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MS. HUFFMAN: Yes. Welcome to everyone. It is great to see you all here again today. Again, I am Katharine Huffman. I am the Executive Director here at Square One.

It was such a pleasure to start getting to know all of you last week. And we are really looking forward to digging in on our first two discussion sessions for this roundtable today, focused on justice and the social contract.

So I am going to start out with just a few quick reminders and updates before I hand this over to our facilitator, Jeremy Travis, who will remind us where we have been, introduce a few newcomers, and get us started.

So first, a couple of reminders about events coming up.

Next week, on Tuesday, August 18th, we wanted to let you all know that Square One will be participating in a side event, a virtual side event at the virtual Democratic National Convention as part of the Raben Respite Convention Series. So we hope you will join us.

And several of your colleagues here at the roundtable today, Bruce Western, Emily Wang, Danielle Allen, Sukyi McMahon, and a couple of others will be leading us in a conversation titled Justice on the Trail: The Future of Justice and Democracy. Our colleague
Madison is going to post the registration link in the chat box now so you will have that right now, and we will also be forwarding information to all of you. So we hope you can join, and that you will share with others.

Second, and just as important, a reminder that at the close of our session today, for anyone who is able to stay on for a little bit longer, we are looking forward to an informal virtual happy hour together, where we can just talk informally, and get to know each other a little better. No pressure at all. This is not required. You have not committed to this.

But if you would like to stay online for an extra few minutes, please do. Kids, pets, partners, anyone else in your near vicinity are welcome to join you on your screen as well. So if folks are able to stay on, we invite you to do that.

So now, a little bit of housekeeping for today's session. Today we are going to be beginning our work together, digging in on some important topics.

First, Elizabeth Hinton will provide a historical perspective on social change and the social contract in the U.S., with particularly what we can learn from the past half century or so. And second, David Garland will share his insights on what we can learn about making change to our own system of justice in the U.S.
examining the justice systems and other social systems in some other wealthy countries with a comparative look.

So for each of these approximately one-hour conversations, our paper authors will start us off by talking for just about ten minutes, to give us an overview. And then we will move into a group conversation.

For the authors, Elizabeth and David, our Square One colleague Madison will be our timekeeper today. She will send you little time checks during the course of your ten minutes, so you will know how far along you are. Those will come in your chat box.

And then after each of you starts us off, we will take a quick moment for any clarifying questions directly to the authors. But then we will move into a group discussion, which we hope and expect will be free flowing, as it was at the end of our gathering last week together.

So for that discussion, just a quick reminder for everybody about how to get into the queue. Jeremy will be facilitating us. And he will be calling on us, in the order in which we sort of raise our hands in the queue.

I think Sukyi is going to post this. Sukyi, are you going to post the instructions again? Yes. There
it is. The magic of Zoom. As you can see there, if you would like -- if you have something you would like to contribute, just go to the participants button at the bottom of your screen.

Click on raise your hand, and you will be joining the queue. You will be coming into the queue on Jeremy's screen, showing up in the order in which you raised your hand. And so, he will be moving through that.

But as Jeremy explained to us last week, if you have an urgent comment that needs to come in response to something right away, something that won't make sense if you don't get to jump in quickly, or that really is important to that particular moment in the discussion, you are welcome to do that. You can just do that by getting Jeremy's attention. Ideally, by physically waving your hand.

We are all on a screen. Jeremy can see all of our faces. And so, he will almost certainly see you doing that. You can also send a private chat message. But the hand waving is better, because I happen to know how much he focuses on the faces before him in the screen. And that would be a good way to do that.

So with that, I will just say, welcome again. It is really great to see you all. And we, I think, Jeremy, are ready to go ahead and get started.
MR. TRAVIS: Great. So let me, again, add my welcome and my thanks to everybody who participated in the first session last week. If you haven't had a chance to look at it, the session was recorded and is posted on the Square One YouTube channel.

And it is really a rich, deep, far ranging discussion that we had. And as happens often in these types of meetings, even if it is not on Zoom, we lose a lot of the nuance and the complexity of the substance. Just because things happen so quickly.

So I encourage you -- we also keep a transcript. But I encourage you, if you want to spend some time reliving this experience, we have that luxury, because we are connected this way. This is an advantage of our technology.

The second thing I would like to do is just remind you where we are in the longer process. So we are meeting every week at this time. And I'm really impressed with the turnout. And the turnout last week was great.

And in each of these sessions, as Katharine laid out, we will have a paper presenter who gets to administer. So we talk about summarizing their paper, and what they would like us to take away from it. And then a discussion, starting with clarifying questions and then a discussion that I will facilitate around that paper.
This is not an academic conference. We are not responding to the paper. We are responding to the ideas that are put into the conversation by the paper writer. And of course, the paper matters, because we are framing up some very big topics here.

But my goal as the facilitator is to keep things moving quickly, so that we can cover as much ground as possible. Get as many ideas into the mix as possible. And to the extent that we have some back and forth, and maybe some disagreement, that is a good thing, that we want to encourage and be respectful, and direct and constructive in their comments. And of course, to keep them terse and short.

You did great last time. I was really, really impressed with this group, in the sense that we were able to make -- give everybody a voice. And we'll try to do that again today. No guarantee, but we will do our best in that regard.

We meet again next week, and we have another session, very much like this one. Two papers -- I am sorry, three papers, on various elements of the social contract. And we meet once again, then we meet once again.

So we are on a journey together. And today, we are focusing on these two issues of history, with
Elizabeth Hinton's paper. And the comparative look at the social contract with Dave Garland's paper, getting us started.

A couple of more housekeeping things, if you don't mind. Do get my attention, if you want to intervene, with what we call the urgent wave.

And please just be respectful of others. And if I make some note, motion like this, that probably means time to cut it off and move on. We have a lot of time to be together, and a lot of airtime for everybody.

So let's realize that we have some people who have joined us for the first time. And we want to give them a moment to introduce themselves. But I want to thank you.

Thank you to those people who made some contributions by email after the last session. And just to thank them, and to recognize some of the afterthoughts.

A lot happens after we leave our time together.

Hedy Lee suggested, the academic that she is, things we can read, homework to look at. There are great articles that will elevate some of the points that were made last time. My favorite one was on the social contract as property, particularly white privilege as property. So take a look at Hedy's recommendations.

Kimá Joy Taylor made some suggestions that we
think about the difficulty of bringing equity into our conversation about the social contract, and the sacrifices that people should make in order for the social contract to be actionable. Great suggestion.

And Marcia Rincon-Gallardo did something that we did at the end of last session. Remember, that we did this little exercise of asking people to nominate something that somebody else had said as something to hold on to, that was new to them, as opposed to going back to what they had said before.

And Marcia, after last time, said, in reflection, I want to lift up two contributions of others. It was just a very generous sentiment. I like that a lot. But one was, Ananya's recognition of the original peoples or land. That conversation, that observation was made a number of times, last time. And it is, and remains, worth our continuing recognition of that.

Marcia, I thank you a lot for that.

And Chas Moore, who made a lot of very important contributions last time, Marcia wanted to just remind us what he said about the importance of youth involved voices. Those were system-involved young people, leadership, potential, it was really driving a lot of movement these days. And the risk of overly concentrating on systems, as opposed to people.
(Ringing.)

MR. TRAVIS: Sorry about that. That one will disappear. We have some people with us today who could not make last session. We have one person, colleague, who couldn't make it this time, and that is Deanna Van Buren had another obligation.

I also want to acknowledge that we have a couple of observers with us. Jasmin Sandelson from the Columbia Justice Lab, who is here, and is doing a lot of writing about Square One.

And Nancy Fishman from the Schusterman Family Foundation is joining us and is a funder. And we are grateful for her contribution then, for her years and years of work on justice reform.

So I am going to name five people who are with us today. I think they are all here, and ask them just to say their name, their institutional affiliation, and just once sentence, I really mean it, one sentence of what draws them to this particular topic.

So that is a challenge. Name, institutional affiliation, and what brings you to this topic. So that we could just get your voice in play, since you weren't able to join us last time.

And those people are Amara Johns, Vesla Weaver, Danielle Allen, Fatima Loren Dreier, and Aswad Thomas, who
has joined us for the first time. We are grateful that you could join us, Aswad.

But let me start with Amara Johns. And looking at the screen. And is Amara here? If so, the floor is yours.

MS. McMAHON: I apologize, Jeremy. Amara let us know she will be an hour late. And also, Danielle is having trouble entering. I will get her in immediately.

MR. TRAVIS: Okay. I saw Danielle's picture there.

MS. ALLEN: Yes. Thank you. I am not sure. I don't know.

MR. TRAVIS: Now you are muted.


MR. TRAVIS: Hi, Danielle. Good to see you.

MS. ALLEN: Good to see you, as well.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. So and Vesla, we know is here, because we already heard from her. But Vesla, what would you like to say about who you are, your institutional affiliation, and a sentence. Maybe two. What brings you to this topic, of the future of the social contract in America, and how it applies to justice.

You are also muted. There we go.

MS. WEAVER: Sorry. Thanks, Jeremy. I am Vesla Weaver, and I am at Johns Hopkins University. I am
a political scientist. And what draws me to this work is that I have long known that this is -- and tried to theorize that this is -- the policing that the criminal justice system, the carceral state, is a central aspect of what the state is and does, is a key feature defining American citizenship. Is a key way that we come to know about government.

And so I was told early on not to write about that, that that wasn't a concern of political scientists. And I am glad that I didn't listen.

MR. TRAVIS: Great. Love it. Yes. Danielle, welcome. As you are -- and what brings you to this party.

MS. ALLEN: So I am a political philosopher, based at Harvard, and Director of the Edmund J. Sacker Center for Ethics. And you know, it is hard to give a short answer to that question. I mean, everything Vesla said, I would put a check by.

My first book was on punishment in antiquity, of all things. A long time ago, already. But I realize that I wrote that book.

It was a project that I got started on as an undergraduate at Princeton in the late early ’90s, because I had grown up in Southern California. And over the course of the ‘80s, just saw the massive growth of the carceral system around me.
And I was, as an undergraduate, struck in reading the sort of literature on antiquity, about the fact that they didn't use imprisonment. It seemed to be sort of non-existent in their courtroom speeches and so forth. You would never have known that such a thing existed.

I couldn't imagine a world -- I couldn't believe there was a world that existed that where prisons were kind of just growing and growing and taking up more and more space. And so, I guess, like just literally since then, I have been wanting to try to find a community of people who could collectively achieve an alternative to what we have.

So this looks like that community of people.

So I am happy to be part of it.

MR. TRAVIS: Great. We are happy to have you.

And Fatimah, it is nice to see you. Fatimah is a roundtable veteran from our Detroit roundtable.

MS. DREIER: Hi there.

MR. TRAVIS: Hi.

MS. DREIER: It is good to see you.

MR. TRAVIS: Nice to see you. What brings you to this work, Fatimah?

MS. DREIER: Sure. So hello, everyone.

Fatimah Loren Dreier. Recently married, Executive
Director of the Health Alliance for Violence Intervention. We are a national network of hospital-based violence intervention programs. I am also newly named Posen-Commonwealth Fellow at the Yale School of Management.

And what brings me to this work really is the paradigm shift of our time. And we really are at this particular moment, with an incredible moment of global uprising.

And I feel a particular responsibility to do our part, to contribute to the realm of ideas and to really build, you know, what are the alternatives? What is that infrastructure that we are imagining when we tear all this down, the carceral state and policing as we know it.

MR. TRAVIS: Thanks, Fatimah. Wonderful to have you here. And thanks, congratulations on that new appointment. And Aswad Thomas has joined us.

