, but I intentionally came to listen. And I appreciate all the work that each and every last one of you is doing. I hope that we can connect, we connect, intentionally connect with each other. I love to bring some of your to the real D, that's Dallas. I'd love to do something so y'all can cheer for America's team. Making an offer. Thank you.

MR. J. TRAVIS: That's our cowboy. So what happens is like this. We started the process, it started with Ron, people go around like this. I got to lay back now. So I'd like to mix it up before I give everybody the opportunity to call the next person, that's kind of fun. You guys get to call the next person after you.

We're going to start with Jahmal. I'm not saying anything about you, like you were dozing off. I'm just going to make sure everybody's on their toes.

MR. J. COLE: As an activist I feel very empowered listening -- first of all, reading the white papers and listening to the academics. The are very effective communicators, and now I feel like I can make that information palatable to the people that I work with. I'm excited about that challenge. I'm very inspired, it's been great.
One of the things I would like for us to do, if there was like a Facebook group created and we all joined and stayed connected, it would be easy like that. If somebody writes a book or has a presentation, we could all see it real time.

MS. F. MUHAMMAD: I was one of those people hanging back, I was drinking my tea, enjoying. First, I just want to acknowledge, you've seen me in and out of the room, there's been some crisis, people passed away, so I apologize for that. Just trying to get present in this space.

It's already been said, I found this space to be really profound and the attention to trauma-informed practices, the healing space, the inclusion of community, other voices, the accessibility, all those things are part of the engineering of the new. We have to actually enact processes that train us to be collaborative.

They're not embedded.

Structural racism means that we are always separate, we don't have shared language because we've not had the ability to be together to actually wrestle with language together; and these are the spaces to do that, as messy as they are. So I appreciate that process. We need to continue.
Not only does Square One have the license on this, we can do this, which is sort of a call to action for that.

I have been thinking a bunch about this question about academia and what the wisdom is on the streets and how you actually ensure that there's accountability in the way that the people who research this work do it. What is their community or research, what standards make sense here?

And the burden of bringing rigor to research itself, there is a methodology, there is an understanding of what sorts of research is going to actually help mobilize people. I don't think research is the end all, be all, but I think it's a critical piece.

So I give tremendous gratitude to those who are toiling and really thinking about this and articulating, I think, to advocates, activists, folks on the ground what they need. I think we are burdened by the fact that we have not had the significant investment in research on violence, right, we talked about that. And so I'm wrestling with that. How do we build new structures for accountability in the ways that we build this collaboration so that it's honest and still rigorous
and ensures that we're moving. How do we continue and articulate what's next?

MR. R. WINANS: Good morning. Jeremy, when you said you were passing to Jahmal to make sure everybody was on their toes. Can I reach out and get everybody to engage with me for a minute. I ask everybody to stand up and this is super intentional, I promise.

Turn to the person next to you and while you're looking at them, I want you to look them in the eyes, dead in their eyes, and I want you to recognize and notice everything you don't like about them. Please have a seat.

Now, people are still chuckling, laughing. If we be honest about that thing, it was embarrassing. Don't nobody want anybody looking at them dead in their face trying to figure out everything they don't like about them. So when we talking about being intentional, about language, at risk, oppressed, community ain't oppressed. Don't nobody want to be labeled at risk, right.

Sitting here and my reflection of the last couple days, it forced me to think about what Amanda said five generations from now. I brought my wife with me today because when I think about the
five generations from now, I got a grandson that
just turned nine months this morning, and I think
about his children and his grandchildren and
everything else.

I think about when I was labeled at risk,
grew up in this community over here, we used to call
this the Cass Corridor, I came out the Jeffries
Projects. And today we can sit here and we can
celebrate, and we can talk and we can laugh.

So in my reflection, a couple things that
I reflected on, and I got to be clear that I hate
that my brother Paul Butler is not here today,
because I do not agree with the language of
oppressed people when we talk about the
neighborhoods. I intentionally brought neighborhood
folks here, I intentionally brought the neighborhood
talk here. Why? Because they need to be able to
see what's possible because I provide a level of
hope. And I'm being completely honest, this ain't
nothing new to me, these tables, I'm sorry, they're
not. But they new to them young men and they need
to see that I get in the rooms and still represent
them, and I'm not going to apologize about it.

One of the things that I did not see
about D life, yeah, we got the DMC, but Wayne State
is also our research partner. So we understand the
value of research, but we made -- myself and my
partner Calvin, made an intentional decision to walk
away from the university because they wouldn't allow
us -- and we understood it, they would not allow us
to service those young people y'all seen yesterday,
none of them, not in a real way.

And they told us, you got a decision to
make, and they fired both of us together at the same
damn time. And I told my wife, I ain't got no job
but we going to be all right. The next day we got
blessed because somebody else believed in us and our
mission.

So for two and a half years we laid low
and we just built what we built. The university
came back and said, what the f**k did we do, let's
get them back by any means necessary, right.

So it's possible, but I got to state this
because we in the D, and Antong, I want to come to
the D so I can show you that we can put the D in
Dallas, baby.

And with that being said and talking to
the community, here's what I know. What y'all saw
yesterday with the city of Detroit and the
community, you ain't going to see nowhere else, not
no Pastor Barry, it ain't going to happen, I know that for a fact. I've been there searching for it. I'm always looking for what people is not doing, not what they doing. You not going to see Mama Barb at the tables, right, dealing with formerly incarcerated saying, hey listen, I need you to go through this process with me, right. And I'm not saying it's not possible. If it's possible in Detroit, it's possible anywhere.

But I understand that we're the largest African-American city in the country. So with that being said, let me just do a quick rundown real quick.

I addressed them, I'm making a commitment after talking to the community, Pastor Barry, the mothers and the young people. Detroit will take the lead, right, with Amanda's leadership to pilot the first reconciliation justice community, right. Amanda, we appreciate your leadership. You got us, whatever it is that you need.

To my -- I heard Paul mention this and like I said, David know my heart. When we talk about police and community relationships, man this thing got to change. That cease fire piece, man, that didn't work, not in the city of Detroit. I
believe that was good, but for the city of Detroit it don't work. We seen more people get indicted and more harm being done to legitimize the law enforcement that wasn't ready.

When we talk about evidence-based best practices sometimes we got to understand when we building out these models, we need to keep our evidence right there in our own community until we perfect it and then invite others to come and see our work versus us trying to take it and scale it across the country because we chasing research.

We got five IRBs running right now, five of them, but every last -- every person that's contributing to that either co-authored or they incentavized. The judges, Ms. Fox, I appreciate what you do, we need more of you, like seriously, right. But Keith, you triggered it all, brother, when you talked about the choices. A lot of them young people didn't even know that they had a decision, man. I told you I didn't know I had a decision.

And lastly, my man E, what you doing for now, Detroit ain't ready for that right now but we inspired to get there, bro. You know what I'm saying? We're inspired to get there. I come in
love and I come in peace and I come in harmony. If we going to do this thing, let's do it the right way. That's it.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Celia, share you hope for toay.

MS. C. COLON: Well, I appreciate this space, I appreciate and everybody's thoughts. I'm very observant. We've gotten together like this is the first time that I've actually been in the space with academics. It's usually me entertaining a whole room of people getting retriggered and retraumatized most of the time, right.

And to truly, truly move our community forward it's really going to take the people that understand and -- which are the academics, to really understand the expertise that we have and we hold because of the true experiences that you guys read about, what we go through, and really, really value that space because a lot of times our expertise is not valued.

And so I appreciate that here, you know, we're all I feel at an equal space. You might have a Ph.D through a university, I have one, too, but it comes from the streets, okay.

What I would like to see, because I've
been doing this since I've been home, I've been home
for 18 years and in the space for 17 years because
this is not work, this is my life. And I know that
in every space that I go to, I go to spaces that I'm
very uncomfortable in and I share things that I'm
very uncomfortable about, things that are hidden in
the dark. Because until we really talk about them
things and make everybody uncomfortable, true
transformation doesn't happen.

And I would like to know, like Jahmal
said, I go to a lot of these spaces and I meet
amazing, brilliant people. But then, you know, we
maybe just see each other in a year or two or three,
but we never truly, truly mobilize our strength and
our resources and our thoughts and our ideas. It
just stays here in this space and dies here, and I'm
tired of that, you know.

I want to see what is the long-term plan,
what is that action plan and how are we going to
move that agenda through community and through all
our social leaders and academic leaders and the
people, the one percent. When do we get to shake
them and move them out of that one percent and
really create a space where environmental harm,
structural harm and social control doesn't exist any
more, right.

Because one thing that we haven't spoken about, and I think that needs to be talked about, is that generation harm that's caused by all of that that I just mentioned. And right now we're not talking about the alarming rate of suicides and children of color and where their mental health status is, you know.

It's killing our future leaders, it's killing our communities, and when do they get to come up and be in this space and talk about how they feel about social control and the environmental harms that exist in their community, because I'm from the south side of Chicago which if anybody has really looked up that history, I belong to what's called the Black Belt that was put there intentionally. So that's my thoughts.

MR. D. WEBSTER: I guess maybe the most important take away that I have is that there's fairly deep distrust of academics. And I wrote down some other things, you know, that are other takeaways for me. But if I sort of rank them right there at the top is this distrust of academics and the take away is we've got to fix that. That's a long conversation here. But that's maybe the most
important take away.

I guess related to that as far as what I hope we will potentially talk about before we leave is -- I don't know the best way to express that, but sort of different ways of knowing. You know I come from an environment of there are standards of how you determine what's true and what's not true, right. It was pretty powerful to me over these last few days, the power of art and imagination, a different way of knowing, a different depth of knowing. But -- and then there's the experience that, you know, so many others have talked about.

There are times when my way of knowing and my standards of knowing collide, collide with other ways of knowing. And maybe again that's another conference or two to kind of sort all that out because again, I've been doing this stuff for a while and I've worked very closely with people doing programs with their heart and sole and giving their best that they know is having an impact and then my way of knowing doesn't always align with that. So what do you do with that.

It's uncomfortable, but I feel like we can't run away from that. All groups need to wrestle with that and come to terms and I've used
the same methodology to evaluate, for example, safe streets near my house in Baltimore. First generation so it's some good positive effects. I did exactly the same thing over a longer period of time. That showed, you know, it's a sort of disappointing effect, deep, deep distrust from the people doing the program. Like, what kind of agenda you got? I did exactly the same thing and you loved me and I have to get all this funding with one approach of my way of knowing and then I'm doing the same thing and it doesn't look so good so it must be wrong and I can't trust you anymore.

So these are hard things to wrestle with and what is the meaning of the different ways of knowing. So I'll leave it at that.

MS. K. CARTER-JACKSON: This is a lot y'all. These past two days have been a lot for me and I've been trying to take everything in. One, I just want to say thank you for the intentionality behind this entire effort to put something like this together. It takes a lot of carefulness and thought to think about even these which I just figured out what they were yesterday. That's genius!

Between hopes, choice and between all the other ways in which we've been just very intentional
and careful about how we express ourselves, I think it's just really meaningful for me because I've been in places where none of that intention is there, none of that care is there. So for that I'm grateful. I think I'm also grateful because nine times out of ten I'm only speaking to academics or college students and I don't get large opportunities to interact with other people that are doing drastically different things but yet we're all working toward a same or similar goal.

And that for me it is really encouraging because it makes me feel like I'm not trying to swallow the ocean alone and that there are other people that are doing this work and in different ways and in valuable ways and that is really encouraging to me and I've seen that with everyone that I've gotten a chance to interact with. I took a lot actually yesterday from Paul Butler and Ray and one of the things I thought was that, you know, it's not this split of this or that. It really is both, it has to be both.

And I think listening to Paul one of the things that I took away was sort of like, okay, so the community, I see how the community is there and necessary in order to survive, you cannot survive
without the community. But one of the things that Paul was saying is that, if you want to thrive, if we want access, if we want equity, if we want systemic structural change, you do need the state for that, you do need policy changes.

And I see how both of these work hand in hand. I think going forward, you know, I'm a historian, like the past is my road map, so I always look to the past to give me sort of direction going forward. You know, when I look at the abolitionist movement, one of the things that encourages me is that they were a completely diverse group, they were black, they were white, they were rich, they were poor, some were poor and free, some were fugitives, there was no typical abolitionist.

There was no prototype for what it meant to be an abolitionist. Anyone could be an abolitionist. You didn't have to have capital, you didn't have to be a slave. And I see that in this room that we all have this diversity of experiences that we can bring to the table and that is really encouraging to me to see that. You don't have to be in or of or around to be a part of the solution and I think that is good.