Aswad, give a sense of who you are, what you do, and what brings you to this work?

MR. THOMAS: Thank you all for having me. Aswad Thomas. I am the Managing Director of Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice. A fellowship project of the Alliance for Safety and Justice, CSSJ is a national network of crime victims across the country. And what kind of led me to this work is, I am also a victim of gun
violence.

You know, like many crime victims across the country, the criminal justice system and traditional victim services, we have been left out of the conversation, out of policy making, out of program -- out of funding. So being able to organize crime survivors across the country to make sure that we have a voice at public tables, but also influencing programming and funding at the state level.

MR. TRAVIS: Thank you, Aswad. Thank you for joining us. And this gives me a chance to say that your participation in an earlier Square One event has stuck with me, ever since. And so, I commend it to everybody to take a look at Aswad's remarks on another occasion.

So we are now about to jump into our work. Just to see if there are any questions, let us know through chat. But I am ready to get going, and I hope that you are as well.

So again, the drill is, we will turn first to Elizabeth to take ten minutes or so to say whatever she thinks will spur conversation in this group. She already knows who we are and knows what we are about. And it may not be a summary of the paper, but it could be. We don't know.

And as you know, she is asking this really
radical question about almost what if, what if our country had taken a different turn years ago and taken community participation seriously. She will do that for ten minutes.

I will pause to ask for clarifying questions. And then we will open it up to whoever is in the queue. If you want to react, please get in the queue.

The insistent wave gets you in more quickly, and we'll move pretty quickly. It will feel like we are moving quickly through this, because it is a big topic. But that is how we put a lot of things in our pressure cooker, hoping that they will generate some life.

So the floor is yours, Elizabeth. If you would like to take it away.

MS. HINTON: Thanks so much, Jeremy. And thanks also, Bruce and Katharine and Sukyi, and Evie, and everybody who helped make this possible. It is really wonderful to be here. And I am going to try to be as brief as possible, because I am really looking forward to this discussion.

And I do think there is a lot of really important overlap between some of the issues that I am raising in my paper, and also David's paper. So I think it will be a lively and important day. I wrote this just like, I think, most other paper contributors in the pre-
COVID world. So this was back in February or March.

And after COVID and after George Floyd, these issues about community representation and the policy precedent of maximum feasible participation seems even more urgent to me. And so, I turned parts of this into a New York Times op-ed, that is again kind of propping up maximum feasible participation as this really important policy precedent.

So last week, many of us raised some skepticism about the social -- the idea of a social contract. And if that contract ever really extended or was meant for poor people and people of color. And you know, which raises the question, is the system broken?

Is mass incarceration and our problems with policing and punishment the result of a system that doesn't work? Or is it working exactly the way that it has been designed.

And I think since the election of Donald Trump, at least -- I am a historian. And so, increasingly among historians, there are new discussions kind of pushing back on this narrative of the U.S., U.S. history as one of kind of continued progress. And rethinking it as something that has always been about punishment, that has always been about repression.

And I think, you know, a lot of our work shows
just what a tremendous policy failure mass incarceration has been. And in my own work that this draws from, which this work is part of the research I did for my first book, which is called *From The War of Poverty to The War on Crime: The Making of Mass Incarceration in America*. And it is a history of federal crime policy from the Kennedy administration through the Reagan administration.

When I started doing the work in the early 2000s, you know, many people had kind of located the rise of mass incarceration in the Reagan administration in the 1980s. And you know, as I began to do the research, looking at these federal documents, my primary source base was the White House central files of these administrations.

I kept on having to go back and back and back to the source, all of the way to Kennedy, which is kind of surprising, right. We don't typically think of, you know, the moment of the war on poverty and the civil rights revolution as also being the moment where policies were introduced that fostered the widespread criminalization of targeted low-income communities of color, which I argue is largely a response to the threat of demographic transformations and urban uprisings happening in many cities at this point.

But, so you know, the question is, in the midst
of all these repressive policies, you know -- and I get
asked this a lot. Like, what are the things that worked?
You know, what are the things that we could turn to that
might help us think about transformation in the future?

And this concept, as critical as I am of the
war on poverty and the Johnson administration in my book,
the concept of maximum feasible participation is a really,
really important policy precedent. That means that when
we talk about community-based alternatives, we don't have
to -- you know, it is not pie in the sky things. This is
a program the federal government supported.

And basically, the centerpiece of the early war
on poverty was this idea that structures many justice
reform movements today, in particularly those founded and
directed by formerly incarcerated people, which is that
those closest to the problem are closest to the solution.

So in the first year of the war on poverty,
Congress introduced this principle of maximum feasible
participation, which allowed the federal government to
begin granting autonomous grassroots organizations funding
directly. So the federal government kind of bypassed the
states and you know, gave millions of dollars in grants to
community organizations like the Woodlawn Organization in
Chicago, and the Syracuse Development Organization and
Mobilization for Youth in the lower east side, that
basically said, you know, you know much better how to respond to the problems of poverty than we do in Washington.

So you know, we are entrusting you to solve poverty. And we are going to take taxpayer dollars to support you in that process. This idea and community action programs end up being discussed as kind of the main steering force of the war on poverty.

But really, this direct kind of funding channel only lasted for a year, from 1964 to 1965. And by 1965, 1966, especially in the aftermath of rebellion in places like Watts, and Los Angeles in '65, local officials really bristled at this, right. Because the problem, when you are giving millions of dollars to poor people, this kind of vision of governance really does threaten, right, to undermine longstanding systems of racial hierarchy.

So eventually, policymakers fought back. And increasingly, these grants were tied to municipal officials and civic organizations and police that became involved in implementing these programs. So for many organizations, if they wanted to receive funding, they had to have some kind of municipal oversight which, as we know, can really compromise the programs themselves.

So the root -- for me, the root of some of these shortcomings in these policies has to do, of course,
with policymakers on racism, with the emphasis on kind of behavior as being the root cause of poverty, rather than socioeconomic exclusion and systemic racism. And you know, as such, the war on poverty was limited, even though it has this you know, sexy terminology. But it wasn't a major structural intervention.

Johnson and others believed that Black pathology was the root cause of Black poverty. And so, the idea is, we can actually fight Black poverty cheaply, because you know, the kinds of programs that are necessary are self-help programs, remedial education. The war on poverty was not a job creation program for poor people.

But the war on crime that Johnson then launched in the second year of the war on poverty became a job creation program for police. So I am kind of all over the place. But this really important -- you know, as Jeremy introduced this.

You know, going back to the ‘60s, this is a really important kind of crossroads in domestic policy that these twinned domestic programs, one is warring on poverty, one warring on crime, were at the center of domestic policy. And eventually the crime war is what ended up winning out and what ended up getting implemented.

And you know, we can think about, you know,
what -- again, this how I end the piece, you know, what
the U.S. would look like if policymakers got behind the
war on poverty and this idea of empowering marginalized
communities with the same kind of length and level of
commitment and resources that they dedicated to the war on
crime, the war on drugs, the war on gangs throughout the
remainder of the 20th century and into the 21st.

So I will stop there. And looking forward to
discuss it.

MR. TRAVIS: Thank you very much, Elizabeth. A
perfect launch for a good discussion. So we always ask if
there are clarifying questions, something that didn’t
quite come across in ways that you could understand what
Elizabeth meant.

And you can do that just by waving at me.

Otherwise, we will start. Yes, Heather.

MS. RICE-MINUS: So I apologize, Jeremy. I am
not sure whether this is a clarifying -- counts as
clarifying or not. But there are questions.

MR. TRAVIS: Go ahead.

MS. RICE-MINUS: So two related to the example
that you gave, Elizabeth, in the programs that were funded
in ’65 to ’66. Were there any signs, even within that
year of outcomes from those programs? And I am also
wondering just overall, for your theory, what were the
metrics of success?

MS. HINTON: Well, I think from many of the residents' perspectives, you know, they had been registered to vote. They had successfully challenged landlords with the help of groups like the Syracuse Development Organization, so, ostensibly improving their conditions. Community programs were launched for youth.

I mean, I think it is also, because the program was so short lived, before it became essentially -- these programs became more institutionalized and more tied to the civic organizations, and in some cases, the police. You know, the pertinent point is, they weren't ever really given the chance to work before many of these local officials felt as though their power was threatened.

And what was the second part of your question? Sorry.

MS. RICE-MINUS: I am just wondering, like overall, for the theory to work, like, how would we measure? So if we were to pour resources in, as you are suggesting, to community-based or to the community itself, how would we know if it was working? What metrics would you use to define that?

MS. HINTON: Well, I think, you know, talking to people, talking to people in the community and seeing how they are responding to this investment. I think the
other thing is that, you know, we have to be prepared to
be patient. And we have to be prepared to have some of
these -- to have this kind of change not always, you know,
demonstrate success maybe by traditional metrics.

Certainly, with respect to, you know, crime
control programs on the other end, many failed programs
that didn't succeed in reducing crime continue to be
funded. I think one of the ironies behind this is that,
you know, those community-based crime prevention programs
that did receive federal grants into the '70s, like tenant
patrol organizations and community block watches and
things like that were much cheaper than the policing
programs that the federal government supported, and did
have a measurable impact on crime.

Yet, consistently across region, across city,
these community-based efforts were quickly defunded. So
you know, I think part of it is, and this is one of the
points of the paper, elites, people in power, people who
have control over these kinds of investments and funds
need to trust that people in communities know what they
are doing.

And I think that there has been, historically,
a real resistance to that, as if outsiders have a better
understanding of community problems than people in
communities themselves. And that doesn't mean that there
aren't different kinds of expertise that need to be brought to the table. But that we just need a different way of imagining, you know, how to govern and what change, what success might look like.

MR. TRAVIS: Thanks, Elizabeth. So we are going to start taking questions from the queue. At this point, the way this works, Elizabeth recedes, because this is not about her at this point. It is not about her paper. It is about, how does her paper suggest questions and discussion.

And remember, even though that half an hour plus or so doesn't feel like a long time, we are weaving a big tapestry here, over our four weeks together. So it will all make sense at some point. So any sort of first thoughts.

And we have Ananya is first up. And David is next, triggered by Elizabeth's paper and her recommendation. And remember at the end, we are going to ask Bruce, of course, to do his wrap-up at the very end to bring all of this together.

So Ananya, you are up.

MS. ROY: I thought I saw Chas waving his hand earlier. Chas, did you have a -- you are fine. Okay. And so, I am hoping to be on a first name basis, here. So I am going to say Elizabeth, rather than Professor Hinton,
I really enjoyed the paper.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes.

MS. ROY: The paper speaks so much to the present moment. I love teaching about the community action programs, and I teach about them as almost a hinge of history.

But the paper poses the question for us, as to whether our present moment is that kind of hinge, or whether it is, as being commonly talked about, a portal. But it also raises the persistent question of whether or not the revolution can be funded, and what that effort means.

But two specific comments that might ought to be questioned related to the paper. So the first has to do with the ways in which community action programs morphed into something that we, and I say we who work with cities, in cities, and communities, continue to have to live with, which is this thing called community development. So community action quickly became the matters [audio skip] out of a bureaucracy that is community development.

And more specifically, of course, it became model cities, led by Banfield. So that line is really interesting. And I guess the question related to this for Elizabeth, as well as for the group, is whether we see any
political openings that might still linger within community development.

The second point has to do more with a longer arc of history. So the work that I have done on these programs in Oakland, California, around there for many years, community action was preceded by a Ford Foundation program called Gray Areas. Oakland was an experimental city.

But it also goes to programs that were morphed into community action and then morphed into the poverty bureaucracy modeled cities. But it is in that bureaucracy that emerged a Black Panther party that rose to power, an established power in Oakland, by seizing control of the poverty bureaucracies.

So I am very interested in how the Ford Foundation efforts at pacification, and I would call it that, actually sort of fell apart and were taken over for one glorious moment in Oakland by a Black liberation movement. So again, there is a question there about political openings. Hopeful questions.

MR. TRAVIS: David is up next. And we will come back and ask Elizabeth to respond to anything she wants to respond to in this discussion, but we are directing our conversation to the group. Elizabeth is listening attentively.
And David Garland is up next.

MR. GARLAND: Great. So I thought this paper was super interesting. And I want to talk about maximum feasible participation, which is what you highlighted just now. But also, one of the other issues about -- to do with the complications surrounding responding to the immediate problem of crimes in the community, and the risk of blaming the victims that are involved.

You kind of referenced this in the paper quite extensively. So on maximum feasible participation, normal community groups and ordinary action groups come with the same kind of politics, the same kind of legitimacy, and the same kind of, I would say, progressive credentials.

And so, the question of which groups are to be funded and given authority to operate in this way becomes a key one. These are not democratically elected. They are singled out, selected for federal funding, or state funding and so on.

And you know, the -- my first response is to think there is a very powerful argument that says, one reason the USA is so punitive, one reason the USA retained, say, the death penalty, is that we have in our political structure the kind of radical level of local majoritarian democracy. And when you allow very local people to decide things about, you know, who they elect as
a prosecutor, who they elect as a state judge, who is on
the jury, quite often you get politics that are not
permissive in the least.

They turn out to be the reverse. You could
imagine community groups that claimed, you know, we are
white militias, we work in Michigan. We should be funded
too.

So all the issues about the oversight, the
involvement of your public officials in community action
that you identify as being kind of problematic seem at the
same time to be linked to some kind of safeguard, some
kind of sense of ensuring that the people that are being
funded are not illiberal in their use of the funds. So
that was one question about funding at that level and
involving, participating.

The other issue is really, just to say how
complicated and important I consider the issue that you
talked about in the paper, where actually, you were
talking about like, the '60s and how projects to bring
about socioeconomic reform and kind of structural change
to deal with the underlying problems that were causing
crime and various social problems in Black communities
particularly, they were displaced by a concern to police
and to punish.

And you kind of signaled, or you kind of gave a
sense of a contemporary version of that, by talking about Pete Buttigieg responding to his record as a Mayor in South Bend. And why it was that Blacks in that community were four times more likely to be arrested for marijuana. And you described his response as being, he justified it because that is where guns were, and violence was, and that is where the police were sent. And this was the consequence. And you were describing that as a “blame the victim” approach, basically.

So that is for me, a really crucial issue in all of this, because we are constantly working with the same stuff. Look, the immediate victim might be the person who has just been mugged, or the person who has been raped, the person who has been killed in a crossfire. And they surely should be provided with support of prosecution, policing and so on.

But you also want to say, actually, a lot of these gang members or offenders or adults who are now violent are themselves the victim. And this -- Bruce Western's work on this has been very important, that they themselves have become prone to violent behavior because of the violence they have experienced in upbringing and so on.

And so, what we need to do is respond to that deeper question with, you know, structural change in the
character of these neighborhoods, with violence control, with family support, with jobs, and so on. But you know, the temporality of these responses are entirely different.

That is to say that one can bring about kind of a response to a crime incident within the hour. You can bring about a change in the conduct of youth in that area only over generations, really, and in terms of investment.

The level of government that is involved is different. I mean, mayors and city governments will respond with police. They can hardly respond with the kind of social and economic transformation that requires federal dollars and requires major improved resources.

And bringing these two conversations together and thinking not in terms of, you know, victims and offenders, but in a more kind of complicated ethical set of questions and political set of priorities and requirements. That seems to me, like, central to what we are talking about here.

And I found, reading the paper, that I was kind of thinking, we just need to have more of a conversation about it. Because it is more complicated than either blame the victim by punishing and controlling and policing or invest in economic justice and solve the problem.

MR. TRAVIS: So provocative questions. Those will linger in the air. Let me turn to Lynda Zeller who
is in the queue next.

MS. ZELLER: Thank you so much, Jeremy. So in the paper, when I was reading, I was struck by a couple of things.

One was maximum feasible participation. I represent a statewide philanthropy fund, and prior was the state Commissioner for behavioral health. And prior to that, did health care for Michigan's prisons. So in my current role around philanthropy, I really think this paper has me thinking about what do we need to do this time to try to get the maximum feasible participation so that it really is the, and I am quoting from your paper now, Elizabeth, autonomous and self-managed organization that is competent to exert political influence.

So it feels to me like the learning from history that you raised for me, in this paper, is that somewhere along the line, we decided that municipalities and other existing sort of systems could be that entity that helps provide for maximum participation. In fact, that was sort of a fatal flaw, in my opinion.

So as a philanthropist, we are extremely interested in trying to find a way to get maximum community participation. The challenges communities define some -- you know. There is just no consistent way to define that community.
So when you are trying to invest, it is so dynamic. And so, if this amazing think tank of people could help inform how we move forward with those types of investments, when there is an ability to invest, either financially or in empowering people with authority and ability to control their own environment, resources and destiny.

So I don't have an idea to fix it. But it is just -- it really got me thinking. So thank you for the paper. I appreciate it.

MR. TRAVIS: So I would like to just encourage a discussion that represents our colleagues on the screen who do community-level work. So just note who has jumped in already. We have academics and funders.

Because this is an issue that has come up in Square One, every roundtable we have had. Because we make efforts to have strong community voices, community activists at the table.

And it comes up, certainly, the political discourse of the day. Talk about defund the police, and where does money go. Who controls the money. For what purpose. And how do we think about what might be other ways to produce safety.

So this is a central question of the day, of the moment, of the day, literally. And I think we are
onto something here that would benefit from hearing from
those who do community level work. And I am not going to
call on anybody, other than to say that Chas had a lot to
say last time.

So if you are so inclined, I would love to hear
from you. Or others, who are really on the front line of
community engagement and activating. Kristian, you are up
next, and then Fatimah. Yes.

MS. CABALLERO: Yes. So speaking as a
community organizer and activist on a variety of social
justice issues, I think something to keep in mind is,
while the ideal to directly invest in community-based
programs and services and so forth, and making sure that
we are properly identifying those marginalized communities
that need those resources, and that are better
interconnected to distribute those resources, something
that I think needs to change on an institutional level in
you know, every sector, where there is an hierarchy is
looking at leadership.

You know, if you are with a foundation or an
organization or an institution, looking at, you know, the
Boards, the directors, supervisors, you know, anybody that
is in some sort of leadership position, if there is not
true inclusion and diversity there, that is a problem. It
doesn't matter how many community organizations, how many
community groups might be receiving some level of funding or resources.

If you are not changing the whole dynamic of institutional representation, especially how it perpetuates racism, we are going to still see the same, you know, issues, at the end of the day. So another thing to keep in mind, too, is, even when you eventually diversify in your leadership and your boards and so forth, and you identify the community groups that you want to support and fund, a lot of these community groups at the end of the day feel exploited, because they fit an image that the organization or the institution wants to portray.

And so, keeping that in mind, that you are truly being inclusive. You are truly being considerate. You are truly being supportive of these communities, and what their needs are.

And I think a huge part of that too, is not just doing your homework and identifying needs, but doing regular assessments and regular evaluations where you are providing that oversight that needs to happen.

MR. TRAVIS: Thanks very much, Kristian. Fatimah, and then, Chas. And then Dona. Thank you.

MS. DREIER: You know, I want to echo a point, I think, Elizabeth, you raised here, about you know, we are burdened in some ways by these questions about, well,
how would it look in reality? Right.

We are talking about dynamics of power and how do you avoid reifying systems at a local level. David, I think I heard you say, you know, with new players who are dominating, and aren't actually equitably, and with accountability, supporting what needs to happen at a local level.

And what is hard about those questions, I think, is we have not tried in earnest ever to do it in the first place. Right, an array that brings it to scale. Like, can we give people a space to fail, and to learn, and to be reorganized with a set of values. And I think this is, you know, this piece, like how do we set. How do we bake into investment restorative accountability? How do we bake?

Well, you know, we have learned a lot over the last few decades about those sorts of things. And it is not to say -- it is not to kind of make the ideals that we imagined for these structures. Let's anticipate that there will be failure. How do we bake that in? And how do we adjust when failure.

And let's be surprised about the places where there is innovation. I think that I am fascinated by, you know, the startup community and venture capital, and this idea that you invest big in big ideas. You empower

There are these ideas.

And with enough grassroots infrastructure, people iterate. And what does it mean to iterate in a way that allows communities to try things and invite others to participate, and to adjust, and iterate as they grow. And this question is about, well, how do we evaluate it.

Well, we have learned a lot about participatory research. We have learned a lot about how to shift power. How to listen to those who have been most impacted, right. Those sorts of processes.

As someone who is kind of involved in the trauma-informed movement, thinks about this at local levels. How to inform in local processes and recognize that oftentimes when we are actually -- when you look with a microscope at some of the dynamics that play out in communities, they are often based on scarcity, on a lack of resources. And frankly, a tremendous amount of trauma like those who have been impacted have.

And there are supports that can be provided at, particularly, units of development in local communities that I think are really compelling. People are trying this out all over the country and the world.

So I want us to be bold in imagining, and not be caught up by these -- they are very good questions.
But I think that we need to give people space. And to talk first about investment and then about what it looks like.

MR. TRAVIS: Great. Excellent. So we have an active queue. And we have some members of our group who wondered where did all those blue hands come from, and how do I get mine up there?

So we will take a moment for Sukyi to do a little reminder tutorial on what it takes to get in the queue. And then I think I had Dona next, and then Chas.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes. So also I think, from the perspective of a community --

MR. TRAVIS: Let me ask you just to hold one second. Sukyi, do you want to come in, just to --

MS. MURPHEY: I am sorry. Yes.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. Tell people what they should do on their screen.

MS. McMAHON: Sure. So just, if you will go down to the bottom of your screen in Zoom, you will see a button labeled, Participants. You will click that and then click Raise Hand in the participants box. And on the host end, we will see your hand raise, and what order it comes in.

MR. TRAVIS: Hey, Jorge. Great.

MS. McMAHON: Yes. And when you are done
speaking, you can also lower your hand by also managing that as well. That is all.

MR. TRAVIS: Great. Okay. And so the queue we have now, and this will be all we can do before we ask Elizabeth to give some reactions to what she heard and then move on to our next paper.

The queue we have now, if I have got it right, is Dona, Chas, Jorge, Marcia, and Vesla. I think that is it. And if I missed anybody, I apologize, but I think that is it. So Dona, you are next.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes. So as a community organizer, also, as an activist and as someone who has run for local political office, like I feel that --

MR. TRAVIS: Aha.

MS. MURPHEY: I am sorry. Can you hear me?

MR. TRAVIS: I just said, ah, right. I am always impressed by people who take the plunge. Okay.

MS. MURPHEY: I think that it is really critical to elect activists into public office. And I think a lot of people have a lot of reservations about that.

But I think honestly, it is really the way to empower the people who are closest to that struggle, to make some real political change in a way that is -- it is kind of bringing that kind of outside the box thinking
into institutions, right. And I think that what is important about doing that is to not get caught up, first of all, in the cult of celebrity which I think really pollutes our political participation in this country.

And we tend to do that. We have these local activists who, I think, people get wrapped up in who they are, and not so much in what they offer, in terms of bringing transformative change to our communities. And so, I think, you know, kind of mobilizing the community around people who can bring real political change, who have really intimately experienced some of the problems that they are offering to solve, that is really crucially important.