I do think though that sometimes I'm
discouraged because I feel like someone who is one, a woman, and someone who is black, I'm fatigued by having to be responsible for the racism that's inflicted on me or the sexism that's inflicted on me. I find that it is -- when we talk about accountability and we talk about who is responsible. I don't think it's necessarily black people's problem to solve racism, right. White people have to do that. White people have to step up to the plate. White people have to be able to relinquish their power. And I also understand that power contains nothing that demeans, like and that's where black people come into play and politics come into play.

But I do think that, you know when I'm looking at the abolitionist movement I think about how all throughout the period there was no new piece of legislation that benefited them. Every piece of new law, policies that came out favored slave holders. And it wasn't until the civil war and it wasn't until the 13th and 14th and 15th amendment that you got federal change.

And then it wasn't until a hundred years later where you get like the civil rights movement, the voting rights act and the equal housing act. I
mean, I think about that and I'm like, oh God, I can't wait another hundred years for something else to change. I think we really need to be thinking about policy, yes the community is so important but we need policy changes at the local level, at the state level, at the national level and even more so at the international level.

Think about the things that Juan was saying, the things that happened in it country have larger implications for what happens outside and in other places. And so, I got a lot on my mind. I got a lot of notes.

But I'd still like to say there's a lot that encouraged me and that I've taken away but there's also a lot of work to do and a lot of risk involved in that work and I think that's something that I'm constantly grappling with is how much am I willing to make myself uncomfortable or make others uncomfortable in order to make those changes.

MR. J. TRAVIS: We're going to mix it up again a little bit and Beverly you're up. And then we've decided, Eric, we'll be coming your way.

MS. B. TILLERY: I will just say ditto to what everyone else's sentiment was about their appreciation for this space. It definitely, it has
helped me think about how to even structure some of my work going forward. So one of the things that struck me the most was the conversation yesterday afternoon with the folks from Detroit and seeing manifested a collective movement that was de-siloed, that was really seemed like it was both sort of organically and intentionally created where people are coming together across communities, across organizations really raised a lot of things for me.

To Rays point, what makes that work here and how can we get more of that in other places. Because I do feel like what we need is a concerted and decentralized movement where we can all be working collaboratively. And something that somebody said about -- I don't know if this was the phrase, but I took it as, you know, sort of thinking about the non-profit industrial complex and what do we need to be doing to -- as much as we can to decolonize, decapitalize our work so that we are relying less on competition and individualism. That felt like that was a piece of that puzzle that was coming together.

And for me one of the things that we haven't talked about that relates to that is how do we -- and also relates to what Katharine said first
was how do we not mobilize in crisis, which is what
I feel like our organizations is doing all the time.
And we talk about it but we don't know how to get
out of it.

And so what is a sustained movement that
is not based in crisis, and I think it needs to be
based in our vision for what can be. But I don't
feel like that gets articulated enough so how do we
get to that so we can be painting a picture for
people about what this looks like. So some of what
I was seeing from folks in Detroit was kind of
starting to get me there.

And then one thing I wanted to just say
about the definition of violence which we
organizationally have a broad definition of violence
but we also struggle with it because we are also
seeing the internalization of that becoming kind of,
I don't know, bastardized in a way where now
violence is being used for everything. And so part
of my struggle too with this definition is how it's
being used as a weapon against each other in
community and I don't know exactly what to do with
that. But I just wanted to put that out there.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Just mindful that time is
expanding to incorporate lots of thoughts and we do
have things we want to get to. So if you could be concise the remainder of our participation, that will be great, Peter.

MR. P. HAMMER: Well first I would like to express the gratitude others have expressed. The things that struck me the most was this combination of the citing and can the state transform itself with the first discussion we had about this notion of being forced to get change and I think there's an interesting set of discussions that can be triggered from that.

The thing I would like to see more of, I wish we had a little bit more time to actually process the discussion we had about Detroit. And I think very intentionally so we were looking at successes and models but there are ways in which things are happening in Detroit that I think are also pretty different, different challenges exist here. One of those is the notion that in Detroit and other cities, not Chicago, not New York, the lack of density is an important issue.

So how do we think about the exercise of social control in areas of abandonment. In many respects I believe that the abandonment itself is a means of social control. If you think historically
when a neighborhood was valued, then what you had is social control being physical and violent. What you're seeing now in Detroit and I would imagine other cities of declining population, you're seeing abandonment of neighborhoods in the form of social control.

And something we didn't highlight yesterday was a very important report that was put out called the Project Green Light in Detroit. Which is a mass surveillance system now being put out in the public private partnership which is now being combined with forms of facial recognition. So we have the idea of abandonment as a means of social control and then relatively lower cost for the technology to be surveilling folks to make sure they're behaving they way that you want them too.

So as I say, there's a lot of amazing things happening in Detroit which is why you should all come back. But that I think purports itself for further discussion on thinking about what that means as well as core community activism around that. There's been some really amazing community education and push back and exercise of power trying to change those facts on the ground.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you. Thank you for
brevity. Micere.

MS. M. KEELS: Thanks, I just have a couple of things. One is to say it kind of struck me for a moment when you said the distrust of academics is real and a thing we had to grapple with. I had to go like oh, yeah, that's right. And the reason was because when I got my job in Chicago, somebody said, it's not the worst thing that could happen to you, because I was so upset about it when I got tenured somebody said, now you get to have this job for the rest of your life, I actually cried.

I was like no, because of the way that those titles can separate us from being able to actually access communities because it comes with -- it can be such a barrier to developing trust.

And I guess the rest is largely a conversation with Ray and it's about the issues of language. And as Ken said, we are playing an inside outside game and that's what a lot of our language is often about, playing that inside outside game. And being able to have enough trust to be able to say, when I say an oppressed community and I'm talking to you, this is what I mean and being able to know that when I say an oppressed community over
here and the more, kind of, you are the state and 
this is what I mean, but I need you to know what I 
mean when I say over here because this is the 
relationship that I really need to keep and maintain 
in the work that I want to do.

And so what I want to say is one of the 
things that came out for me was shifting from using 
disadvantaged community to oppressed community and 
to say, I'm going to use oppressed community and I'm 
going to use it because what I want to do in terms 
of the conversation that happened yesterday, is to 
keep calling out the fact the role of the state in 
creating and maintaining the resource constraints on 
the communities that we want to work with and want 
to try to change.

But I need you to know that that's why 
I'm using oppressed community. It's not because the 
community is not strong and cannot do a lot of work 
for itself but I want that community to get all of 
the advantages that my advantaged community gets. 
And so what those other communities do is organize 
themselves in ways to get as much resources as 
possible from the state.

So I don't want your community to heal 
itslself, I want your community to make the state give
it the resources to account for all of the reasons
why it's placed it and kept it in the position it's
in. So I want us to understand that that's why when
I turn this way I'm using oppressed community. Just
how that we need to be both intentional about
language and intentional that we've communicated why
we're using language in particular ways.

MR. E. JONES: Speaking of the --
mentioned here, distrust and researchers, I find
that interesting because I don't know if you're all
aware, there's some distrust in the criminal justice
system that we see. It just comes down to it's
distrust in systems right, from financial
institutions, educational, the medical field and
obviously criminal justice where there's been the
largest impact.

For me, what I've really taken away so
far is when my mind has clearly been stretched. In
a lot of areas and that's always good, that's always
healthy and that only happens when we're all outside
our comfort zone a little bit.

What I would like to see is perhaps our
minds stretch a little bit more. And I'm going to,
kind of, give you some prompting things to think
about.
One is I do believe, for example, the triple bottom line that many of us talk about where we do the cease fire, for example and for us it works. A lot of the right program fidelity has to be the right people have to be along. But I think when we talk about the triple bottom line that we've been working a lot in Stockton and I think we can all agree with the triple bottom line. What is that? It's reducing homicides, violent crime, it's reducing arrests, incarceration and it's increasing trust in systems within the criminal justice system.

When we're all going for that -- they're all related too, I think we know that. So for example we have the stocking lines for equity, which is myself, the district attorney, public defender, we're all on the same page to take this trust work and move it into the entire criminal justice system. Community is at the forefront obviously. In fact, how did we even get to do cease fire again, we did it once before and we didn't stick with it correctly and it failed. This was years ago.

Why did we do it again because the community came forward and said you need to do this, and their voice was really loud. It was actually one of the peak organizations that said you're going
to do this work and we're going to do it with you and that's what kicked it off for us.

And we've been doing it right and we're seeing results. I would also like to stretch our minds and prompt -- throw this prompt out, too.

Yesterday or the day before, police unions were painted as bad people and I didn't say anything at the time. Hey, I'm management, they're labor, we disagree on things, there's a certain relationship there.

What did we do? We labeled them right, all as one group. I would just say this. I wouldn't be able to do the racial reconciliation work I've done in Stockton without their leadership. They're an informal leadership in the department, I'm the formal leadership. There's got to be a leadership sandwich to actually infuse things into culture and to make systems change.

When I talk about racial reconciliation, that's work I was doing for the national initiative for building community trust and justice really quickly. I go forward to -- I started first with my communities of color where we made a black leadership council and key groups like that and made the acknowledgements that -- of the harms that
policing has done in America, going back from slave
cfabs, to enforcing Jim Crow laws, through civil
ights, suppression of rights, the violent acts that
were done to more recent injustices, right?

And that cracked open meaningful dialogue
in my communities where town halls weren't working,
regular community meetings weren't working. That
cracked open some amazing dialogue that's really
changed the trust dynamic in Stockton. One thing
that made that successful was police union
leadership was there with me. If they were to
undermined those efforts and I've seen that happen
in other jurisdictions, it wouldn't have been nearly
as successful.

So guess what's happening now too? They
are doing -- when I say they, line level police
officers, officers out on the streets, not just the
leaders of the department, are out doing these same
discussions.

So I just don't want us to write off
police unions as bad people that are always in the
way. Let's use them to our benefit. Thanks.

MR. K. WATTLEY: Good morning, I've taken
away at least three fairly specific things. One was
understanding the science behind why talking through
and about traumatic experiences helps us move past it. That was -- for the work I do, that was really -- I want to just go right back to work after we finish because I need to jump on that. And another thing is just the importance of really supporting local solutions in a way that hasn't always happened.

And the last thing is about importance of using very specific and clear language in what we're trying to communicate and trying to combat. Terms like even violence, we don't all agree what violence is or trauma or healing when we throw that around a lot and we pursue that but we don't all agree what that looks like.

On that point, something that Joe mentioned, I have to pick up on which was we talked about how using a term like defendant is critical in the early stage because with that comes a lot of rights and protections, due process protections. The people I work with, my conversations inside a parole hearing are with prosecutors and parole commissioners, helping them understand this man was a defendant 30 years ago. He's Mr. Jones and that's his family we're trying to get him home to. It's a very different conversation and context is
everything. But these kind of conversations allow us to consider those different perspectives and I really value that.

One thing I would say, and I'd like to see more of, this really came up really clearly last night and Daniel mentioned this earlier, we are trying to reimagine justice. We are trying to create something that has never really existed. And what's missing is a much more prominent role of the artist who can see something none of us can see and I want to see them be sort of in the middle of this process.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Kim, reflections on the roundtable discussion and your take aways.

MS. K. FOX: I just want to echo your appreciation for the diversity of this space. I sit at a lot of roundtables, but they're usually just academics, just the community, just policymakers, so there are a lot of these tables happening without this mix.

What I also appreciate, having sat in those different tables, is that they will have, I think because there is a push, to have someone with experience at the table. And sometimes it feels we're a performance, it feels obligatory, it feels
like let's do this because we should.

And I say this to my colleagues here in academics in particular. When there's an emersion in a certain piece of work and there's a sense that we understand this community and we bring someone to affirm what we're saying. That happens in those spaces and so my challenge when we talk about the distrust, even for folks who are not in that space, this did not feel like performance. This did not feel like these are people who are bolstering hypotheses that we have made about our work and they're going to come reaffirm what we say.

That being said, my hope for moving forward is that when we convene such tables that is the expectation, is that people are going to come. And what I'd like to see is that there is more challenge.

There was a point yesterday, I think there was the truncated piece the observer said around gender. We hurried up at the end because there were things that were said that I was like, woah, from not the perspective as a prosecutor but the perspective as a survivor, from the perspective as someone who does this work.

And it was very quickly like let's just
move this on, because this is controversial, but
that was the whole point of doing this. It's also
why I started the conversation about where I sit,
but I hold a bunch of different spaces.

Because again for academics, prosecutors,
law enforcement, we come with a title. But if we
are not allowed to challenge all the things that we
hold together without fear of what that conversation
will be, I think we've missed the robustness of it.

Very quickly, I think you know even as we
talk about vocabulary and language, reimagining
justice, justice means different things to different
people. And I think there are people when we've
acknowledged this in this room and perhaps that
diversity of thought hasn't been here, this worked
just fine. This is actually perfect. That this
is -- all these things that we're talking about
needing to be changed does not -- that is
unfathomable.