I think also, you have to move these people out of these. I mean, I think it is human nature, when you are put into a position where you can become complacent and do. And the systems, as we have built them, I think, they are vulnerable to that.

And so, insofar as, or as long as we have the systems that we do, I think it is important to move people in and to move them out. But you know, as a community organizer, what I think part of the responsibility of that person who has moved into that position is to continually engage in the community as they had as activists, as organizers, and to, basically, organize themselves out of
the job, right.

So that is what we aspire to do as community organizers. We should be cultivating leadership among activists and organizers, to replace us in those systems. And I don't think that this is unique to elected office. I think this is also -- it is also something that we should see happening. I think it would be very valuable to see it happening in other institutions as well: in academia, in the non-profit industrial complex, in all of these places.

MR. TRAVIS: Okay. Thanks, Dona. Chas, and then, Marcia.

MR. MOORE: Man, I am like, I started here, and then people kept talking and bringing up other stuff. So now I am in, like, this other place. But I will try to compact it a lot.

One, I want to go back to the funding piece. Before, you know, we were in a place and position to where we were getting grants and funding, I didn't really understand. I didn't understand how it works.

But now that I know how it works, like, I think philanthropy needs its ass kicked just as much. We are talking about policing, education, and prisons because they perpetuate very much the white supremacy, the privilege, and all of the things that, you know, like that
we are fighting against. They perpetuate it, very much so, even in ways that it causes us, you know, the advocacy groups, the community groups to compete with one another, right. And our approaches to the work are now going against one another.

And I think it is enough money out there for us to be able to do the work the way we need to. But philanthropy just has to radically change how we give that money out, one.

Two, like, you know, I am really still struggling with, you know, trying to get people on board with my idea. I feel like I am the only person on this ark at this time. But like, I really think, as we are talking about rebuilding and transformation, somebody said it earlier, really beautifully. Like, I think we have to allow that space for innovation.

I think it was Fatimah. You know, because the place where we are going, the only place I have seen it, at least, you know, in my mind is like, in a bell hooks book, or a Toni Morrison novel. Like, it doesn't exist in the real world, right.

This place where, you know, like women can make a rap song and it not be the end of the world, because men have been doing it for decades. Like, we haven't been to that place.
So you know like, even today, I was talking to somebody about, well, like what does a world without police look like? And the funny look -- like, well, I don't know. But you know, like that is okay not to know what it looks like, because we are all going to have to collectively come together and build that world.

And also, you know, again, I am going to keep saying this. Like, tearing down white supremacist institutions means nothing if we keep the white supremacist ideologies, right. Like, if we bring you know, patriarchy, misogyny with us, it doesn't matter. Right.

So I think, as much as we keep talking about institutions and the systems, we have to, like, really let that go. And maybe not even have a word for, like, this new ideology what we are talking about, because it needs to get to a sense of humanity and existence.

And then I think another thing that Dona just brought up for me was, while I agree that we need to let people, you know, that have been impacted by the systems, and people that are closest to the problem, I also think we need to be aware that when we do let people into these systems and institutions -- that if we don't free up the transformative change that they may want, it doesn't
matter, right.

Like, you know, we have some -- we have a couple of great elected folks here on council. Maybe one or two. Jorge might disagree with that, and Kristian. But it is only so much they can do, because the way the system is set up and designed, right.

And that is why, I think, so badly, you know, when we are talking about Square One and the reason I like this space is because I think we need to think boldly. And boldly, to me, means maybe like rewriting the Constitution to make it actually be inclusive of everybody and all, and really just kind of restructuring who we are as an American society today, because we are not the same.

We are not allowing ourselves to be the same, who we were, because we are very much are still the same. But like now, because, again, of the leadership of Black women, women of color, queer folks, we are saying uh-uh. Something has to give.

And I think we have to really reflect that systemically, to make sure that you know, we can still -- because there is really nothing wrong with having a representative and council. But if they are not able to operate to the wills and ways of how the people want, then we just frustrate ourselves, right.

So it is like, how do we, how do we get people
that have been impacted in positions? But how do we also not set them up to fail?

MR. TRAVIS: Great.

MR. MOORE: Jeremy, thank you for cutting me off.

MR. TRAVIS: Your mind is going, and that is a good thing. I can see it. You said it at the outset. So we have got a very active queue. No surprise. Marcia, Jorge, Vesla, and then I know that Bruce was there somewhere.

So we are going to extend our time a little bit, if you don't mind, to five minutes after. Then go back to Elizabeth, and then on to our next paper presenter.

Marcia, if you could give us some, as brief as you can, comments about what you have heard so far. What is prompted in your thought-processor?

MS. RINCON-GALLARDO: Sure. So can everyone hear me okay?

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. You are good.

MS. RINCON-GALLARDO: Okay. So I wanted to respond to the first paper by Elizabeth. Really exceptional.

I really appreciated reading about maximum feasible participation myself, as a community activist
early on in my life, particularly in Native American and Latino communities in the country. It seems to me that we are still talking about structural racism, though.

That given that you know, where we are talking about residence, for citizens’ participation, the differentiation for a lot of immigrants, what that means. Even though that for Native American, and lots of Latinos, they are born here, but still, when you talk about elections, and who are elected officials, and then who are elected to be systems players, the administrators of systems, it was never people that looked like us.

And so, for them to be the ones making decisions about what the system needed, and what it didn't need, and even most recently, in my comments that I made earlier, when we only rely on systems people -- so foundations pouring, year after year after year, money into systems leaders, and building their leadership to be better leaders, to reform the system, that was the moot point. Because you know, they were taught to have a hammer and a nail. And that is all.

And so, they were going to always come at this system with that perspective in mind. They never included the people most impacted, those people from the community. You have to look at the data and then go to those communities and those neighborhoods where the data
said that the people coming, sitting in juvenile halls, were coming from those neighborhoods, and go to those neighborhoods. But no one ever saw them as, you know, the experts, or the officials, the administrators, to be able to say, and/or to give validity to what they were saying as appropriate ways to respond.

And last but not least, yes. We use the word innovation. But I want to, with all due respect, I want to say something about how we as people, we had ancestors that never used cages to hold our youth or our adults to change their behavior. And so for us, that still believe in our traditions and in our teachings, there is a wealth of beautiful information there that can be utilized to teach us about who we are.

How to live our life. How to be as human beings, and not have this colorism and racism. And so, when we say innovation, we always think like it is something out there that we have never done, as opposed to the fact that we have beautiful ways of being that we just need to go back into our past to bring forward. So those are a few points.

MR. TRAVIS: Great point. Okay. Thank you so much. So our queue is now, Jorge is next. And after him, I will get it up in a second, is Vesla.

MR. RENAUD: Thank you, Marcia, for the nod to
la gente. I want to comment on the fact that maybe one of the first comments having to do with this paper had to do with metrics and had to do with outcomes.

I think that one of the things that we sometimes, or that I know that funders or whatever -- people sometimes lose sight that were maybe aren't as easily impressed by whatever is the fundamental philosophical change that needs to occur before we can accurately measure anything.

We sometimes -- myself and some other radical organizers, we refuse to make the cost benefit analysis when we go testify in front of committees that offer funding, or whatever. If it is based on the argument, look, if you have so many prisons, and if you quit funding prisons, you can fund so many colleges.

But the Koch Brothers can come in tomorrow, fund all the damn prisons, and then what are you left with. You cannot simply make the argument on dollars. You cannot simply say, okay. You can come back with all these numbers. And if you can show that you can come back with these numbers, then we are going to give you so many dollars.

Despite the fact that historically, we have raped and pillaged and exploited the same communities, and maybe they are deserving of some funds. And they are
going to fail sometimes. They are not going to come up
with the metrics that we want.

They are not going to be able to prove
something that maybe we can go back to Zuckerberg and say,
look. Give us half the money that you put into your
yacht, right, for this city, please. And if you lose half
the money that you need to get your yacht, that is okay.
Right. That is okay. Because look at the people who are
otherwise dead in that community.

I just want to say that I think that either we
are going to buy into the idea, or we are going to
actually push the idea, or internalize the idea that those
closest to the problem, that those communities from which
these individuals have been pulled from and these
communities that we devastated, deserve that funding,
right.

And if they are going to fail -- and to refer
back to something that Dr. Garland said, right, that it’s
not something that’s going to happen right now, but it may
happen over the course of a generation or two, or three
generations, that is okay. But that you are not going to
get a return on your dollar tomorrow or next year. And
that is okay.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. Great. Thanks, Jorge.

Vesla.
MS. WEAVER: Thank you. So Elizabeth, I think the paper, for me, brought up -- and this is maybe a question for you, and maybe just a chance for us to think about where this can go. What you are talking about with maximum feasible participation is from the government.

But as your work shows, as, you know, Simon Balto and Max Felker-Kantor and others, and you know, some of the work I have been doing on the 1970s shows, is that there are so many ways that communities without a precious little penny developed radical alternatives to safety deprivation, right. We didn't need -- I mean, yes.

Maximum feasible participation is the core of your paper. But what it kept calling out to me is this robust understudied, right -- as academics, we don't know the metrics. We don't have the metrics because we never studied groups like 300 Gangstas in Baltimore.

We never studied the hood claimers. We never studied the efforts in a particularly social scientific way of the Panthers, right, and their programs. We never studied the efforts and measured the efforts of Woodlawn, of all of the efforts from the '60s on forward, of communities to actually propose something different, and to give us an idea of safety grounded in communal knowledge, right.

And so, I just wanted to add to this that one
of the biggest themes in my own portals work, which is the biggest archive, I think, that has ever been collected of policing narratives by people who have been policed. One of the biggest themes -- one of the biggest things they call for is exactly at the heart of your paper, which is self-determination, collective autonomy, and the right to design and implement their own notions of safety.

And in many ways, the police themselves interrupt efforts to set up Black indigenous economies, to set up survival strategies. So in my own city, Baltimore, right, the police constantly are surveilling the squeegee kids, right. The kids who go and squeegee the cars for money, right. That is a Black independent, informal economy, and a means of sustenance.

And I just wanted to, you know, read one little tiny excerpt to just, you know, underscore this. In this conversation between two people, they are talking about how none of the community centers that they relied on in their own youth, all of them had been shut down.

And now, somebody comes along and sets up an informal basketball court, just to have a place for kids to play. And as soon as he sets it up, the police are circling the basketball court, right. Looking for them to get in a fight, so that they can come in and surveil.

And so, I think one of the things that we need
to bring to this conversation is the role of police themselves in limiting efforts, maximum feasible participation and efforts by communities themselves to police their own, to provide safety, to informally set up structures of care, and economic independence. And I see this again, and again -- the role of policing constraining the ability of communities to actually provide safety to one another.

MR. TRAVIS: Right. Thanks. Vesla. I just want to confirm that Bruce took his hand down. True?
Yes. Okay. We have two more of our colleagues who want to come in, before we come back to Elizabeth. Vivian and Gabriel.

(Pause.)

MR. TRAVIS: Vivian?

(Pause.)

MR. TRAVIS: I am not quite sure what is going on here. I can't hear anything. Okay. Vivian, I don't know if you are working with your mute button or -- try one more time. No.

MR. WESTERN: Jeremy, she’s muted --

MR. TRAVIS: But then she is not. So we are going to ask Evie to work with you, to figure this out. Because we definitely want to hear what you have to say. So while we are doing that, we will come back to -- oh,
there you are. Are you there?

    MS. NIXON: Yes. I fixed it.

    MR. TRAVIS: Yes. Okay.

    MS. NIXON: I didn't know my computer had two microphones.

    MR. TRAVIS: The things we learn. Right.