And, again, I have the unique vantage
point from politics that I represent Cook County,
which we talked largely in this space about
violence, we're talking about certain segments of
Cook County. There are other segments in my county
who are angry and frustrated that I am talking about
violence in the way that I have.

There are other segments of my county who believe that we should be doing more incarceration. And so I don't want us to have this notion that there is a uniformity of what this looks like, a uniformity of community. We've been using the phrase community a lot, what the community wants, and my pushback is for what your community wants.

I go to a lot of different communities and, again, it is heartbreaking at times and infuriating at others that there are some people who want more people in your community locked up, who want to encourage the police coming after the painting of the poles.

And so because there is that consistency, that dialogue that began with Paul about oppressors and the like, it's a real conversation that we have to have because I do believe in community power. I do believe in resiliency and pride and all of that, but I also know that there are levels of power and we need to decide who is going to sit and make policies. There are people who are out there who are actively trying to oppress community, and we need to be honest about that.

Lastly, I mentioned in all the circles,
politics, it matters, it absolutely matters. And not like big P politics but how we engage. I think it was Joe who was talking about the right and how the language that they need to hear. That's a thing, that is an actual thing.

And if we are so entrenched in the belief of the outside, and back to Paul's point, without recognizing what happens on the inside, how those decisions are being made, we can convene all we want. And I agree with Kellie's point about the diversity of the coalition that has to move this along.

But if there's not any real intention about changing politics or changing policymakers, we'll keep doing this and it will take a hundred years for us to get it diversified, you know, enough people on court or enough people in the body. And we have to have some intentionality around that.

Last, last, last thing, I promise is -- and I said this yesterday. There is an arrogance that comes when you do the work, wherever you come from, for a really long time. And what I have seen in the last couple days is some checking of that arrogance, and everyone has it. Whether you know your community really, really well and so you ain't
going to tell me what my people need. Or you can research this issue so long, and I know this model works because I've seen it or I've been to a number of these convenings so I know.

I think we need to check our arrogance in places like this. I think we need to check because I think for a period that I was in this yesterday that there was attention of ego about experience that wasn't allowing the space for the other experience to permeate. There was an ego about, I know this and therefore the challenge to this has to be broken down because I'm defending what I know and not listening to what others are adding to the space.

So that is my hope for moving forward.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Barb, you're going to be next. And then we're going to go down this way and we're going to end up with Candice. I think we moved around. Eric, we'll start with him.

ERIC CUMBERBATCH: So I'm grateful for everyone in this space and what you represent and what everyone has contributed. I think it's been rich both intellectually and spiritually, and so I truly am grateful for everyone's contributions. I don't know that I agree with all of them, but I do
think it helps move and shape different movement and
different perspective and ways of thinking, so I
appreciate that.

Take aways for me, one, great
relationship building. And I think it's key as we
have these types of roundtables to stay in contact
with each other and remain organized and support one
another from afar.

So I definitely want to extend that to
all of the great brothers and sisters that I've met
from Detroit, but then I've also met some new folks
from Chicago and elsewhere, Dallas and DC, to just
name a few. And I've also met a lot of people that
are of service, so I think that type of contact
exchange where we can be resources to each other is
powerful in mobilizing what I see as a national
movement that's not just taking off, that is in
motion and growing.

The neurobiology piece was good for me.
I think that was a nice take away, and I thank you
for that contribution. I'm in a lot of spaces
similar to this, but in different not necessarily
roundtable, different situations. And I think I
hovered between street outreach, academia,
government and agencies. I've worked in the mayor's
office, so I'm in all of those spaces. And in those spaces I've heard DAs refer to individuals that have been arrested as poison, and we've extracted X amount of poison from a community.

I've heard precinct commanders and, you know, chief of you name it, calling neighborhoods hot spots or impact zones or those things. And it's like this militarized type of language that then leads to that type of action. Not only how you view community but view people, and that's how they're going to address and approach those individuals.

So I thought that was really key to discuss, but also given me more language around that, because the opportunity -- in doing that, I'm not using the terminology.

More conversation, I didn't hear much about environmental design and what that looks like in terms of public safety. And I thought that's a key area that we can focus in on. I want to say you did bring it up-to-date around a lot of blight that you may see in a community what that does and/or in places that are densely populated, like a New York city, how we have neighborhoods within neighborhoods because of the design of public housing or other spaces.
So really looking at environmental
design, I would love to look at that more. And
violence as a learned behavior and really looking at
exposure to violence and what that does to
individuals and what are the points of intervention
when we look it through the lens that violence has
been learned.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Home stretch here. We're
spending a little extra time doing this, and I know
we're behind on our schedule because of the richness
of what I heard from you during the day and at
night. And it just seemed like there was a lot of
gold in those hills, and I want to just extract it
before we move on with our agenda. So you know the
plan here is to really speak to each other in ways
that this is not your typical conference. This is
just simply deeper what's going on here, and I want
to spend some time.

I should note, by the way, that the
healing by choice room is open again, opened at 10.
Just to note that a number of our colleagues who
have had to step out for work that they're doing,
you know, Ray on the first day had observation about
something he was doing. Fatimah just said that and
Danielle said that, too. So this is -- talk about
having a real presence with a topic under
discussion, and certainly Barb yesterday brought her
experience in the room. So the healing by choice
room is open.

So we'll try to do this as efficiently as
we can. The one or two things you want to highlight
from the last two days and the one thing that you
want to make sure we pay attention to before we
leave knowing also, Barb, that we come to you at the
end of the day.

MS. B. JONES: Thank you all. I've taken
so much away from this as far as everyone's
reflections for the past two days. Jeremy, you have
a hard job, you're facilitating all of this. So we
know you have to cut the mic when we know we have so
much more.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thanks.

MS. B JONES: But I also want to
recognize you in stating on the first day that you
wanted this and everyone, all of the organizers,
wanted this to be a thing of nonscholarly
reflection, discussion and I want us to continue to
reinforce that theme, because if we don't reinforce
that theme, it continues to exclude people that
really need to be at the table that are here,
period. And the ones that aren't here, their voice is not being heard, so thank you for that.

And, Mr. Webster, the distrust of academics, oh, my goodness, that's really broad. I think we need to reimagine accountability. It's bigger than reimagining justice, because like Kim said, justice means so many things to so many different people.

Soledad said, well, we got to walk away with what we do agree on. But if we don't have certain voices at the table, we still exclude those folks that are out of the loop with what we do agree on and even what we don't agree on. I believe that social justice is a broad term. Violence is included in social justice.

We know that this is very complex, we know it's very complicated. And the expectations that we all have by being here, all of them are not going to be met. And if we put one thing before we put the other, how do we come up with these solutions that everybody wants?

So I have just so many questions as it relates to what everyone has said, but it's a lot of things that we have not talked about, because we're all in our specific genre of work.
I am not supposed to be sitting at this table. I'm an academic, but I became an academic later on in life because my life experience had to get me to the next level that still is not working because of the distrust that academics have. And I'm so invisible as an academic. No one sees me. So that's another larger discussion that we probably need to have and put on the table, as well.

But the courage that we all have to call these things out is what I'm so happy about even when it's such a sad situation that we're talking about.

MS. A. ALEXANDER: So I think behind this question of language that we keep bringing up is either conscious or unconscious differences and theories of change. And I think it would be really handy if at some point we were more explicit about what are our theories of change. I think every last one of us has a different one around this table and that's fine, but it's just about being very explicit about those.

I think some of this distrust of academics is because people aren't clear about what is the theory of change. Is it building up data reserves so that communities are more empowered for
change? Is it to get data into a congressional briefing? Is it to change our demise? Is it to build tenure power because you believe in the power of public education? All of these different things. And so just being very clear and explicit about the theory of change.

I would say going back to the question that Paul put on the table about the role of the state, I'm really intrigued about what that looks like in different city or community formats. So I think that was a big thing after the Detroit discussion yesterday, I was thinking about how different a place like New York is with more wealth, certain type of city leadership versus a city that is -- feels like it's under colonial occupation and it's coming out of just six years ago a suspended democracy.

Like Peter has talked about, a billionaire developer who's putting surveillance cameras, police department rolling out surveillance technology. It's a very different context. And again a different set of problems.

I would say lastly, I'm thinking a lot about who's not here and the fact that as energizing as a lot of this is, I also feel exhausted by
criminal justice conversations or anti-violence conversations and often feel energized by conversation that happened around the city right now, around community benefits agreements or community land trust or worker cooperatives or community solar and all of those conversations.

So I'm thinking why weren't some of those folks brought into this room because those are questions of safety and anti-violence all of that. How can we expand this even further to bring in people who are really holding a lot of the work.

MR. J. TRAVIS: David.

MR. D. KENNEDY: So on the lesson learned or lesson elevated, mine for this one is that violence is history. I knew that and the addition to that knowledge and the reminder of that fact that comes from the account we were given on the first day of the intergenerational transmission of harm and trauma even at the neuro levels. The insight of David's paper, that's something that certainly the scholarship has taken for granted and lots of us take if not for granted is something that we disparage, we don't know anything about which is the presence and role of firearms.

All of those are deliberate historical
products. The kind of violence that we're here to talk about is the creation of our long national history, it is the creation of white supremacy, it is the creation of deliberate control and harms done to harm the people. And we should never forget that. And even though I'm very conscious of it, my understanding of that is expanded and reinforced.

On the substantive thoughts I think I would like to try to see my time to a future self because I have thoughts that I think I want to try to take up at greater length.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Alia, take aways for the last couple days and something you want to make sure we pay attention before we break.

MS. A. HARVEY-QUINN: So I'm always challenged by these spaces, by everything in general because I love sort of abstract thoughts so much and my work is concretely measured by, you know, less dead bodies, more free people, period. And when that is achieved, there is success. So I think in spaces like this the thing that I want to under pin so much is that there is such a richness and thought and perspective that doesn't always land on the ground.

And so how do we, you know, academia
produced methods of healing the earth before we got to the point where we might -- we might cease to exist, right. We produce solutions and when I say we, very loosely, the spacers produce solutions that don't get enacted. So I guess my challenge is what do those partnerships look like and how do you tear down those silos of trust. What are the paths and what are the equalizers.

And so I heard somebody talk about humility as something that's necessary and I think my mom who is a scholar, she always refers to academia as the higher halls of blah blah blah. And it is this reference that intellectual capacity as valued in spaces like these are more rich than, you know, something that somebody is less degreed or less astute or less well read is sharing, and that's not necessarily the case.

So how do we think about equalizing. And then the other thing -- another distrust and I think Ray spoke to this yesterday, is how do we share resources. Because if I let you in my community and you talk to me and my people and then you go get a five million dollars grant and our work is not sustainable and our community was never changed because the goal was just to know, it hasn't
benefited my people at all.

And then the other thing which is a vastly different thought that I take away repeatedly from this work is that we don't really know what success looks like. We don't know what a decolonized state looks like. We don't know -- I mean militarization is such a vast thought within our culture that we don't know what the other side of it looks like. And so I think that's it.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Juan.

MR. J. CARTAGENA: In the last couple days for me, a lot of take aways on moving my mind and my brain into various directions and I appreciate what I'm starting to learn about during the birthing of the civil rights movements and violence, founding violence as Amanda talked about and really to learn more about gun policy and about structural violence and founding violence.

What drew me to this conference is not moving my head so much as it was moving my body and my heart, it's getting personalized. In that regard what blew me away in the last couple of days was the resilience of communities that suffer. From my perspective and my work, I deal a lot with mothers who lose their loved ones to police violence.
In Vegas or California there's a family that I've been working with whose grandfather, Francisco Serna was killed by police because they thought he had a gun in his hand and turned out it was crucifix. We don't hear enough about Francisco Serna. Interpersonal violence for my family, I have a family member who's doing decades for interpersonal violence, gang related murder.

So what blew me away the last two days was the resilience of communities that suffer violence. Seeing Marco, hearing about those painted poles, thank you man. Hearing the words of Alia and how to respond with love. That's my biggest take away, what makes me feel that I can look at communities that suffer violence, including my own, especially my own and have hope that we can have the resilience to overcome.

What I'd like to see and this is not exactly it won't be developed profoundly because we don't have the time. I'd like to see and know about resources that can deal with healing that are anchored and centered in black and brown structures, indigenous African structures, structures that we know from the withstanding you just suffered so much from the state violence and probably have the
answers. Resources that I can use.