    MS. NIXON: The things we learn. Yes. So a couple of things. Like, I -- Elizabeth, I'm really interested to the point like, of obsession right now, about whether or not you looked at any of these community action programs or Community Development Corporations that were developed outside of urban areas, and what happened in those communities after the programs were shut down.

    And it is really a very specific and kind of personal question. Because we had both in -- on Long Island and Nassau County, we had Community Development Corporations, the EEOC, and we had community action programs in every town.

    And the funding did go away. But somehow, even when the funding got connected to the municipal county seat, nothing changed. I remember, because I was there. And I grew up in those community centers.

    And everybody that grew up in those community centers with me is the reason that my neighborhood is still able to force them to rebuild the park when the park
is crumbling. Right. It is my -- the people I grew up
with are, like, making it happen.

That whole generation is making a difference.
Because our program stayed the same, right up until like,
1973. Nothing changed in our community. We had, it was a
mix of you know, traditional civil rights organizations
like the NAACP, plus the Panthers, plus other groups.
Nothing changed.

And has any study ever been done, of the folks
who grew up in that era, who were teenagers and young
adults in that era, who participated in those programs.
What are they doing now? And I think that is a really
important question. Because that is where your results
are.

And they may not have been immediate results,
but the long-term implications are massive. Because over
time, these folks have made a difference in their
communities.

And the other thing I want to lift up again is
this question of what funding looks like. We know that of
all of the philanthropic dollars that are invested, very
little is invested in, first of all, in issues of
defunding or reducing the size of the carceral system.
And what is invested in that area, it is -- a tiny bit of
that is directed at people impacted.
But it is not just about the dollars. It is about the opportunity to fail, and what are your measurements. If we want to say, we want to tear down something that is not working, you can't do it under the capitalist structure.

Because the capitalist structure is going to look for a return on investment. And that is the problem. The revolution won't be funded under a capitalist structure. And that is the answer to that question.

It can be funded, if it is not under the capitalist structure. But if it is under that structure, it will always look to return on investment. And return on investment as defined by the investor, not by the people who are being invested in.

MR. TRAVIS: Good. And I am going to cut you off there to ask Gabriel to say what he would like to say. And then get back to Elizabeth. We are a little behind schedule, and we want to give adequate time to David and his paper.

So Gabriel?

MR. SALGUERO: Elizabeth, thank you. A few quick comments. Number one is, when we are talking both about funding, collaboration, and empowerment of communities, how have you seen the work of embracing the hybridity of the communities, right.
So I am thinking, I am a -- I work with faith-based organizations, FBOs, and what those studies have. By hybridity, I mean, I think David alluded to this, you know, in our communities, we have the kind of, both the progressive and liberative, and justice-oriented bent. But there is this internalized, I think Chas spoke to that, colonization, hierarchy, patriarchy, right. And sometimes, we want the autonomy and the voice of the community, but there is a kind of romanticizing of what that community is like, right. And so, the community may have something else to say. And some of it is not liberative or justice-oriented. And so, how have we dealt with that collaboration and empowerment and funding.

Especially with, you know, I am Puerto Rican, and I grew up in el barrio. A lot of those FBOs were long standing, very liberative, very empowerment, but simultaneously, very oppressive and very hierarchical. But they were there for 50, 60, 70 years. And so, how do you partner with that hybrid community that helps and hurts, I think, is a simple way to say that.

The second thing is about, I appreciate what you had to say about process and time, right. I think there is something that needs to be said about time. What do we consider time -- enough time? Enough time
commitment and enough time in the process.

Jorge talked about freedom to fail, or freedom to reinvent or freedom to innovate, or to pull back from the best of our traditions, as Marcia said. I think that the question of process needs to be clearly defined when we are talking about maximum feasible participation.

And the last thing I want to talk about ingenuity and tradition. What does creating space for both tradition and ingenuity look like? Creating space.

And I don't just mean physical space, although I do mean physical space, but time, reflection. My former life was as an academic in Princeton, but now I work as a pastor of a church under a coalition. And there is not a lot of space, because we are putting out a lot of fires. So the ingenuity space has not been created, and how do we fund space for ingenuity.

And thanks, Elizabeth.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. Good point. So Elizabeth, you have 38 seconds to react. What a great conversation.

I hope you are taking it all in and remembering it and that it will influence your work. But are there two or three points that you would like to respond to, before we move on?

MS. HINTON: Well, this has just been such an enriching and informative, and mind-blowing discussion.
So I am still processing it, and taking it all in. So thank you all.

I am very much [audio skip] the work, and all the points that you raised. I think this is a really amazing jumping off point for subsequent sessions, but also our conversation today.

Because I think, you know, one of the themes that keeps on coming up is, how limited we are in our current economic system, but also our world view, and our frame of mind. And I think that these are some of the issues that David raises in his paper.

And the danger here is, you know, as we are trying to bring about a kind of transformation, how do we prevent reifying the very inequalities and hierarchies that we are challenging. Especially when, you know, those are so ingrained in our society.

Anyways, I have so much to say. But hopefully, it will end up coming out over the course of weeks. Thank you all so much.

MR. TRAVIS: Good. Great. And that, we just have to, you know, come to grips with the fact that we are not tying up any loose ends here. Even at the end of our time together, there will be lots of them.

But that is the point, is to keep things fluid and learn from each other, and to not come back and forth,
and back and forth, and try to resolve anything. But it is really to develop the big tapestry that I mentioned before. So we are going to turn next to David.

Before I do that, just a reminder. And I should have done this at the outset. We use -- we try not to use the chat function to message each other during the session so that we can stay focused on what is happening in the screen, and in the moment. We do ask people, if they have things they want to share with people later, like there is a great article you want people to read, to do that in the comments that Sukyi contributes afterwards.

Bruce, what are you holding up? What is that? You are muted. I don't know what you are doing.

MR. WESTERN: This is Danielle's publication, the link that she shared with me.

MR. TRAVIS: Okay.

MS. ALLEN: Yes. So I know there are rules now. I am sorry.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. I had you in mind. I didn't want to --

MS. ALLEN: No worries. I get it.

MR. TRAVIS: -- personal.

MS. ALLEN: Of course.

MR. TRAVIS: I had you in mind, when I should have said. So Bruce has actually illustrated your chat.
There we go. That is pretty powerful. So David, give us ten minutes of additions to this crazy brew we have got going here.

MR. GARLAND: So I do have a ten-minute summary of my paper. Would it be preferable just to skip that and go straight to general discussion, in the interest of time? I don't mind either way.

MR. TRAVIS: I think it would be useful for you to frame up what you think. And if you can be a bridge from where we were to where we are going to be, that is even better.

MR. GARLAND: Okay.

MR. TRAVIS: So it is not just a continuation.

MR. GARLAND: Okay. So here is a summary of what I think are the key points. I think all of them are pretty simple.

In fact, I am stunned by the extent to which most of these ideas, which I thought were insight, have just become headlines and slogans in the last few months.

So I don't think I am telling anybody anything they don't already know.

So the paper argues that American criminal justice uses penal controls more extensively and more intensively than anyone else on the planet. Other western nations obviously use punishment, but they use controls.
less extensively. The policing and punishment are less harsh and more humane.

I want to try and suggest in the paper that this is not just a question, although it is this too, over recurring policy choices. It actually reflects underlying durable social and economic structures. And then particularly, the political economy is the USA.

Other affluent nations I am claiming, and of course, by the way, here the comparison is a kind of optimistic one, as if the USA should be compared with other liberal democratic affluent nations. Maybe that is wrong.

Maybe we should be compared with, I don't know, high crime nations, or former settler societies, or I don't know, illiberal authoritarian nations. But if you compare us with Western Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, what I think is that these other societies are less reliant on harsh policing and harsh punishment, first of all, because the social milieu of poor people in these societies is less disadvantaged and less dangerous than is true here.

And secondly, because states in these societies, because it’s a kind of soft car and a social infrastructure that allows them to regulate and shape behavior in non-penal ways that aren't just -- aren’t
available to U.S. government in the same way. The lesson I take from this is kind of simple but also rather somber. What I think it means is that without big structural change of the kind that Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders have been talking about, the prospects for ending criminal injustice are really quite limited in this country.

Less incarceration, worry of policing, just like high rates of criminal violence, have deep roots in America's political economy, and they are unlikely to disappear without wider socioeconomic transformation. So that is the overall thesis, right.

The comparative points in the paper, made sometimes with some detail, usually with a broad brush, are that other nations obviously are dismayed by criminal events, that they regard, you know, offenders as people to be condemned. Violence is something to be feared. Public safety is something to be promoted.

But the way that they undertake that process continues on the whole, I mean, there is a lot of variation, to treat offenders as individual citizens whose social rights and even welfare state entitlements continue while they are being punished. In contrast here, we have this kind of war mentality that individual offenders basically lose their liberty and trust, are to be regarded
as dangerous, and to be, you know, subjected to whatever kind of continuing controls the public feels safest to impose.

The claim I am making is that this is true, not because European nations are more civilized. Not because they don't have a tendency to be punitive or racist. But rather, because they have in place economic arrangements and welfare states and forms of political association that are more egalitarian and more inclusive and which have the effect of reducing the need for penal control.

So one of the things I want to emphasize, and often enough, when we talk about punishment and policing in the current context, especially after a long-term reduction in crime and violence in the society, we tend to forget that even now, the USA continues to be a remarkably violent place. In terms of homicide rates, America's homicide rate continues to be three times as high as Canada's and between five and ten times as high as Western European nations.

And of course, these rates are much worse, if you focus on communities of color, African American youth. But even if you think just about white people, they are killed at a higher rate here in the USA than any of these other countries.

And we think about guns. But if you think
about non-firearm homicides, they are higher in the USA than in any of the comparable countries. So basically, what I am suggesting is, we need to focus on the USA as a high violence society.

We also have to remember that that is not the only social problem where the USA comes bottom of the league. Basically, child poverty, relative poverty, poverty while in work, infant mortality, teenage birthrates, mental illness, high school non-completion, drug addiction, drug death. All of these are higher in the USA, or worse in the USA than they are elsewhere. And of course, nearly all of these problems are worse in minority communities than in general.

So why is this the case? What are the structural sources of violence and disorder in the USA? And what the paper suggests is that if you look at comparative research, it suggests that societies that are more unequal and societies that have less generous, less comprehensive welfare states are prone to have higher rates of violence and higher levels of punishment than more equal or generous societies.

And of course, on that scale, if you look at America's political economy, its quality, its welfare state, it is no surprise to find that levels of violence in this country, and levels of punishment in this country
are so high because we are the most unequal of these societies, and have the least generous welfare state for the poor.

So the claim is that America's political economy, its labor market, and the lack of poverty-reducing effort by the government ensures that the risks that markets impose are left to lie where they fall. And that individuals and families in these communities are less secured against market risk than is true in any of these other countries.

Which means that the work of -- the important work, which I kind of emphasized in the paper, of socializing and raising and integrating and controlling individuals that kind of goes on, on a routine day to day basis, that is less successfully done, on the whole, in many of these communities, with the consequence that we have more disorder, and the most dislocation. And margins in which illegal economies, violence, and crime prosper.

So there’s a section in the paper where I talk a lot about this. It is important to remember that when we talk about inequality and poverty and lack of welfare provision and crime, it is not because most crime is, you know, like 19th century crimes of poverty, where women are stealing to feed their families. That is not the relationship between poverty and inequality and crime we
are talking about.

The problem is really -- and in fact the important problem is one of violence in this country. And violence is complex. And violence has all sorts of social and psychological and environmental triggers and formative and developmental processes.

But what I am claiming in the paper, and what I think is borne out by the research is, that in society [audio skip] where the families and the employers and the schools and the communities that are charged with the kind of routine work of raising kids, socializing kids, integrating kids, and controlling kids, do a much less good job of that work. Difficult work. Work that always kind of is prone to going wrong in any kind of setting.

If these families are stressed, if these families have few resources, if they have poor housing, if they have low levels of employment, and less security, if they are -- you know, if both parents are working, if one parent is incarcerated, if there is just no resources to do that work, the possibilities of doing it, especially in a context where schools and employment and the background informal controls of community are undermined by these circumstances.

It is no surprise that levels of violence, levels of crime will tend to grow in these settings. And
in the USA, that is exactly what we find.

So where social order is fragile, what you find is that it ends up being the state and its control agency, the police, prisons, and probation and parole that move in and do more of that work. Where families and employers and schools are functioning better, law and order stays in the background. Law and order is for the abberational case, not for the routine community. In America, we have got too many cases like the former.

And by the way, just because, you know, talk about families and talk about social controls and talk about the social criminal deficit often seems like blaming the victims. As if, you know, there is a family values problem here.

The key point to emphasize is that routine social control by families is enabled or inhibited by the supply of resources that the social system, the political system, the economic system provides. And in the paper, I talk about what these resources are.

But basically, this is a political economy story. It operates through the mediation of families and communities and schools and neighborhoods. And it ends up in individual violence. It is not a story about individual characteristics, or even about family failure.

Okay. Just a couple of moments more. Welfare
states we think of as being kind of tax and spending
redistribution machines. But welfare states are also
apparatuses that build infrastructures of social services
and public health and educational provision and
employment, that basically provide an infrastructure that
provides social support and social controls to aid
families and communities to do this work.

And of course, in the USA, that apparatus is,
by comparison, much less effective. Now we see this, what
we are really talking about is a kind of weakness of the
social infrastructure in the USA.

You see this in response to the pandemic. Not
just in terms of leadership by, you know, the Trump
administration. But in terms of the actual infrastructure
of capable control that central government is capable of
exerting at the level of individual behavior and family
behavior.

In this country, it doesn't exist in all sorts
of places. And of course, it is always tripped up and
opposed by the levels of government and the levels of kind
of, you know, veto opposition by different parties and
different politics and different places. This is a
nation, a huge nation that is governed very poorly in
domestic terms, even when the administration is working
well. Not just when it is dysfunctional.
So what tends to happen is that when we have social problems, when we have violence and crime, the default solution tends to be to resort to harsh policing and penal control. And that is partly because of politics and partly because of the lack of value accorded to the lives of poor people and poor people of color in particular.

But it is also a story about just capacity, and what is available to government, particularly city government. Particularly governments that would like to invest in communities but are faced with the need to control violence.

And so, what I am suggesting on the whole is a rather kind of simple but rather somber conclusion, which is that basically, if the USA is to move away from high levels of violence, move away from aggressive [audio skip], move away from mass incarceration, it won't be just because criminal justice movements and movements for criminal justice reform exist.

It will because these movements somehow managed to hitch themselves to, and embed themselves within wider struggles for economic justice, for transforming the labor market, for building a welfare state. And of course, none of these struggles will happen because of crime and criminal justice.
They will happen because working people demand these things. But in the meantime, criminal justice activists can, you know, shape criminal justice thinking, crime control thinking in a way that accords with these transformations rather than seems separate from them.

So for example, and I will finish on this. We need to emphasize the whole time that punishment is not an efficient form of crime control, that punishment is necessary, that you know, we have to impose some kind of punishment to do justice, to deter offenders, to contain dangerous individuals. But criminal punishment, if it happens at all, and most of the time, offenders go unpunished, tends to be after the fact, and tends to reinforce criminality and social exclusion, rather than reform offenders.

We should think of punishment instead as a kind of tragic necessity to be minimized, not a social tool to be deployed everywhere. We should remember, and this is the important point of the paper, I think, that real crime control, crime prevention, responses to criminal behavior, particularly at the early stages, that occurs in the mainstream, routine practices of social control.

It is done by parents, and teachers, and neighbors, and employers, and communities, not by law and order activity. And that is precisely why other nations,
other affluent western nations, tend to, you know, do without the level of punishment we have, enjoy lower levels of violence than we do.

Basically, because they are supporting families and communities to socialize and integrate and ultimately to control generations of youth. Not to expose them to the kind of risks that we do.

That is the paper, I think, in a nutshell. I look forward very much to hearing what your responses are. Thanks so much.

MR. TRAVIS: Well, thank you so much, David. I am glad we asked you to summarize and present it the way you did. And I think I speak for others.

Just to say what a collection from Elizabeth to David, of some big ideas, at a moment in our country's history, where we would like to think that big ideas are in play in our political system. And maybe that is being overly optimistic.

So we always allow for a little bit of time for people to ask clarifying questions. And I hope they are truly that. I want to privilege people who have not spoken yet today, when we open it up.

And I am going to ask for Sukyi to help me on sort of culling out whoever -- she has a list of those people who haven't spoken. It is a little hard for me to
do that.

We have about 25 minutes. So this is not enough time to take on a big topic. So I am going to ask for really, really tight observations. And forgive me if I ask you to move it along, if it is going on a bit too long. We have a lot to talk about.

We want to get to Bruce's summary. We give David a chance to respond to any observations. And we are going to 6:15. Just reminding people that we have extended to 6:15.

So clarifying questions first. And this is not the queue. This is just, wave your hand at me if something was not clear in what David said, or in his paper, that you want to focus on.

(No response.)

MR. TRAVIS: Seeing none. So Sukyi, help me out here with privileging those who have not spoken first. I know Aisha has not. So we will do that one next. And then you can just help me to think about who might be next. We will get those done, because I would like to have everybody have a chance to say something. And then it will come back to those who have already spoken before we wrap it up.

Aisha.

MS. McWEAY: There is a lot in that that I want
to talk about, but we have 25 minutes. So I am going to try to zone in on one particular aspect.

And I think you hit it towards the end, David. Because in reading these two pieces together, I thought it was a great juxtaposition of, like, what is the cart, what is the horse. What is the -- like, how do we engage with this.

And one of the pieces that I just want to amplify, sort of mimicking what we did last week, is the piece about any of the reform that we are doing, or that the revolution can't be separated. And so, when we talk about criminal justice reform, to me, that was one of the strongest points that resonated, that I just want to, like, parse out. That economic justice and an overhaul of the child welfare system.

An overhaul of all of these, like, social sort of constructs that exist that impact the lives of our communities, however broadly you define that term, or narrow. I think it is really inextricably tied.

And when we talk about violence and the rate of violence, we cannot separate those discussions from trauma and the, like, generations of perpetuated trauma. And so, I don't actually know what to do with this.

And I have been struggling during the first session of how to take all of this in. And like, and
chime in, in these like really quick bits. Because I want to talk for hours about this.

But I would just say that I want to amplify this idea and this notion that if you are talking, if we’re figuring out where do we go next in overhauling the criminal justice system. I don't think we can --

MR. TRAVIS: Yes.

MS. McWEAY: -- the question there. It has to be much broader.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. That is a central premise of this roundtable of Square One. You can't do that, criminal justice reform, without doing this. And there is a sequencing issue, obviously.

So Sukyi, I am going to rely on the queue. Is Kimá next, is that right?

MS. McMAHON: We have Hedy, Kimá, Aswad, and Elizabeth.

MR. TRAVIS: Great. Okay. Hedy is next.

MS. TAYLOR: So I do [inaudible]. I think in similar ways as Aisha. But the other piece. You know, we want individuals, families, communities to thrive, not just survive, not just be part of the criminal justice system. And that requires real thought in education and partnership with these other systems.

What David said resonated so strong with me.
But one piece I have been struggling with, even as a lot of criminal justice reform work has gone on, is that we are a very punitive nation.

Even if we don't put people in the criminal justice system, we look at the education system. Who are we expelling and suspending first. When we look at the child welfare, as soon as people are using drugs, you know, take their babies away, and it is punitive in that system.

So how do you reframe systems? And reframe systems really means we have to understand the intricacies of other systems. And one particular piece I have struggled with in the substance use space, and even just in here, is people say, well, we will take people out of the criminal justice system, which I completely believe in, and put them in Medicaid, and the health care system.

But what the health care system, the Medicaid, is like the place we want to reform. We want universal health care. Medicaid isn't great. It has huge disparities. It is hard to get into. Yadda yadda yadda.

And so, it would be great. It is not only creating a shared vision, but it is making sure that we really truly understand what the ideal goals are for each of those different sectors, so that we truly have a restructured nation into having different communities
thrive. Because sometimes we accidentally kind of take each other out and make another sector kind of take two steps back.

MR. TRAVIS: Great. Thank you so much, Kimá. Perfect. And Hedy Lee is up next, and then Aswad. Thank you.

MR. BOCANEGRA: Thanks a lot.

MR. TRAVIS: Eddie, I think you -- it’s actually, Hedy was next. And then we will figure out where you are in the queue. I know Hedy was --

MR. BOCANEGRA: [inaudible].

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. Sorry about that.

MS. LEE: I think it was because it was Eddie, and our names rhyme.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes.

MS. LEE: Sorry, Eddie. I will be quick. Just one thing that I was thinking about, from what David was talking about, is this idea that inequality is killing us. But isn't it killing us all?

I mean, so some of the compare -- we spoke a lot on comparisons of African Americans and lower socioeconomic status groups. But I think at least the work in health inequality literature shows that if you compare even millionaires in the U.S. to these other countries, I don't know if they are the perfect comparison
countries as you alluded to, our health -- I’m not a
millionaire. Their health is also way worse. Higher
risks of mortality, more risk to experiencing violence as
well.

And so, I am just wondering how we should be
taking or framing these discussions to ensure that when we
are talking about violence in the United States, when we
are talking about the social problems, that these are
things that are impacting all of us, not just particular
segments. And so anyway, this is something that I wanted
to bring up. And hopefully, you can reflect upon, after
everybody has asked questions.

MR. TRAVIS: Great. Continuing through our
queue. Aswad is next.

MR. THOMAS: I thought it was a great article, David. Just an observation. When we think about the
criminal justice system, you know, we think about more
policing. You know, for the criminal justice system,
victims of crime has played a lead role in that.

And it has primarily have been victims of crime
that are often have one single victim experience, often
it’s a white woman or a white male. And for the past few
decades, you know, crime victims in communities of color,
from parents who have lost children to violence to victims
of gun violence themselves, to Black and Brown women and
men that are impacted by domestic violence and sexual
assault, like, have been totally excluded out of the
conversation. Right.

And when we look at criminal justice reform
today, that still stands true. The majority of crime
victims in those communities most harmed by crime and
violence and incarceration are the least supported by
these systems.

So until we actually, you know, talk with crime
victims about what makes them safe, we will continue to
build a system that haven't been supported and don't meet
the needs of crime victims. And think about law
enforcement, you think about politicians. They are always
speaking on behalf of victims.

Across the country, I sit on Committee
hearings. And everyone is talking about the victims and
speaking on behalf of the victims. But in those committee
rooms, there aren't any victims of color who are at the
tables.

And so, the important work of community
organizing, the work that I lead, is to organize those
survivors that have been neglected, that have been
mistreated. And we think about the organizations who are
on the frontlines doing the work in the community that
hasn't been investment into the infrastructure and the
capacity building of those organizations who have the solutions.

    When something -- violence happen in the community, folks in the community aren't calling police. They are calling the organizations, the interventionist groups. They are calling the gang intervention.

    They are calling the mothers and fathers and the pastors that have lost individuals to violence, have all started their own organization as a result of that. And so, I think we have come a long way. But still today, we have got a long way to go.