MS. C. JONES: What I'd like to see more of is, I think I want to circle back to this conversation about philanthropy which I think has been invoked a couple of times directly and indirectly over this morning and yesterday. And I just want to spend a few minutes on what I don't understand. But every time it's brought up, it's like a hopeful thing, the thing is the alternative to state resources. I said if we think that philanthropy is going to save us, we should definitely talk about that.

Because I think in the same sort of systemic issues of race we should have a conversation, like it's not an accident, some things get funded and some things don't, so I just want to spend a minute and to circle back to that. I'll be brief. Because one thing I'm also learning is I'm trying, at times, in this conversation to listen more than I talk. Like everybody here, I struggle with but I think it's important.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Bruce and then we're going to switch back to -- Danielle will have the same opportunity with the two questions.

MS. D. SARED: I think I do. And I'm
sorry I'm late, one of our participants was arrested and badly beaten by the police who were not letting his mother talk to him to ensure his injuries were life threatening and so I just wasn't going to come back into the room until we knew that. And he seems to be okay but I very much had this conversation with all of you, with me in the course of those hours.

I think my two quick take aways, one is I think I agree very much with Amanda with Grace Lee Boggs, that I feel sorry for all of us who don't live in Detroit. It's just been really extraordinary to get to learn from and bear witness to a lot of the work that's happening here and in a context with far fewer financial resources than our present elsewhere.

So it's just really deepened my excitement and regard for this place. I think the other thing is I was so grateful for the consistency of our focus on power in a conversation about violence. I've been to so many roundtables about violence that only talk about interpersonal violence as though it is the product of specific new relationships. It's a historical, it's out of the context of power and I think having those
conversations that way is probably a large part of why our solutions remain too small. So I'm just really grateful for everybody for the original framing of the conversation and everybody who held that as the center piece of the conversation of what it would mean to end violence, I found that very helpful.

The thing I would love more of, they're related to each other, is more conversation about -- I don't just want to call it land. Right, so whether that's gentrification, for us in New York, whether it's or housing, stock and mortgage crises in other places but people's ability to stay in a place when they choose to or a place when they want to which I think is so central to so many of the safety concerns we see.

And really as we think about the original founding violence and really understanding a through line about being in ownership and possession and control as being really intricately related to violence. I think related to that the thing that I'm always eager to learn more of is how we can be actual use to each other across geography. Like how the things we know where we are can be valuable other than by parachuting in and telling people we
know things they don't know about the place they have known forever but also not presuming that there is nothing that we can share with one another that can foster real community and growth.

And so I'm really trying to learn how our movement works across geography in a way that is respectful of place of local wisdom and also doesn't miss opportunities for us to build with each other.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Bruce, reflections on the last two days and what you hope to see more of.

MR. B. WESTERN: Two quick thoughts and that was so rich, I feel that I have a lot to add to it actually. One is you know, coming into this meeting certainly within the Square One Group, we had been sort of talking about an idea of civilianizing the language that we've used and that was language that we found very influential coming out of New York City and what is going in others that are doing there.

And I think I for the course of this meeting we heard that reflected in the summaries just now. There's lots about a language to get a very similar idea and it's fundamentally about shift of power from state to the community and we talked a lot yesterday about what community led strategies
would look like.

I think listening to our reflections it -- the issue for me is not so much what community led strategies would look like, but what is going to be the relationship between the state and the community and what is going to be the relationship between community activists, community organizations and criminal justice agencies, mayor's offices and our courts and so on.

And how does a community take its place within the agencies of the state. So the state agencies are not some external force that the community must deal with. And to me that's an evolution. I feel like I've sort of moved forward in my thinking from where I was coming into the meeting, and I think that is a significant part due to hearing the experience of what's happened to Detroit and I'm very grateful for the learning of the experience.

I feel I've learned something important about that and I think that's something we can take home at Square One. The relationship between different kinds of community representatives and academics which was a big thing. That was a surprise to me too by the way. I did not coming in
today, coming into this meeting, I did not expect that to be a significant theme in our discussion. I feel I've learned something from that.

But -- so that relationship language short-term and long-term, I think we actually talked about that in a number of different ways this morning too. These are all discussions about politics and I really like and appreciate that we're talking about politics in a very direct way. I feel we've been a long time coming. This is how I'm hearing it.

When we talk about the relationship between community representatives of different kinds and academics, I think we are -- this is a discussion about coalition building and if we're trying to figure out what this relationship can productively look like. I think as academics we haven't fully acknowledged at this table that we have not really been on the right side of history by any means. And this is done, for me, through relationships for academics to be trying to work closely and constructively with community representatives.

Typically a partner is government partners. That's where the power and the money has
been and that's a magnet for people in universities and there's a consequence. Academics have often been, really on the wrong side of a lot of issues. I think that has to be acknowledged and understood as part of the context for distrust on the part of communities with the academic community.

But I think ultimately this is a discussion about what this coalition might look like and I think it's important. Kim and Alia I think have given us some guide posts about how we can do this productively, we have to come into this on the academic side. This is not our natural posture, but we have to come into this process with a lot of humility. I heard you both saying that, and I thought that was right on. Language -- code switching, right, we talked a lot about code switching and translation.

I think we're learning everyone has to become competent at code switching, academics have to become competent in code switching, understanding the contents in which they're in and being very intentional about how they communicate and use language. If you want to sit at a table like this and be a partner in a process like this, you have to be very aware of the context you're in and very
deliberate about the language that you use. And this is political, this is how we can function in trying to make the change we want.

Short-term, long-term, to me this issue was coming up in all sorts of ways as we were going around the table. The only observation I make here, because there are pragmatic things we want to do tomorrow and there are long-term goals that we want to be able to reflect on five generations from now, as Amanda said when we started on Thursday. And I think the only thing here is that I take away is whatever it is we do tomorrow, we don't want that to get in the way of where we want to be five generations from now.

So whatever it is we do tomorrow, we don't want to be that long term project. One tiny little plug, I would have loved to have seen -- where is the discussion about work at cooperatives, all the environmental justice work that's going on, and I think this is very much going to be on our agenda for the next roundtable, so I just wanted to flag that I agree that's at first rate importance and we're going to get there.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you all. Please pull out your agenda. I wanted to tell you how we
modified our remaining time together to allow for
the conversation that we just had.

It's -- we've all been there. It's
typical to end a conference, a one day conference or
a two or three day conference and leave without
having had the opportunity we just had here from
each other as to what we're taking away from it and
setting aside an hour for us to do that means that
we are borrowing time from other parts of the
agenda. Just want to let you know how we're going
do that.

Each of the segments that we've set aside
for discussion of public health, the first one. The
second one is healing for violence each will be an
hour rather than an hour and a half. We'll go from
11 to 12, Webster's ten minutes and clarifying
question, just as we've done before, ending at noon.
It means we're going to take a break at noon.

For those that can't wait that long, you
know what I mean, feel free to get up and do what
has to be done because I know we'll be break at noon
and 12:15 come back. Barbara also had an
opportunity yesterday to set up some of her
discussion with her story so feel free in essence
we're going to incorporate that by reference and
from 12:15 to 1:15, she will get us started then
we'll have this really important discussion on
healing which many of you referenced as being both a
take away and hope for today so that we can go
deeper on what that means and Barbara will help us
do that.

Bruce has already done a good part of the
summary but I'll also ask him to summarize what we
hear between now and then the really important thing
is boxed lunches will be provided at 1:30 so we know
what we're heading towards is lunch. So something
to keep us going but feel free to get coffee and use
the restroom in the mean time. Is that okay with
everybody? Before we turn over to Daniel, Antong
wanted to have a -- because he's next to me he
didn't have to do the insistent wave, he handed me a
napkin. He wanted to make an observation before we
turn it over to Daniel Webster.

MR. A. LUCKY: I just wanted to say so it
will be clear from me that I don't have no --
nothing against academia and research, none of that
because I have a bunch of appreciation for the data
and the numbers and the research. So I want to be
clear about that so that we know that. I just think
a lot of times the perceived distrust coming from
the fact that most people on the bottom or most people believe some other people gets awards while others get rewards.

We got to make sure that those rewards is partnered with those who get the awards and I think that's kind of the basis of that perceived mistrust. I don't have I a distrust but I love the numbers. I read every paper, so I love the numbers, I just feel we have to marry too. I just wanted to say that.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Daniel, thank for your patience, it allowed us to do the group work.

MR. D. WEBSTER: Obviously I'm going to assume that folks have read the paper I'm going to summarize some key points, get a little bit of framing and also mention a few things that I recognize as omissions that I do plan to address in a final form of the paper. I began my career late eighties just when the whole idea of public health addressing violence was becoming really new. When we were trying to figure out what the hell does that mean.

Public health is such an incredibly diverse interdisciplinary activity that be very suspicious of anyone who says, here is the public health approach, right. There probably there are
probably dozens of public health approaches. So what you are going to hear from me today is honestly Daniel Webster's public health approach. Take it for whatever it is there. I intentionally constrained this discussion in my paper around gun violence as opposed to more broadly violence. Obviously there are public health approaches to violence more generally that have absolutely nothing to do with guns or gun violence. But it was intentional that restriction not only because I want to play where I know the material the best but truly I think it is appropriate given the astronomical impacts that guns have on violence and also on justice and on criminal justice. I'm going to get back to that in just a moment.

What I present in the paper in rough terms is one set of approaches that comes from an understanding of research events of environmental conditions that appear to promote lethal violence in particular. And so the public health response to those conditions often involve advocacy, policy, community mobilization to address those environmental conditions.

The things that I focused on in this paper and I could have gone broader, I recognize
that. You have to do something to constrain this, it was focused on guns, alcohol and I'll just use the term blight very generally to address the decaying infrastructure and conditions in the neighborhoods and public health responses in those three places. And then the other thing that I try to address you could describe as behavioral approaches, behavioral interventions more on the groundwork that recognizes that, yeah, there are these environmental constraints and issues, but right now we need to do what we can to address the people most at risk for being involved in violence and promote some behavioral and supportive interventions that are going to lead to less lethal violence.

So just to summarize very briefly on the gun policy front and I'll focus first on the sort of supply side of the issue. We have a lot of already published data, more coming out very soon showing pretty strong effects of requiring licensing in order to purchase firearms. And if I'm convinced of anything, I'm convinced that substantially reduces homicides, suicides in both directions of violence by and towards law enforcement officers.

We also find that something that David
alluded to in his paper, really profound changes in public policy around concealed gun carrying over the past three years. Even though it was discussed and in some ways you could appropriately say this is allowed law abiding or legal gun owners to bring their guns into more public spaces even though as a group you can say they are relatively low risk that they were going to do something bad with them, it's been a horrible social experiment in the sense that a lot more people have experienced violent crime and die as a result of that.

On the alcohol front, something hardly -- you know, I study violence and we hardly ever talk about alcohol. The available evidence about connections to alcohol abuse and violence are vast. It's a big, big problem, and there are policy solutions to them. The neighborhoods most impacted by violence, including gun violence, have an over density of alcohol outlets in their communities that are causing more harm than help anything.

And when that is constrained through licensing and policy, approaches both in terms of number of outlets, in terms of the number of the hours that they're allowed to operate, there's less violence. There's also some evidence, and this is
more in an international context, that alcohol taxes also lead to less violence.

Let me then get to the set of policies and what we know about interventions that aren't trying to change environment but are trying to change behaviors, and some of those interventions involve law enforcement, some involve no law enforcement and some a blend, okay.

So let me start with, I guess, -- I wanted to say the most pure public health approach, but I actually don't believe that. But the approach that has nothing to do with law enforcement. Most people think of as a program with a brand name now of Cure Violence. Outreach, violence interruption, conflict mediation, it is the foundation upon what Eric and his team have built up to something much more robust, you can think of as Cure Violence 2.0 or 3 or whatever you want to put on it.

There are success stories with that model without a doubt. But there's also some evidence of times when it hasn't worked out and a lot of times it's been more involved more frankly. And so one of the I think take aways going forward where we were talking about Cure Violence model or even a Group Violence Intervention model or turn it to whatever
label you want to put on that approach is not only what you do but how you do it that could matter a lot both with respect to public safety outcomes like how many people get shot, but at least on the Group Violence Intervention or focus to turn dimension. What are the outcomes with respect to incarcerated individuals, what's the police violence, those sorts of things.

I think it's largely been unmeasured, sadly. So Cure Violence, really has some great success stories and I present and highlight what I consider the most involved dimension of that with the work in New York City. And on the Group Violence Intervention I kind of hold up the Oakland model. What Oakland has done is more than just Group Violence Intervention. It is a real transformation of a very community led approach that when all in, I believe with respect to helping the individuals at greatest risk of involving in the violence which I think again is an orientation that Eric and others in New York City have taken on as well.

So there's some similarities and differences in these models and hopefully we're not done, we're going to continue involving and get
better. But I think the take aways are that it has
to be very focused, it has it to -- this will be
over medicalized, but the dosage has to be
sufficient. I've seen too many times where it's
very superficial assistance that is brought forward,
and I loved hearing some of the examples from
Detroit, for example, that were trying to -- and
harm well beyond the more superficial systems.

The last thing I want to talk about
because I recognize the most controversial thing in
the paper is what do we do about gun possession,
illegal gun possession from a law enforcement
standpoint. On one hand there's pretty strong and
consistent evidence that when you have very focused
efforts on trying to deter and curb illegal gun
carrying, the result is fewer people get shot, fewer
people get shot in the communities most impacted by
gun violence.

Just as the case with Group Violence
Intervention however, the research -- it really has
never done a deep dive but what are the other
implications or outcomes from those efforts in
addition to fewer shootings and short-term, were
there bad long-term effects or bad short-term
effects with respect to community trust and
policing.

So we need to get far beyond thinking this is broad stuff, progressive, aggressive style policing and I believe anyway, try to reimagine a process for trying to constrain gun carrying that is far, far more focused and far more transparent and accountable and community determined in essence. The communities most impacted by violence and I know that goes from other research, but research I've done in Baltimore with surveys and focus groups in impacted communities that they are both over policed in this broad racially biased style of stop and frisk. When they're under policed what they say is, but they're really not focusing on the people who are driving the violence and they're not solving the murders.

So I think that's the place we need to get is what does the community want from law enforcement and I believe very strongly that they want them to focus on gun violence and do that in the most focused and transparent way possible. So I'll end it on that. That's the Daniel Webster view of this that other public health folks don't want to talk about law enforcement other than that it's bad.

In working in Baltimore, let me tell you
I understand the bad part of the criminal justice system, I understand it very well. But following Freddie Gray's death and following the uprising from that, I felt I could have just stepped away and say, I have nothing to do with that, I want to get as far away from Baltimore police as I can. I sort of felt that, no, I need to do the opposite. I need to try to imbed and try to push reforms internally and externally because I fundamentally believe that when you have a totally dysfunctional police department, the work done in communities is far harder. I'll tell you that based upon talking to the violence interrupters, that they cannot effectively do what they do if law enforcement is not focused in the way that I just described.

So there's an interdependency here of proper reforms in my view. I'm going to stop there.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Okay. So open the floor for not discussion but for clarifying questions first. If it's not a clarifying question, I appreciate you waiting. Is yours a clarifying question, Juan? And Bruce, clarifying question? We'll start with Juan then Bruce then Beverly, direct them to Daniel and let's make this as succinct as possible because we do want to have a
MR. J. CARTAGENA: Without police focus, violence interrupters work better when stop and frisk activities are --

MR. D. WEBSTER: No, I'm sorry, I didn't -- I'm glad you asked that. No, what I meant more is that Baltimore police have to be more effective in focusing on the most violent individuals, their gun and their gun use. Both in a proactive way and in essence to solve murders. Because if they believe there is no consequence for routinely being armed and ready to shoot at any provocation or even after the fact, it's much harder to convince somebody because how you trusted that everybody's not out to get you because you're living in a city and in a set of conditions that is very war-like and you are going to respond ready to go to war. So I think that a whole bunch of things have happened, some long-term and some short-term that have made the police very ineffective in addressing violent behavior.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Do you have a clarifying question or you don't.

MR. B. WESTERN: I've got two.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Let's get all the
questions in the room at the same time and Daniel can figure out how to sort through them. Bruce and then Beverly and then Beth.

MR. B. WESTERN: Daniel, you mentioned the violence induced effective licensing how big is that effect, that's one question. Second question, I'm very very interested in the uneven effects of Cure Violence why it fails in some settings and why it's more successful in others. Dosage was mentioned as one thing. A failure of missing, I want to understand better what that failure of policing is as a source of failure of Cure Violence. Are there other things that we can say, is there something more general we can say about the conditions, something that appears to be more effective than others.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you. It.

MS. B. TILLERY: Were you saying that the licensing has also brought about a decrease in gun violence by police? So that is what I thought I heard.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Help us those two and then we'll open it up and we'll start with Fatimah's --

MR. D. WEBSTER: I'll start with the
licensing so, size and affects. They range in the public research and we have more data coming out. So the range of affects have been from 11 percent reductions in gun homicides to 40 percent as we're getting more and more observations, they seem to be centering around 30 percent reductions in gun homicides, pretty substantial. I don't know of any other particularly broad public policies. It's one thing to say we're going to do very intensive and one in the community.

When you think about statewide reductions in statewide homicides, it's pretty large. Even though our conversation has not been about suicide, I'll about tell you that the effects are just as large on suicide and because gun suicides are far more common than gun homicides, most of the lives prevented from licensing are actually suicides.

So this is not a small thing from a public health standpoint with violence both inter and intrapersonal violence. To get to your question about effects as it relates to police. So the data on that right now are less clear than the other measures that I mentioned of general homicides in communities, suicides of law enforcement.

There are a couple of papers out. We
intend to do more on this, but the papers show that the states with the strongest set of gun controls compared to the less strong gun controls, there's like a twofold difference with respect to the population rate of civilians shot and killed by police. And if you look at the subset that has the generally the strongest gun laws, the common denominator is a strong licensing process for handgun purchasers. So more I think will be revealed, but I think it is highly consistent with everything that we are seeing. Variable effects of Cure Violence. I'm still wrestling with this and I think that --

MR. J. TRAVIS: Let's state that they're variable. Bruce is right, there will be a discussion I hope about interventions and violence and violence and interventions and others. Let's just hope that this comes up in the group discussion. Fatimah if you would please get the discussion going and then Beth and then Ron.

MS. F. MUHAMMAD: I want to talk about the field of health, the industry of health because I think it's important I mentioned to add. There's the analysis of public health which is really important methodology, sets of questions I ask.
Health has a history and I think in a way that the activists and advocates have pushed for the justice system to reckon with its own history, past and violence towards people of color.

I think health needs to reckon with its sordid past and acts of violence in the way that they see people of color or experience the pain or experience as lab rats, there's just a whole history that provides I think some context as we kind of look at the role of public health in addressing this issue and many other issues related to communities of color.

So I think that's incredibly important and I think it's important to ask similar questions about how we compel this field industry that is a multibillion dollar industry to be accountable to some of the questions and things that we're addressing here. So how do we do that, what does that take. Because right now where are we compelling systems to actually partner or pay attention to communities?

There are some cracks and I think, you know, I run a national organization that focuses on hospital-based and hospital-linked violence intervention work that is beginning to -- has been
testing this out in 50 cities across the country which is a partnership with hospitals, who because the health care system touches those victims of violence all the time, the shooters, right, and everybody, all the forms of violence that we're talking about here.

But if you're going to focus on gun violence, here is a place. And the model requires a relationship with the community, with folks who have experience, are credible, who are connected, have access to the hospital, to the bedside of those who are experiencing violence. And Ray's explained this; I don't want to go into the details.

But I want to talk broadly about the incredible ownership and experimentation at this intersection allows for new discussions, and I want to talk about what those new discussions are.

There are -- because of this work, you know, we have places like in Boston where hospitals are beginning to consider their procurement policies, their employment and how actually doing housing projects. You've seen the hospital as investors in communities as a violence reduction strategy. So now we're talking about mobilizing resources driven by community to actually address
this issue. That puts them on the hook. They do
assessment and they are required to. Are they
paying attention? Are they asking questions about
things we're talking about here? We've done a
survey and the answer is not really, and they could
be thinking about the payors in the health care
system.

Elevating this work of, you know, become
the violence prevention professional, they have a
million names. But they are folks that have
experience in communities. We were instrumental in
getting that designation, the race of the world
classified within the nationally formed claims code.

That code, taxonomy again is a
infrastructure question. Nurses are designated
there, physicians. Now we have the Rays of the
world in the code, and then we can put payors on the
hook for paying for this work.

So we've introduced legislation that's
actually -- we have in California, sits on the
governor's desk -- so I was coming here and was
talking to the governor's office, it's probably
going to die.

But I think there is an opportunity to
resource this work through other means and it, I
think, opens up questions about how we can envision health benefits thriving as a framework and liberation as a framework that mobilizes communities.

MR. J. TRAVIS: I just want to interrupt. I remember when I first heard you reveal this at the John Jay conference, I fell off my chair. So when you say -- when we talk about resources, when we talk about advocacy and to find funding versus, what you say the Rays of the world, people who can do this work, and where's the money? There's a lot of money in health care and I'm going to on your behalf invite him to be in touch with you.

MS. F. MUHAMMAD: Yes, absolutely. So, we just introduced legislation in California and in New Jersey that would compel Medicaid to pay for violence prevention services. And our strategy at this point was to kind of test -- you know, we were just learning, right. We were shocked that it went through the system in California, and I think it's because people hadn't thought about it, they just had no idea. But our goal was either -- there's been an 80-page analysis of its impact on the health care -- what's the impact of violence on the health care system and the cost savings, right. It
obviously will save money.

But there's -- I think it's -- again, these are deeper questions about who's on the hook for some piece of this. Where the accountabilities about are you carrying for are communities of color? You're accountable for caring, what does that care look like and is it actually responsive to the needs?

So, there's a remarkable again accounting for the violence of ignoring the needs, ignoring the pain, ignoring the trauma structurally of communities of color. That has not happened, but I think that gives us an opportunity to have this discussion.

MR. J. TRAVIS: I just encourage you to spend more time talking about that, and I'm going to ask you to hold your comments in the interest of your colleagues.

The next one up is Beth. During the break if you want to find Fatimah, she'll have a table somewhere. This is really, really important work.

Beth and then Ron and then Candice and then Eric, okay.

MS. B. RITCHIE: There will be a long
list after me, so I'll make very brief points, although I wanted you to go on and on. I thank you for your paper, I appreciate the public health approach.

Guess what I'm going to bring up? So I wanted to raise two points that I won't elaborate on but just for point I'm thinking about for the future. One is, I'm interested in thinking about what it would mean -- what it means to do better policing or to have more murders solved; two points that I think you brought up that are that are important.

And in the murders solved, it makes me think about what it means in cities like Detroit that we have called for example, this is one example, testing rape kits to get rid of the backlog of all of the people who have been sexually assaulted.

And I wonder, stepping out there, I think that's critically important but that doesn't prevent sexual assault to test. What it does is maybe solve a crime and when we solve the crime, we sometimes then call for incarceration of people. It doesn't prevent crime.

And so solving murders is critically
important in some ways for a sense of healing, and I
don't minimize that at all. I don't -- I'm saying
this quickly, I don't minimize that, but it doesn't
prevent crime. It doesn't bring justice, it doesn't
bring capital J. It brings maybe a sense of
something internal to people's hearts and to family
members and to community members. So I want to just
make that problematic.

And it leads me to a question about what
it would mean to disarm the police, and I don't
think we've talked about that very much. In a sense
of demasculinizing -- making less masculine the
interaction between law enforcement officers and
community members. Again, I don't want to take a
lot of time to talk about it, but I think part of
the question about what better policing would look
like would mean we would do a different kind of
policing that wouldn't so much rely on group force
as a way to resolve conflict or certainly to create
peace.

The second point I want to raise without
elaborating on is I think part of what we need to
look at when we evaluate programs like Cure Violence
is violence that happens within the context of
activist groups that lead people to not be able to
be involved with them.

And I know there's been a lot of critique of Cure -- I'm only using Cure Violence as one example because that's the one that's on the table. But I think we need to look at the internal dynamics of what happens in activist orientations that are articulating a very clear analysis of racial justice and community accountability and other things that we want to cosign, when sometimes in those same political formulations women are excluded at best or harmed more directly.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Ron.

MR. R. DAVIS: So I'm going to push back, and you used Oakland as an example. And I'm going to tie in that Oakland has something in common with Detroit and with New York. And that is, you said community led, but I think not so much community led in the sense of do this program. It started in two phases, community led.

The first community led was stop doing what you're doing and that required federal intervention. So you had federal intervention in New York that said it was unconstitutional and told the police stop doing what you're doing, find another way. You had federal intervention in
Oakland where through private plaintiffs stop doing what you're doing through a consent degree.

But at the same time where the community was stronger, they demanded those accountability on the front end and they still said, but we're still holding you accountable to be effective in fighting crime, which now meant here's the community saying, here's the way to do it.

So what I'm offering is this is the part we talk about, the interplay where the state and the community can come together. You got to get the state to first stop doing what it's doing in order for it to be open to do something new. In some cases this is kind of a federal intervention that Paul talked about yesterday whether consent decrees or others that says stop through the courts, now that you've stopped this, you have to find the right way to opens to evidence-based products and science and things of that nature.