    And the more that we don't include the voices of crime victims in communities of color, we are going to continue to have those challenges. Whether it is through research, policy making.

    But most importantly, we cannot do what we have been doing for the past 30 years of not listening to crime victims in communities of color. And you know, what are their priorities for the justice system.

    We will see there is more intervention programs. You know, trauma recovery centers. You know, more and investment to health treatment, which is what crime victims and communities of color want more jobs. Not just more policing.

    And the victims’ landscape for the past few
years have played a lead role in advocating for tough on crime policies. And still today, there are those groups that are out there.

And we see a shift, but we must continue to have the voices of crime victims at all policymaking tables. And also shift the narrative in the media as well.

MR. TRAVIS: So the wonderful problem that we have is that everybody wants to get in right now. Not everybody, but many of you. This is a good problem for a facilitator to have.

So I am going to ask again for brevity. I am going to ask Elizabeth who is next up in the queue, just to hold a minute, if you would. So we can get people who have not yet made a contribution to the conversation.

And starting with Courtney, next. Just, whatever the punchiest points you want to make. Make sure that we get your contribution.

And then we will see where we are. In the interests of time, we are going to have to close it out early. But I do want to make sure that we give an opportunity for those who have not yet said what they would like to say.

Lots of people want to be in right now.

Courtney, you are up. Elizabeth, please be patient.
MS. ROBINSON: I am going to try and make it as brief and quick as I possibly can.

MR. TRAVIS: Okay.

MS. ROBINSON: The thing that sort of kept coming up for me is this notion of fellow citizen. And the Mr. Smith, and sort of the normal, the treatment of people.

And so, that led me to think about in what ways are we comparing ourselves to other colonized countries, and how are we reckoning with our own history of violence. And how that violence continues to perpetuate itself over and over again in our systems, and sort of maintaining how we understand violence and crime in our country.

So I will stop there, so someone else --

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. Great. Very important. It links to our first conversation, which I like a lot. We can do that. Ananya Roy, you are next in the queue.

MS. ROY: So Elizabeth, I think, is before me.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. I am asking Elizabeth, since she had a lot of airtime in the first session, just to hold on a little bit. I won't forget her.

MS. ROY: Okay.

MR. TRAVIS: But I want to make sure we get new voices in quickly.

MS. ROY: I appreciate that. I have a lot of
questions about the paper. And I have concerns about how
the paper frames certain issues related to the political
economy of the U.S., but I will be brief and mention two.

MR. TRAVIS: Please.

MS. ROY: So my concern is that the penal
control argument rests on an argument about fragile social
order, which in turn, is equated with racialized poverty.
But what it elides is a system of predation. Some of us
would call that racial capitalism, where there is the
holding of wealth and power.

The U.S. is exceptional, not just in mass
incarceration. It is exceptional, for example, in
taxation policy. It is exceptional in its enablement of
the looting of the economy by those who are at the very
top of the economic food chain. And I am worried that the
paper elides that.

But second is that there are many arguments in
the paper that seem to be in tension with one another.
And then what I heard David present is yet in tension with
that, around the relationship between poverty, crime,
violence, and policing.

And that is, of course, central to the work we
are trying to do. So I am going to say that of course we
know that there is no direct relationship between poverty
and crime. We do know that in the U.S., policing creates
crime. And that too, is obscured in the paper.

But I am also going to say that we need a bit more time, not now, but in the roundtable, to talk about violence. How we are thinking about it and thinking about its relationship to what is being conceptualized as impoverishment.

Damaged environments is what the paper used. Those are all things that need much more discussion.

MR. TRAVIS: The topic of violence, we devoted two and a half days to it in Detroit. Very complicated. And this is obviously directly related to this discussion as well. So thanks for bringing that into our midst here.

So the queue that I have right now, and let's see if I am getting this right, is Emily, Kristian, and then Elizabeth. And then if that -- that will take us to the point where we would normally ask David to react. And if that works out that way, that is great. But we might have room for one more.

So Emily.

MS. WANG: Great. Thank you. So you know, I have, similarly, I found that there are parts, David, where the paper -- there was a tension.

And in particular, I thought that there was real tension between kind of, you know, an understanding, and a reflection of the structural issues that place
people at risk and then the kind of individual narrative that is like, these folks are at risk. They do things. The behaviors argument, I found that throughout.

One place that I really wanted to unpack more with you, because I actually fundamentally disagree with this, is this sentence. And I think that this is a sentence that goes to the values. I know it is the fifth roundtable. But it is, “Granted, we need some level of punishment to deter would-be offenders, to impose deserved retribution on wrongdoers, to contain dangerous individuals, and to uphold the law.”

And to me, this is core of what we are talking about. And really thinking about how it is that we step back from -- to a Square One is that issue of punishment, which I think is really distinct.

We have been in other settings. We have talked to a colleague, Danielle Sered, about accountability, of a justice system that holds people accountable, but doesn't necessarily punish them. And it is in conversations where patients that have been incarcerated, that have been victims in the south, that are not necessarily looking to punish, but to hold individuals accountable. And that creates systems, I think, that are more kind of deeply humane.

It is also, you know, the health system -- this
is to Kimá's point, is also deeply punishing. And so, if we end up in systems where punishment is something that we call normative, I think we are going to see a slipping back into the same kind of hierarchies and kind of oppressive situations in which we live right now.

MR. TRAVIS: Great. I'd love to hear more conversation on that. Maybe David will take it up as well. Kristian, Elizabeth, and then Eddie, I realize that you are on the phone and can't raise your hand. So you will get the last observation to comment before we turn back to David.

Kristian?

MS. CABALLERO: Yes. I just simply wanted to emphasize, you know, how these systems, especially that are punitive, do perpetuate racial inequity. You know, it creates a cycle of debt, a cycle of poverty, that people just can't get out of.

And so, I think as far as being more solution-oriented in our conversations, I would like to -- for everyone to kind of emphasize how a lot of these issues not only intersect, but how a lot of the solutions to these issues are intersectional as well. Especially pertaining to equity. I will just keep it short like that, for now.

MS. HINTON: Just building off some of what Courtney and Emily said, I just have two really quick things. The first is that I wondered a lot in the paper, the ways in which the legacy of dispossession and genocide of indigenous people and slavery in the U.S., but also in the western hemisphere, profoundly shapes our notions of punishment.

So you know, I wondered the ways in which our -- how we punish people compares to other countries that have a legacy of genocide of indigenous people and slavery. And I guess that the second point is, and it goes to like, the end of -- where you end. Which is, that we need to kind of build the citizen's welfare state.

And this is what, I think, we have been talking about, really, for the past two hours. And so, this gets to Emily's question. Like, is there a place for prisons within that kind of a welfare state?

And even as you say in the paper, if these controls are in place and if people have resources, will -- the kind of resources that you are talking about -- will we still see crime and harm and violence in the ways that we do today?

MR. TRAVIS: Great. Thank you, Elizabeth. So we touch against -- touch up to the abolition argument again and again. And thanks for putting it in the mix.
Eddie, I want to give you a chance.

MR. BOCANEGRA: Yes. I saw --

MR. TRAVIS: And then, Marcia, I saw your hand.

So go ahead. Marcia, we will come to you, and then ask David to respond. Thanks.

MR. BOCANEGRA: Thank you again. So just a quick comment. I think that there is a lot that we could learn, obviously, from other countries, while recognizing the differences as well.

I think about what is happening here in the state of Illinois. Just a couple of weeks ago, Heidi Mueller, the Executive Director of the juvenile prisons here pretty much started closing down all the juvenile facilities in the State of Illinois.

And so, just about five, maybe six years ago, Candice Jones, who is now the CEO of a major foundation out in the east coast, the Public Welfare Foundation, you know, when she was in that same position and they were closing down one of the state prisons for juveniles down south, it was interesting in the story that she shared, which I am going to paraphrase, which ultimately is you have all these, you know, rural kind of county folks, you know, predominantly all whites, who are depending on these jobs, right, for corrections. And they didn't see, right, how challenging it was. Or they didn't see the value of
the fact that they are incarcerating young kids, particularly Black and Brown kids.

And so, it is not until we are able to change that culture, right, that we are going to be able to see the value in human needs. And I think part of it is how does -- from a business perspective, do we see the value of this population. And I think that is something that we, in the last maybe ten years, we started kind of realizing more and more that there is actually potential untapped resource there.

I don't want to go -- obviously, spend more time on that. Because I am also going to be contradicting many of our comments here, including myself. But I think there is -- what I would ask from David is that in his comparison when he is doing his research, were there any other examples in the U.S. that are worth noting, so that we could gravitate, and say hey. How do we look at this example, and think about magnifying that, and going deeper as part of our larger strategy.

MR. TRAVIS: Great. A chance for here, a commercial announcement to a Square One paper by Vince Schiraldi, calling for the abolition of youth prisons, and noting some progress in that direction.

So Marcia, we will turn to you. And then, David, we are coming back to you for any reactions to what
you have heard.

    MS. RINCON-GALLARDO: Yes. Okay. So I wanted to just follow up. Eddie kind of touched on the point that I wanted to make, which was, what I found missing from this report, along with some of what the other colleagues have already mentioned, is this notion of it is a huge institution all over this country that is who works in it.

    You know, judges, prosecutors, public defenders, so on and so forth. They have livelihoods. They don't -- if we undo this system, and do away with it, where do they go to work? Right.

    And so -- and it is the same thing with when we talk about reforming or defunding or divesting of the police department. What happens to all -- you know, people pay mortgages. People send their kids off to college.

    So there is a whole area of work that needs to be well thought out about. And what is it that we need to lead in thinking about these things as we also dismantle these systems. So yes.

    MR. TRAVIS: Yes. So we are going to turn to David for his reactions to what he has heard. I want to acknowledge that after we got started, we were joined midway by two of our colleagues, Erik Bringswhite who was
with us at our first session. And I want to thank Erik for being with us.

And Imara Jones. Imara, I am going to -- when we get together next time, I am going to ask you to do, as I have with everyone else, take a moment to introduce yourself, so that we get a sense of the work you are doing.

And I have already said that I am jealous of your title. But something about Special Advisor for the Social Contract, something like that. But we will give you that floor next time we get together. It was good to have you here.

So David. So quick reactions. And then we will turn to Bruce for our wrap-up. You are on mute. You are on mute. David, you are on mute.

MR. GARLAND: Can you hear me now?

MR. TRAVIS: Yes.

MR. GARLAND: Okay. Sorry about that. So I have written down mostly what people said. And I take them to be kind of friendly amendments requiring me to complicate notions that are in the paper, of political economy, of crime, of the various mediations and responses that are going on.

The one thing that I find really interesting and want to take issue with, and it might be helpful for
the group as a whole, Emily's point about punishment. And I think we need to differentiate between American conceptions of punishment, the contemporary practice of punishment, the way the people in the USA assume punishment means imprisonment and it means lengthy terms of imprisonment.

   So none of that is essential. None of that is required. There is no universal commitment to that kind of behavior.

   But I do think, and I want to emphasize this, that punishment, by which I mean, an authoritative condemnation of wrongful behavior backed up by some kind of sanction. But I think that is essential to group life.

   I don't think you are going to have a normative morality without being, you know, backed up by punishment, and enforced by punishment. But punishment needn't be anything other than like, a raised eyebrow. It needn't be anything more than a fine, if we are talking about criminal justice real.

   But there is no escaping the importance of punishment as a backup to law and to norms. So I do think that some kind of punishment is always necessary. I think that you know, is that going from 100 to one in terms of where the U.S. is currently, and what the kind of necessary minimum would look like.
So that is simply a kind of, I think an analytical point, that there is no escaping some notion of punishment. And of course, in pragmatic real terms, if we got to the rate of imprisonment that we used to have in 1980, we would be enormously improved, and we’d still be way higher than Western European countries are.