People say community led, it's not like -- some communities are very sophisticated, not every community has a rank that will understand some of the crime fighters. But all will know that stop and frisk or this brutality, these things are just not appropriate and that's why you can't solve
crime, that's why people are going to talk to you.

So stop, change and then work together.

MS. C. JONES: I appreciate your set up.

I will agree and I will state I do think because I feel like the conversation is ground hog day, and when I pull in the other conversations into it, Paul, you laid out in your paper examples of three cities that you thought were doing a good thing; Oakland, New York and L.A.

The interesting thing about those is that they are -- I'm sorry. Paul also talked about his consent decree examples, which were bold consent degrees, Oakland and L.A. I distinguish the issue with stop and frisk. Stop and frisk came much later.

I think what happened is that even before most police departments, there was a point in history where New York professionalized is what I'll call it. And I'm not making -- I'm not advocating for police. But I think what it is across those jurisdictions of public infrastructure that is deemed somehow by force or whatever from outside legitimate.

And the reason I think that's so important is because for me in a global conversation
about what's happened the other three days, I think it underscores the need for, not or, but and, across all these other things we're asking for.

In both of those jurisdiction you have what Paul was talking about around consent decrees. You also in these places had public investment. If in Oakland you had measure Z and Y, which was the tax base that paid for the programs so you didn't just have stick, you actually had caring.

In New York, y'all, I don't know where it's coming from but you had black men and boys playing, you had investment so you could really scale community investment.

In the L.A. grid I want to be really intentional because the one thing that I am still hungry for in this discussion is some concrete. Like I walked in saying I want to learn how to change. I don't want to just sort of state problems, you know what I mean. It doesn't get you anywhere.

But I think it's really intentional in these three jurisdictions there were lots of things going on all at once, and none of them actually perfect on their own. By contrast, which I also think is important for this discussion, is you had
Baltimore to use as a piss poor example. But I'm going to throw Chicago in there as well, because they're both examples of cities where by contrast you had sort of a Barney Fife to talk to still going on a fundamental lack of trust in a mass public infrastructure.

You had no scale funding in either jurisdiction in the communities, in violence intervention. Even though you had some things, you had still no care which doesn't build trust in legitimacy in these kinds of interventions and you -- I forgot my third dang point. But I think y'all get it, right? I just think it's really important. Across these conversations, like there's so many, you know taking things by force. But this is about and. I think it's -- I can't say enough. I think fighting for structural investment, that's what these makes these things illustrative of things we like. There was structural investment across a lot of different things, accountability and I think in a lot of things it was forced.

MR. J. TRAVIS: David Kennedy just exercised his immediate intervention right?

MR. D. KENNEDY: When you get to it.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Okay, when I get to it.
I promised people we'll be taking a break at 12 we appreciate brevity. Eric is next. People are real jealous. Go ahead. Danielle and then Ray and then David. We're going to cut it there. Sorry for everybody else. We're going to cut it after David.

MR. E. CUMBERBATCH: So I just want to put a disclaimer out that New York is not perfect and all of the great solutions, ideas and things that New York is doing was not created or invented by me; that we have great advocates and activists on the ground that was doing this before there was funding and now there is funding that's supported it's been brought to a different capacity but we're still not even meeting the needs that we have. In order for me to get home and be safe at home I had to say that.

I have three responses and one question. So Bruce, you asked about successful programs and what that looks like. I can share for us what we've seen is longevity of program implementation, the relationship of the executive director or others that are influential in the organization with the community that they're serving, the turnover in staff, continuous and ongoing training, professional development and personal development investments for
the work force and then integrating that work force
into government so that they actually see themselves
as an extension of what our office is doing.

Beth, I agree with you 100% on the gender
inclusion piece. We are doing a lot of mandatory
training for our entire work force to attend called
to mentoring on an annual basis, so we are picking
that piece up and then for the room I just want
everyone to be aware that there are reciprocal
funding opportunities that all municipalities should
be seeking. Basically partnership pay so as you're
producing results and you have evidence from the
college that you can show that you have these cost
savings, you should be approaching the fed and
others in support of paying for what these
operations look like and how it could be brought up
to scale and how we can reinvest back into
community.

My question is around illegal gun
possession, which is treated as a felony crime in
New York and I wanted to get Daniel's take on just
his thoughts on is illegal gun possession in your
view a felony crime and if not what are appropriate
ways that it could be dealt with.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Danielle, appreciate your
precise observations. I have Danielle then Keith and we'll end it there.

MS. D. SERED: So I just wanted to make sure we're always exercising real care, because I agree very much that if you ask people in communities with high levels of violence where the focus of policing should be, people will say on serious violence. Nobody's like, we, right? That's not ever the answer. And at this same time, I think very often, we take that information to be somehow equivalent to a call for enforcement and punishment and it's not.

And so everybody that knows me knows that people in common justice only get in with the consent of the victims of their crime. Half of the victims don't call the police in the first place, the other half don't make it past the grand jury. That subset who we call who are on the jail train, 90 percent choose common justice when given the option and they don't do that because New Yorkers are not only rich, but merciful. We do it because survivors are pragmatic and we want things that will keep us safe and will keep others from enduring what we endured. That's it, that's what we want at the end of the day.
Even if in our hearts we also want to 
wring out the necks of the people who hurt us. At 
the end of the day, given a choice, we'll choose the 
things that produce safety. The thing I worry about 
with calls for targeted enforcement, the people most 
likely to shoot and be shot which is a 
criminalization of the criminalization.

The thing I worry about that is we 
 Assumes the result of that enforcement should be 
 incarceration which we know is productive of 
 violence. We know that violence on the individual 
 level is made by shame, isolation, exposure to 
 violence and the inability to meet one's economic 
 needs. And that prison is made of shame, isolation, 
 exposure to violence and the inability to meet one's 
 economic needs.

So I think that the kind of rigor we 
 apply in all of the conversations up to the point of 
 identifying where we should focus our attention very 
 often falls away and we behave as though the focus 
 on that attention is still fundamentally for a lack 
 of options or anything else, means putting people in 
cages. And I think we have to be disciplined about 
 extending that rigor all the way through to what the 
 consequence will be and who will or won't benefit
from that consequence.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thanks Danielle. As I
mentioned, Keith is next and then Ry and then
David.

MR. K. WATTLEY: I'm not always sure this
is moving the conversation forward. I got triggered
by something a little bit earlier today. When
Daniel started talking, talking about the increased
presence of guns in public spaces and it's something
that kind of relates itself to something that was
brought up before by like how the public police are
private police. It feels like a return to private
policing and more and more people are having guns in
public spaces.

To me maybe it's because of where I'm
from -- I'm from Indiana and whenever I see guns in
public places, it's telling me, it makes me feel
less safe. It makes me feel like I'm likely to be
victimized and makes me think about carrying a gun.
But the crazy thing is I get this same feeling when
I see the American flag. The more proudly displayed
I see it, the more fear I have today, not just
growing up, today that happens. I just want to put
that out.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Before we start out we're
going to dispense with Bruce's summary here. And
ask you to, whatever you say here, to wrap it up and
Daniel we'll give you a minute or two, anything you
want to highlight then continue during the break.

MR. R. WINANS: Real quick and this is in
response to Ms. Beth, being able to put it in two
different lenses, public health and public safety
where on a public safety side how do we solve
murders. On the public health side, how do we
prevent murders. So the challenge in this is to us
in an entirety, how do we start to measure
retaliation prevention or the lives that were saved.
I can say as a fact in the last 90 days, we know
that the neighborhood folk have prevented, let's say
all the shooters, they're not accurate, right, they
don't know how to kill, but they know how to hit
their target.

We've prevented at least 15 shootings,
but how is that measurable, right. Then we go back
to the question of how do we reimagine law
enforcement or what does better policing look like,
right. And so when you look at law enforcement
training, it is peer to peer, if you will, right, so
how do we incorporate neighborhood folk into that
where you still normalize and humanize folk in the
neighborhood and in the community and that then allows for a law enforcement officer to say or maybe to stop and think before I chase somebody to their death, this is a kid that I may have been forced to mentor that's on probation or parole or I deem him to be at risk or a driving force to the violence, right.

But really putting in neighborhood folk, right, when we talk about communities, we have different facets of community but really intentional about neighborhood folk being part of that reimagining what police and community looks like.

MR. J. TRAVIS: David.

MR. D. KENNEDY: So in the call for in the meantime, right, Alia said I measure what I do by fewer dead people and fewer people locked up and more freedom, right. And that is the goal of a growing body of applied work.

One thing we're seeing there is that it is almost impossible to make this kind of thing work over time. It's study after study after study, example on the ground after example on the ground of effective impact which is only sustained and built upon, it turns out if it is rooted in relationship with effective local government.
You cannot do it against the tide of dysfunctional local government, you can keep it going for a little while and you can light the candle, it will burn bright and the weight of that local dysfunction will kill it every single time.

Where there is effective local government and effective relationship with local government, those turn out to be the conditions in which community knowledge, community insight, the adoption, the overtaking of criminal justice function by community action can take root, flourish and develop.

So in all of these places there is less and less policing, there is more and more community action, what used to be done by criminal justice is being done by other means. It's funded, it's embedded, it's honored. That appears to be absolutely completely impossible without an effective relationship of effective local government which is often produced by activists. This is not either voluntary or just the federal hammer. It is the product of people making sure that it happens and making sure that this work is honored.

And sort of to link this back to our conversation from yesterday, so far as an empirical matter, we need this state to make this work. We
don't necessarily need the same state we've got now but we need the state to make this work. And what we also know, abstractly what is increasingly concrete is that when local government and the agents of this state are seen as illegitimate, that has an independent violence productive effect. And increases in legitimacy which can be produced through this process, through responsiveness, through changes in behavior, independently create increases in public safety, less police and prosecution, more freedom, less people in jail.

And I'm going to invite Eric Jones to return to this in a moment of his choosing. But the trust building work that Eric did with others in Stockton over the course of about two years of real activism produced big increases -- big decreases in homicide, large increases in case clearance which is effectively a marker of community trust and substantial reductions in police use of force. And the addition to the Stockton mix was largely trust building.

So I've come to believe that the answer, the fundamental near term right now answer to do we need the state, is yes we absolutely need the state because it's only the conditions of effective local
government that this other work can actually be done.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Turn to Daniel for a couple observations to add to this discussion and then we'll take a 15 minute break and come back and I just -- we're kind of cutting short a little, I encourage people to find each other during the break and continue to raise questions.

MR. D. WEBSTER: Part of my response to the great input here is mostly head nods for me truly and I will be incorporating some changes in the paper.

Candice, you know, really hit the nail on the head about the importance of resources here. That was actually in an earlier draft, I don't know where it went or what happened to it. But I actually totally recognize that. In somewhat relevant I think a question Bruce raised is basically why do you see impact sometimes, some places and not others. I'm going to tell you that I believe Baltimore tried to do this on the cheap and they tried to do Group Violence Intervention on the cheap.

This requires resources, total commitment and if you don't do that you're not going to get the
impact. I do think that there are other constraints also because that do connect to that other aspect of there being some reasonable credible deterrents from violence that comes not only from community but also from law enforcement.

Beth, another head nod to what you were prompting which what is missing and I have stuff I can definitely connect to that, so thank you very much. I'll try to end. I feel like Eric raised an important question which is to gun possession, illegal gun possession being a felony. My opinion, generally no. Maybe some exceptions, you know. The data are really, really clear. If you have a history of violence and a number of illegal gun possession charges, that's a really strong predictor that something's really bad if you keep doing that, right.

I loved all the restorative stuff, the prevention, we need that, but it may be that certain times, yes, there has to be a consequence. And just to end it maybe with a most challenging question I think raised by Danielle really is if the product of focused enforcement, whatever you want to call it is incarceration then therefore it must be bad, I guess my feeling is that the end result of focused
enforcement doesn't have to be incarceration and it
doesn't have to be the worst forms of incarceration.

So what I think we're lacking and what we
need more models for responses to what I think is an
important legal issue, which is a lot of people
carrying guns around, I think a lot more people die
and we don't want that. So we need more innovative
justice responses and community responses to this
that will be more healing and effective obviously.

End it right there.

MR. J. TRAVIS: So you may notice some
action to my right here. Ten seconds, you got your
ten seconds, go.

MR. A. LUCKY: I'll be remiss if I don't
say this. I do believe we're in a catch 22 because
I know that most neighborhoods, most inhabitants of
neighborhoods, they won't say we often times voices
with people who are not perpetrators of violence
never get told. But they want safety but they don't
want it at the expense of, what someone said
earlier, state sponsored murder where police are
stopping people and don't have no way of
distinguishing between a thug versus a kid that's
just in the car.

So that's why we're in this catch 22.
And I also want to say most people in neighborhoods they afraid of the killers too, they afraid too, why they can't have a gun. Lastly I would say this, is that when we looking at this, we got do remember this. We got to remember this. That everybody want to go home at the end of the day, everybody want to go home, just period.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Efficient use of 10 seconds. We'll take a 15 minute break, be back at 12:30.

(A brief recess was taken.)

MR. J. TRAVIS: We are now in our final segment and Beverly is going to get us started unless you want to help out. Barbara will get us started, take ten minutes. You want to give it to Beverly?

MS. B. JONES: No.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Okay, standard set up, we'll give Barb ten minutes, ask her any clarifying questions and then open it up for discussion. The topic is healing from violence and I know given her work and her experience that she shared with us yesterday, it's both personal experiential and academic for her. We're really fortunate to have you at the table, Barb and hope you know how much we
appreciate your discussion yesterday of a painful journey that you've been on and we were side by side last night and talking about your daughter and how she's been part of our live stream discussion. But you bring something very distinctive and powerful to the discussion. When we thought about how we wanted to close, we were introduced to you and you were brought to our discussion and everybody said yes, so we're delighted that you're here.

MS. B. JONES: Thank you everyone. I do have a disclaimer, I know it should not be called out but I'm going to call it out anyway. I have abundantly and exceedingly not met your expectations for having a paper today. A paper is forthcoming and the name of the paper, the title of the paper is the faces of aftermath of visible and invisible loss. Radical resiliency towards justice and healing. So I will -- it's still a work in progress but I do make this promise that you will get a paper.

So I want everybody to write these words somewhere, whether in your journals or on a piece of paper. Everybody hurts. And everybody's going to take -- will be participants in this what I call a grounding moment with all of us together. So I want
to start with Jeremy and I want everyone to go around the table, and then we'll go this way and end it with you David or Soledad, did she leave? Okay, she's coming back.

We're going to start with Jeremy and I want everyone to say the two words everybody hurts in their strongest voice in this moment.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Everybody hurts.
MR. K. WATTLEY: Everybody hurts.
MS. K. FOX: Everybody hurts.
MS. K. CARTER-JACKSON: Everybody hurts.
MR. D. WEBSTER: Everybody hurts.
MS. C. COLON: Everybody hurts.
MS. F. MUHAMMAD: Everybody hurts.
MR. J. COLE: Everybody hurts.
MR. B. WESTERN: Everybody hurts.
MS. C. JONES: Everything hurts.
MR. J. CARTAGENA:Everybody hurts.
MS. A. HARVEY-QUINN: Everybody hurts.
MR. D. KENNEDY: Everybody hurts.
MS. A. ALEXANDER: Everybody hurts.
MS. B. JONES: Everybody hurts.
MR. D. HUREAU: Everybody hurts.
MS. K. HUFFMAN: Everybody hurts.
MR. J. LUPPINO-ESPOSITO: Everybody
MS. D. SERED: Everybody hurts.

MR. A. LUCKY: Everybody hurts.

MS. B. JONES: Thank you. I don't want to reintroduce myself for the tenth time again. You all know who I am. For those that are tuning in live stream, they also know this, too.

I made a disclaimer and some promises to some people, my support system and I'm going to accomplish some things today during this session that I haven't been able to do. So I need your attentiveness in this and I do want you to listen to me and I want you to listen to me carefully. I want you to close your eyes and listen.

I'm the mother of two children, Charmaine El-Jones and Conte Emmanual Smith-El. I've been a mother since I was 16 years old. Collectively I've been a mother longer than I've been an actual human being. I don't know any other life except for being a loving responsible nurturing provider and protector. My life has not been my own.

I raised my children to respect themselves, to respect me, to respect humanity. I'm 55 years old. I'm the mother of a murdered son. For the past 23 months I've lived a life of
physical, emotional, psychological turmoil, trauma
and unspeakable complex and complicated grief.
Please close your eyes.

I am not the only one who walks this journey and I need for you to hold space for each and every mother that has lost a child. The planned demise and murder of my only son, Conte, has caused a reordering of my life in such a way that no one will be able to understand, except for the mothers who have lost their children due to homicide, gun violence, lethal violence and murder. You have destroyed my family.

Let me tell you a little bit about my son Conte. Conte was a kind, respectable, loving and affectionate young man with a unique, very unique abilities. My son always spoke to everyone and greeted you with a smile that made you feel special, valued and important. Conte did that without fail because he did not want others to feel the pain of never, ever being loved, valued and respected only because he wasn't treated kindly by others and he didn't want anybody else to experience that. My son's unique ability to value everyone and everything was exhibited by his persona.

Once, driving down one of the streets in
Detroit, my son's unique ability to value everything was in a conversation when he shouted out, momma, watch out for that squirrel. I put on the brakes to avoid hitting that squirrel. That happened often because every time we were in the car together, whether it was in Detroit or Colorado, we're always in a hurry to get somewhere. Momma, don't hit that squirrel, momma, don't hit that squirrel.

I would pause my break, we both looked back and the squirrel made it across that street in whatever direction that that squirrel was going into. He turned to me and he smiled, I smiled back because I was just proud that I didn't hit that squirrel. He said, whew, okay, momma, we didn't hit the squirrel and then he would continuously smile. That smile, that smile, that smile. Conte valued life even the squirrel's life.

I had just seen my son 26 days, 26 days before his tragic death on an unexpected trip that my daughter facilitated. Some in this room have said that the work that they do, it's their ministry, I say the same thing, that this is my ministry.

My last visit with my son 26 days was full of love, laughter and immediate plans for me to
finally leave Detroit and relocate to be with my children. I was going to continue my work in Colorado Springs in advocacy for young people and anti-youth violence and restorative justice. In fact I had just had a job interview the same day before my last visit with my son.

We held hands, we talked about me moving here and he was so happy, we had a great conversation on how he was doing, even the morning of the same day of the last time I saw my son, I got angry at my son because we were supposed to go to a very important appointment that we missed because there was no one to relieve him from his job, so we can go to the appointment together.

Yeah, I still have my mothering attitude. I have my mothering attitude for sons and daughters who are not even my own kids because I'm committed to helping and guiding young people. Conte told me he was in a good space and that he was a little bit more comfortable being here in Colorado Springs after almost six years. His words brought me such immense joy.

I got that phone call, that dreaded unexpected phone call from my daughter on the morning of October 31, 2017, 3:35 A.M. her time,
about 5:35 my time, Detroit time. The ringing of my
phone at that time wasn't anything startling to me
because my daughter's a night owl. I really thought
it was her or my granddaughter calling me because my
granddaughter got ahold of my daughter's phone often
and knew how to dial her grammie.

I heard many voices when I picked up and
answered the phone, and the many voices on the other
end weren't talking directly to me, but I heard all
of these voices and I heard my daughter wailing in
the background, a wail that I had never heard
before, not even when she was born. My daughter was
not able to formulate the words to me to let me know
that my son, her only brother, who she's been a
murdered mother too because she's 11 and a half
years older than him, my two only children, my only
son and my only daughter.

It was one of the detectives from
Colorado Springs Police Department who had to tell
me that my son's dead. What constitutes the
horrific loss for me, my daughter and my entire
family, is that we have to wrestle with the facts
that were caught and witnessed and viewed on
multiple surveillance cameras plus two Ring cameras
inside the business that my son was employed.
Twelve and a half minutes I watched my son give service with a smile. Twelve and a half minutes I watched my son cover his mouth in a horror shock that one of his peers, whom he did not know, 23 years old, marched in, bolted in with an AR-15 semi automatic rifle that shot my son seven times.
I watched my son tied up, I watched my son brutalized, I heard my son scream for help, I watched my son attempting to fight and flee, something that I never taught him. I taught him either you fight or you run. My son did both at the same time. I watched my son endure 12 1/2 minutes of torture, exploitation, bullying and execution. I watched and heard my son scream out in pain. I watched my son and heard my son crawl on the floor to an exit. I watched my son take his last breaths before he gurgled and died.

What constitutes my loss constitutes my daughter's loss, my family's loss, my supportive circle, the community, my personal professional role of advocating for young men and women just like you, Joshua Daugherty and motivating them and inspiring them to live a respectable life in spite of any and all circumstances to respect themselves, respect their parents, family and their community.
I teach peace, I champion young people.

I'm with the under dog, my son was the under dog, the most vulnerable but the most valued members of our community and future peace building, peace making, peace keeping. You stole my son's dignity, you stole my son's trust.

You laid along next to my son pretending to be a victim and then ultimately helping to tie my son up, advancing his own demise without shame. What you did to my son when he witnessed your contribution to this horrific act, I could not think of what was going on through my son's mind, but I watched it.

Don't think for a minute that I haven't thought about you, your family and if the tables were turned and different and if I was in that same exact position as you and your mother and your entire family, if my son had did this to you, I thought about you, I think about you and I will never forget you for the rest of my life. The impact of your actions will forever be intertwined in my life and the community of Colorado Springs and Colorado.

My son's life will never be restored. I must honor my son's legacy although my life and my
daughter's life and my entire family's life is destroyed. See, I created Conte's annual memorial scholarship for young men like you. My son has a face, he has a name, although I don't agree with the slap on the wrist that you received for the murder of my son as a restorative justice practitioner and the mother of a murdered son.

I'm asking Judge David Miller, the DA's office, the entire judicial system, the youth offender service program in Colorado Springs, Colorado. Colorado Springs law enforcement and my overt requests to set up and implement and execute a formal and comprehensive victim offender dialogue session with you right here in Colorado Springs, Colorado involving me, you, your mother, and your entire family.

I want my family to be there as well. This is my request. I pray that this will be honored by the above mentioned parties from me. This is my victim's impact statement that was read on June 28, 2019 to the honorable Judge David Miller, officers of the court, Colorado Springs police department, Mr. Kelson Castain, Mrs. Jennifer Darby and the entire district attorney's office of El Paso County, to the team, the entire team and
more importantly to the entire community of Colorado Springs and the entire community of Colorado Springs, Colorado and Detroit Michigan.

Keep your eyes closed. My son has been the subject of the media at least 24 times. My journey is not over yet. The sentencing of the 25 now 25 year old resulted in a two life sentences plus 22 years. Life is no parole for the 25 year old. Joshua Daugherty received the seven-year sentence and that was in exchange for him testifying against Hill. And I'm going to quote from one of the media stories that although Daugherty helped tie up the victim, he did not take part in the violence because he wasn't an active shooter.

The judge said that he considered rejecting the plea deal, but ultimately accepted it because Daugherty's distortions on the stand didn't derail the case against Hill, 25, who was convicted at the last retrial and sentenced to life in prison. The first trial in April ended with a deadlocked jury, so I've gone through this twice. Relatives of Conte Smith-El rattled against Daugherty's lack of accountability saying that it bars any hope of restoration.

The dead man's mother, Barbara Jones, a
Detroit based anti-violence advocate said in court that she would like to meet with Daugherty in prison for the dialog. The judge encouraged Daugherty to accept my offer saying that he must confront his role in the death of Conte Smith-El before he can be fully rehabilitated.

I just wanted to read that excerpt from one of the media reports. I have interfaced with every aspect of the criminal justice system today, to this date and I'm still not done. We cannot heal what we are not willing to confront. So if your expectation of me today was to offer you any type of strategic models of healing, the first model that I'm going to offer you all today is that we must be willing to confront the truth before we can even think about healing.

I was the first witness in two trials to provide proof of life for a kid that I carried under my heart. My story of the complicated and complex aspects of grief, mourning, honoring the legacy of my dead son pretty much frames what my paper is about, the aftermath of the faces of invisible and visible violence that will move us to radical resiliency towards justice and healing, but we cannot get there until we deal with this pain. And
when you all don't listen to me you don't want to hear the pain. You want me to tuck my pain but you want me to stay in this fight.

I offer you we cannot confront the pain if you refuse to listen. That's just my story. It's a couple of people in this room that are dealing with the same thing that I even have a guilt about because we've asked this question so many times, who's accountable, what does justice look like for you? What does justice look like for you, Barb? I've gotten the platitudes, I cannot imagine what you're going through, and I know that is not an empty platitude, I receive that in the best way that I can.

But where I am today that moves me toward radical resiliency as it relates to justice and healing is that all of you have imagined, even when you tell me I haven't imagined what you're going through, Barb. People even ask me why did you watch that video and not only did I watch it once, I watched it twice because I couldn't believe the capacity that we have with each other that is so institutionalized and so systemic that we jump over, that we don't talk about, no one wants to hear my story or pain because it makes others feel
uncomfortable. This is dangerous work for me, it's
dangerous work for you.