So we are not talking about abolishing punishment, any more than you can talk about, I think, abolishing policing. We can talk about abolishing warrior policing or American style policing, or American style punishment. These are very different things.

Thank you.

MR. WESTERN: You’re muted, Jeremy.

MR. TRAVIS: Could you sit with that for one more second? Emily made a suggestion about the use of the word accountability as different. I am not sure. She said, as a substitute, but as a different concept.

Could you just react to that part of what she said as well, before we move on?

MR. GARLAND: Are you asking me, Jeremy?

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. Please.

MR. GARLAND: So I missed the point about accountability. Accountability, holding people to account, making someone responsible for something, I think the condemnation of wrongful behavior is more than just
that. And I think that there is a requirement.

If we regard something as being morally required, like a criminal law is morally required. Not all criminal laws in this over criminalized, create a penal code society. But in most societies, there is a core of you know, mala in se, things that every society criminalizes. And we regard them not just as being against criminal law but regard them as wrongful.

And I think to say something is wrongful is not just to say, you know, you are responsible for this, and therefore, we will hold you accountable. You know, maybe you didn't bring the budget in properly, but you overspent. You are accountable and responsible for that. But it is not to be condemned necessarily.

But if you are -- if the budget is off because you corruptly appropriated some money, that is to be condemned and punished. I think these are different things.

MR. TRAVIS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. GARLAND: They overlap. But different.

MR. TRAVIS: So we always look for these moments of disagreement in any group. So this helps us think about issues in their complexity.

It helps us respect the views of colleagues.

We hopefully take out of this something that will stick
with us after today. And what an important question. So thank you, Emily, for raising it as clearly as you did. And David, for responding as clearly as you did.

So we turn next to Bruce. And for those who are with us for the first time, Bruce is the person we turn to, to just help us reflect on the journey we have traveled in this particular session. And this is always a good setup for the next step in our journey, as we get together next time.

Bruce.

MR. WESTERN: Yes. Yes. A conversation, just a footnote on the exchange between David and Emily. I think what David landed for me is very, very close actually to a restorative justice idea. The starting point of which is, causing harm to someone else incurs obligations.

And you know, that is the starting point for a restorative justice process. I think the ideas are very close. I wouldn't say exactly identical, but very close.

MR. TRAVIS: We clearly need another Square One paper here. Just saying.

MR. WESTERN: I know. I know. Okay. Three ideas. I feel I was kind of -- Aisha's comment, what is cart, what is horse, in reflecting on the two papers. I think I was in the same boat. So here are my three big
So in a way I see the two papers as really in dialogue with each other. Now, the discussion in the first hour and in the second hour are bookends.

And in Elizabeth's paper, the way I hear it in the following discussion, we are really talking about a transfer of power. And the direct funding of communities was a way of empowering those communities.

The second hour was about structural change. We look to Western Europe in David's analysis as a fundamentally, structurally different political economy that has an entirely different set of justice institutions and an entirely different set of social outcomes.

Transferring power.

So what do you -- what was power in our discussion. And I think this is kind of a key question that we are all wrestling with in this moment, actually. And definitely, in the historical example that Elizabeth is talking about, in the contemporary experience of people around the table, too, how power means money and organization.

And part of what the community investment of the Great Society Era was doing was providing money. Not in an indiscriminate way. Not through social transfers, but to organizations who were representing in some sense,
the communities.

And I felt a lot of our conversation was -- tried to elaborate this idea of what power is. Yes, it is organization. Yes, it does involve money. But I thought different ideas of power also arose in the discussion. And I really think they are relevant, the processes, when confronting today.

Different kinds of players in the field have different kinds of symbolic power. And as Aswad spoke to the power of victims and victim voice as having a special kind of power in the political conversation about justice. Courtney spoke about the power of history.

And I think this means that making change right, if we are -- if there is going to be a transfer of power, which is how we can think about change from the starting point that Elizabeth gave us, then all of the residue of historical inequalities and injustices that we are living with today, the transfer of power is going to have to deal with that historical residue in some way. So history does have to be dealt with, because it is a repository of enormous power.

The thrust of Elizabeth's analysis, right, is power is transferred to community. So my second point is, community. And we talked a lot about that in different ways.
Community is complex, right. And I think our starting point in our conversation was empowerment of communities could lead to really significant change. That is the transfer of power that we are talking about and are interested in.

But communities are complex. They are subject to their own inequalities. For one, when I think David talks about local majoritarianism, he is pointing to that. I think Gabriel is also speaking to that. You know, there are inequalities within localities that don't want to unwittingly reproduce.

Communities are also struggling with an enormous amount of harm. And the disadvantage that many communities have been subject to affects their capacity to seize the reins of power. To take full advantage of the power that they might have.

That is how I hear Fatimah saying, you know, she is doing work around trauma, and the people who work in that space are themselves having to contend with trauma, in their own biographies. And so, this idea of you know, transferring power to communities is complicated.

Communities are shot through with their own power relations. The capacity of communities, in many cases, has been constrained by all of the harm that has
been piled onto them.

This makes me think that, you know, we should be thinking of a sort of a CAP 2.0 rather than you know, doing CAP again but better. But in which there is a role for government, I tend to think, to support community power in a more robust way.

It means more than just transferring funds to a community organization. It also means actively supporting the development of political capacity, I think. That is what I would take away. And I think that is qualitatively different from the kind of historical example that Elizabeth was describing about the 1960s.

So a third point, transformational change. So we are transferring power to produce this big structural change, right. What does that look like?

It is at least two things. It is an institutional change, right. And David spoke a lot about the change in our justice institutions and also fundamentally, a change in our social policy in institutions as well. The development, I think, this was a list of words. The citizens welfare state. So it is an institutional change.

And a lot of people also spoke to a change of ideology, right. A change of -- a shared sense of who is deserving. Who has a seat at the table. And in different
ways, I heard Chas talk about this, and Jorge, and Eddie.

So what is this, what is this change. It is this citizens welfare state that David described. And Europe is the exemplar. I think that an implication here for us is that we often point to social policy as the ideal kind of justice reform we would like to see in the United States.

But the problem is, American social policy is very emaciated. It is very inequality reproducing. You know, if you look at Medicaid. And you know, half the states still have not adopted Medicaid expansion under the ACA.

So our social policy institutions are not going to be the answer to justice reform. It will be social policy of a different kind again. And Kimá, I thought, really made that point explicit.

And part of the consequence of this more robust citizens welfare state that David was describing is that you know, community safety itself becomes a different thing. The agents of safety are not our criminal justice institutions. They are families and businesses and faith organizations. And all of the web of social life that does all of the work of informal control and socialization that David was talking about.

And I thought Aisha's point here was right on.
That the whole project of justice reform, in this very transformational way, is just inescapably an economic and an economic justice project. And I think an implication is that we need to be facile with that language and those policy instruments as we are with the criminal justice system.

The big unanswered question that I have is the how question. Right. How do we produce the social process, the transfers of power in this meaningful way, and create this transformational change? We have got glimpses of it in the discussion.

I would sort of like to put a pin in that as a theme that we return to in subsequent meetings. I feel that we have got sort of the template of a discussion here. But there is still critical pieces that we need to fill in.

MR. TRAVIS: Great. Thank you, Bruce. Before I offer some closing remarks, I want to just acknowledge that this is that time of day where if you are feeling like you have got a headache, or there is just too much going on, or it is just like hard to sort through what you just heard, that is what we wanted.

So that is the goal here, is to just keep filling your head with ideas, keep thinking about ways that we can relate to each other in the future, and get
some more sort of conversations going. And remember, at
the end, our last time together, we were talking about,
so, what might this all look like? So we do -- without
wanting to tie a ribbon on it, we do want to sort of try
to pull these threads together before our time is up.

Aisha, I see you have your hand up. Would you
like to say something before we wrap up?

MS. McWEAY: Yes. Really quickly. Next week
we are going to talk about three different papers. And I
just wanted to maybe flag that I think that is going to be
really hard, given the topics. And I am just wondering if
it would be worth considering moving one of those papers
to the session with Bruce. I am not trying to tell you
how to run your program.

I just -- I am not trying to be disrespectful
to the program. I think that the conversations, based off
the ones we have had so far with those three topics
together, I just don't want it to be -- I would wish for
that to happen to elevate it in front of people and not --

MR. TRAVIS: And don't apologize, please. We
like suggestions and comments. We will take it up with
our group as to how we manage the rest of the time
together.

And yes, when you look at housing, education,
and health, these are three big topics. Right. So we
will try to do them all in two hours. Yes. Okay. We are nothing if not ambitious.

MS. HUFFMAN: I will say, just to give a little comfort, if that is the -- we will talk about it. Because we knew that particularly in this new format that we are driven into, where we don't have as much time for each thing that we would -- we always walk away feeling that we don't have enough time.

And that is even the case here. Our current plan is that we will hear from our authors briefly all together, and then have a conversation for an hour and a half or more on the topics collectively. Just so that we aren't going to try to have everybody only have 22 minutes to be able to talk about the paper.

So, but I think you are right. And we will be thinking about how we can best work together over this remaining little bit of time that we have. And so, thank you.

MR. TRAVIS: Particularly given your observation, Aisha, we can't do justice reform without this. Right. So it is like a precondition.

So I will have some close out observations. But let me just turn it over to Sukyi to give her parting thoughts.

MS. McMAHON: Thank you, Jeremy. So just real
quickly, a little housekeeping. As usual, you are going to get your survey. Tomorrow, it is just a quick Google form, asking if you have any follow up thoughts based on the conversation we had here today, and also, following up on any tech issues you might have had.

So we want you all to be comfortable during these sessions. And yes, it will also include in your feedback some of the comments that were captured in the chat today. I will be sure that those are pulled out of there.

Erik, I caught yours as well. He sent me an awesome comment, privately. So I can't have that stand. So I am going to share that. I will make sure I get your permission, but it is too good to not share publicly.

So that is it. You will get that tomorrow. And we will ask that you complete it by the end of business on Friday.

MR. TRAVIS: Okay. This is an appropriate opportunity for me to thank Sukyi for helping us do what we are doing here. Not just in terms of the technology, but more importantly, substantively. This is a very rich conversation.

And we had great participation today, for which I am grateful. And what a group we have assembled, thanks to the Square One team. And I feel just privileged to be
with you.

So we are going to switch gears now. And, Sukyi, just help me understand how we are going to do this happy hour thing. For those who want to stay with us, we are going to have a chance just to get together in a more informal way.

Sukyi, what is the plan?

MS. McMAHON: Well, if anyone who would like to stay on would like to stay on, I have stopped recording. So you can go and get your beverages and hang out with us for a little bit.

MR. TRAVIS: All right.

MS. McMAHON: Typically, we have receptions like crazy. We are getting together, and we are really getting to know one another.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes.

MS. McMAHON: So we invite you all, if you would like to, to just hang out. It doesn't have to be long. You don't even have to have a drink. We can just talk. There is ten, there is twelve, fourteen of us, which is a good amount of folks for a nice little conversation.

MR. TRAVIS: And I will back out as the facilitator. I am also going to go get a glass of wine. But this open to -- we do miss, you know, in the Square
One format, we have music. We have spoken word. We go out to dinner.

We have drinks late, late in the night sometimes, just continuing the discussion. So what we are trying to create is at least a little opportunity for us to continue to get to know each other. So I am headed off to get a drink. I will be back in a sec.

(Whereupon, at 6:25 p.m. EST, the meeting was concluded.)
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