And when Ray Winans said earlier on how
we're going to do this reconciliation justice
because my son's life cannot be restored. When I
offered my victim impact statement, when I turned
around to walk away, not only did I have to give one
impact statement, I had to give two. My daughter
had to give two, my ex-husband, who is a product, an
example of the criminal justice system. My
ex-husband -- my children's father is a product of
this marginalized and institutionalized system who
is dependent upon the police to help solve our son's
crime.

The level of justice that I received
ain't no winners here. I still have to confront
that family who did this to my son. After I read my
victim impact statement and I haven't shared this
with too many people and I'm putting myself out here
in a way that I'm trying to make this rational and
so logical because of how I came into this academic
space at the age of 48 to get educated, get a piece
of paper that I already know because I'm a mother.

When I walked away from giving my impact
statement and my daughter walked up, when I turned
around and faced that family, they laughed at me.
They laughed at me. I couldn't even sit down and
listen to my own daughter give her victim impact
statement because I was so overwhelmed with the
ridicule that I received from another family to
where I sat down I had to excuse myself because
something was about to erupt in that courtroom that
would have said not the Barbara Jones that I know.

I have interacted with law enforcement in
a way that I'm going to challenge everyone in this
room, it's because of where we're from, I was
already stereotyped when I had to talk to the first
officer on a call because I'm from Detroit, I'm a
single black mother. Nobody sees me as an academic,
they don't respect me as an academic. I'm a black
mother who suffered from visible and invisible
violence. And we black mothers and we parents get
the blame all the time. I know some amazing parents
that is dealing with the same issue that I'm dealing
with that's not in this room that need to be in this
room.

But we don't want to talk about them.
You all don't even want to acknowledge me and you
see me every single day. We can't heal, I can't
heal, you can't heal, everybody hurts. We can't
heal what we cannot confront. And in closing, I've touched 14, probably more than 14, 15 in a mistrial and in a retrial. We're not even talking about the loss that I have suffered. And for me to sit there and the work that we do together and I got to sit there and be on the other side of this. I have quit my job every single day when I got that call and when my director came over to see me in Detroit, I can't even focus because I told my director that I didn't need this purpose, I didn't need this event to define a purpose of what I was doing in my life.

I was already operating in my purpose and it still happened to me and every other mother that is operating in their purpose that haven't even received the level of justice that I have. I got mothers that haven't even gone through the court system. I got mothers that want justice. What does justice mean to you? What does justice mean to me? It's an injustice when I walk around this university, I walk around and I see people who can't even look me in the face, but I'm expected to continue to help somebody else's child and minimize the own grief and pain and trauma that I'm trying to figure out what I need because I have gone through this are and I'm still going through this. What
about the mother who hasn't even received the level
of justice and I suffer and guilt from that because
I carry them with me.

But one thing that I'm going to say is
that I had a very interesting conversation with the
lead detective of my son's case who didn't know
anything about me except for my son was dead, they
had to notify my daughter, they had to do all this
notification, he didn't even know anything about me
or my son, but he judged me, pre-judged me because
I'm from Detroit with 267 homicides that I purposely
got my son out of this environment and got my son in
Colorado Springs so he wouldn't continue to
experience violence and the forms of violence that
he experienced before he met his demise.

I purposely did that and it still
happened in Colorado Springs. My son was the 26th
homicide, I said that yesterday, in Colorado
Springs. One of the things the police officer said
to me after our exchange, heated exchange because I
was stereotyped in a way to where I couldn't focus
on the loss of my son, I got to focus on what this
officer said to me that offended me to the point
where I had to say you don't know who you're talking
to. You got the right black mother here.
And from that exchange to this day and ongoing because I'm still dealing with the aftermath of the invisible and visible loss of dealing with the criminal justice system, that police officer told me, after we had the interesting conversation, he said, Ms. Jones, I don't mean to offend you. I am going to treat your son as if this was my son because he didn't deserve this. What law enforcement officer tells a black mother from Detroit that. Colorado Springs police did.

I operated in a community where we have advocates for mothers that deal with homicide, front lines, we are in a dangerous position. But I still have to hold space for the two black mothers who were advocating and murdered in Chicago, black mothers who were murdered in Chicago just recently for the advocacy and on the ground trying to bring peace, justice and healing to a community and those two black mothers were shot in Chicago. I got to hold space for them. There is a visible and invisible loss that you all don't even have an idea of what I'm just personally dealing with because I have opportunity to tell my story that nobody wants to hear. I've actually been refrained and redirected from even telling my story because it's
too painful for someone to hear, but I have you all coming up to me and saying I can't imagine what you're going through.

I say this and I say this again that you all have imagined what I'm going through because you lived my words with your eyes closed, but you also held another type of space for me for those who are parents and mothers in this room because for 30 seconds, for 30 seconds at least on minimum, you put yourself in my position, but you were able to remove yourself from that pain because it did not happen to you. So you have imagined. There is much, much more to what I can talk about as it relates to radical resiliency and justice and healing in a space outside of ten minutes that results in a paper that my son is the data, your son is the data, everybody's sons and daughter is the data.

But no one will look at me, no one will look at this walking, breathing data. My grief, your grief is an act of love, and the only thing that I had envisioned is that we got these young people, we got these artists talking about love. We want the art to come into the spaces, but none of us at this roundtable, whether we've had a conversation or not, but based off of what I've heard and I've
stepped out a couple of times. I've never heard
anything about love being in this conversation.

Because we love what we do and on some
days we really don't like what we do, but we show up
everyday. And I had not missed a beat because I got
some people that love and support me in so many ways
that I don't even know that I can't even trust
because this work is dangerous. We are on the front
lines and you don't know how dangerous just with me
being here is. That's a radical real resiliency
because I don't know what's going to happen after
this. But I'm expected to heal and there's no
trauma informed grief to help me or another mother
deal with the visible and the invisible loss that
we're all dealing with that we have not had this
corveration about.

Because yes, we talk about defendants, we
talk about offenders. But we ain't talking about
the victims. I got another mother who says ain't no
such thing as healing that don't even believe in the
power of healing and she's on the front lines every
single day. We're all spiritual in this room. We
may not all practice the same faith, and this has
been heavy for everyone, everyone, everone.

How are you all going to walk away from
this space, from this city, really from each other if we can't talk about what we need to do to even heal? We can't heal what we're not willing to confront, and there's a lot of stuff we're not confronting. Thank you.

The last exercise as a part of this, you all said it in your voice that everybody hurts. Now, I want us to collectively say everybody hurts, hold on. Five, four, three, two, one.

ALL: Everybody hurts, hold on.

MS. B. JONES: Thank you, thank you.

MR. J. TRAVIS: I appreciate the hugs that are being offered. And as we end our time together and Bruce will understand if we forego his closing, I would just like to provide an opportunity for anybody who would like to say anything in the spirit of the love that Barbara asked us to name and acknowledge to you or to each other. And then leave with a commitment to continue the hard work of retention that is necessary for healing.

So the mics and floors are open for any final words of appreciation.

MS. F. MUHAMMAD: So, Barbara, thank you so, so much. I want to just say that I can feel the impact in the room. If we could just do a quick
breathing exercise just to kind of center us since this is at the end.

I want to invite everyone to just put your feet on the ground, and if you decide to keep your eyes open or closed, we're just going to do something together.

Just notice your feet on the ground, take a deep breath in, exhale slowly. Another deep cleansing breath in, hold it. Exhale slowly. One more deep breath in, exhale slowly.

Just take a moment and notice your feet, notice your ankles, your knees, your thighs, notice your thought is continuing, notice your shoulders and release tension now. Continue to breathe.

Keep your awareness up through your face, all the way extend beyond your crown. Remember to take care of yourself and continue to breathe.

Thank you.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Thank you all for the last three days. Thank you Fatimah for that ending. Thank you Barb for the reminder of what's important in life. We're here for you in any ways that we can be.

MS. B. JONES: Thank you.

MR. J. TRAVIS: A reminder that there's
others you're speaking for who are not here, that
there are many people around the state who we work
with every day and care about and are trying to be
there for them. And the appreciation that I want to
express to everybody is for your generosity of
spirit and for your willingness to engage in ways
that are sometimes -- Alia, did you want to say
something before we close?

MS. A. HARVEY-QUINN: Thank you. I think
there is sometimes invisibility of this pain, and I
think it's meaningful to just be warmed and received
in a compassionate space.

MR. J. TRAVIS: Any other final words? I
don't want to be the only voice at the end of our
time together.

MR. R. WINANS: Thank everybody for your
patience. And Barb, thank you, Barb, for being who
it is that you are. Like, that's just who it is
that you are but you serve as that example. So I
just want to thank you for that. And Amanda, I
won't expect anything less. And lastly, Alia, where
you at, sis? I can't see your face. There you go.
We got work to do baby, we got work to do. And I
thank y'all, thank you y'all, seriously. And thank
you for hosting this.
MR. J. TRAVIS: Anything else?

Thank you, thank you, thank you. We hope to stay in touch. We applaud the work that everybody is doing here, it's important in all the ways that you've described. Thank you for being so generous and being with us for the last three days.

(Meeting concluded about 1:13 P.M.)
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Thirdly, I thought.

Thoughts are not just fleeting, they can be powerful and long-lasting. I stood there,望着 my list of tasks, wondering how I could possibly complete them all. My thoughts raced... today, tomorrow, the day after tomorrow. Feeling overwhelmed and lost.

declaration of a certain truth.

One thing that frustrated me was my own tendency to succumb to the pressure of deadlines. I wanted to do everything perfectly, but sometimes that perfectionism just added to my stress.

I was thinking about what it would take to thrive and to thrive I needed to start taking things one day at a time, not try to seize today with all its burdens and stresses and worries.

to make tomorrow a little bit better than today, and to make today a little bit better than yesterday.

I wanted to change things, make things different. I had so many ideas, but too often I succumbed to the fear of failure. I had to learn to trust in the process and to trust in myself. I was tired of the struggle and the wear.

I wanted to make my life easier, to make it more enjoyable, I wanted to make it more fulfilling. And I was determined to make it happen.

My hopes were many, my dreams were vast. But I knew I had to start by one step at a time.

to find me, to find my way.

I was determined to get better, to grow, to change, to transform. I wanted to become the person I wanted to be, the person I believed was potential inside me.

I wanted to thrive, I wanted to live.

I tried, I struggled, I failed, I experimented, I learned. I couldn't do it all at once. I had to work at it day by day, making small steps toward a greater, wider future.

And so I stood there, towering over my tasks, feeling the weight of the moment.

I knew I had to take a deep breath, to let go of the fears that held me back. I had to let go of the past and focus on the present.

And so I said to myself, 'I am capable, I am strong, I am successful.'

And I knew I would make it happen.

I was determined.
uplifted 19:8
uprising 84:3
upset 41:9
urban 5:5
value 33:15 68:24
valued 28:20 40:1 63:14
vantage 50:20
variable 88:11,15
vast 64:7 79:15
vastly 64:3
Vegas 65:1
version 3:18 4:4
versus 27:10 60:14 92:9
112:23
victim 122:8 123:13 124:13
127:6,18 128:3
victim’s 123:20
victimized 105:19
victims 90:3 103:15,16 133:19
video 126:20
view 55:9,10 83:22 84:17
102:23
viewed 120:23
violence 5:5,12 7:6 10:13
11:5,6 15:11,21 17:23 18:6,
10,11 22:21 38:14,15,19
47:11 50:23 51:1 56:3,4,6
58:14 61:15 62:1 64:16,18,25
65:6,8,11,15,25 67:21,22
68:6,18,21 74:14 76:19 77:6,
8,9,13,19 78:12,15,24 79:13,
15,18,25 80:2,14,17,24,25
81:5,7,10,14,16,20 82:18,19
83:8,15,20 84:12 85:3 86:5,8,
12,20 87:19,20 88:12,16,17
89:4,6,24 90:4,5,8,12,23 91:9
92:17,24 93:10 95:23,24 96:3
violent 40:2 44:9 46:3 79:10
85:8,21
visible 114:16 125:23 128:16
131:3,20 133:14
vision 15:25 38:7
visit 118:24 119:6
vocabulary 50:11
voice 44:24 58:1 115:7 134:7
136:14
voices 21:15 58:11 112:17
120:7,8,10
voluntary 108:20
voting 35:25
vulnerable 122:3

wait 36:2 74:19
waiting 84:21
waling 120:10
walk 16:1 25:3 58:9 127:7
129:19,20 133:25
walked 99:17 127:24,25
walking 132:19
walks 117:4
wanted 3:20 38:13,23 57:20,
21 73:21,25 75:15,17,19 76:9
80:10 94:2,6 102:21 103:3
114:6 125:7
wanting 11:3
war 35:20 85:18
war-like 85:17
warmed 136:11