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PROCEEDINGS

MS. HUFFMAN: So I think we are going to go ahead and get started.

MR. WESTERN: That is a good idea.

MS. HUFFMAN: Jeremy, unfortunately, is having some trouble with his router at home, and even his cellphone isn't working at the moment. So he has asked us to go ahead and get started, and then will -- and hopefully, he will be joining us again shortly. But we will get this show on the road, in order to respect everyone's time, and hope that our fearless facilitator will be joining us again in just a few moments.

So I will start us off and get us going. And then, we will move into our conversation. So starting with, again, a huge welcome to everyone. It is great to see you all and to be together again for the third session of this roundtable.

This is starting to feel comfortable in a wonderful way, as we begin to get to know each other a bit. And it is great to be able to continue our conversation together and feel like this is part of a continued conversation on the future of justice reform and the social contract.

Speaking of the connectivity of this group, we really appreciate everyone's enthusiasm to join this
conversation in a lot of different ways. And we have been
taking to heart and thinking, and talking over the course
of the last week, your interest in having more ways to
connect and to share thoughts with each other.

So with that in mind, a couple of updates for
everyone. First, thank you to all who joined our
roundtable Slack conversation. That has already begun to
be a place where folks can share thoughts and post links
and ask questions. And we are seeing that happen.

And we encourage everyone to continue to use
that to talk in between our sessions -- talk in between
our sessions, and to keep building relationships, and to
keep sharing ideas. Keep this conversation going.

Second, in the same spirit, we have decided to
make a change in the “no chat in the chat” rule during
these sessions. We realize that they are short and
consolidated. And we want to make sure that we have as
many different ways as possible to capture everyone's
thoughts while they are fresh, and to ensure that as many
people as possible can weigh in, as often as possible.

So in an about face from last week, we invite
you all to chat in the chat if you have a thought you
would like to contribute. We ask you to please try to
keep that as part of the ongoing conversation. We will be
incorporating the comments from the chat into the record
for the -- to the transcript from the roundtable and will be matching up the timestamp.

So if you were responding to something that someone is saying, we will be doing our best to try to keep that coherent in the record of the discussion, so that we can still maintain one conversation. But please, do feel free to share with the group, if you have something you would like to add in real time, in that way.

Still, please, raise your hand. All of the rules about how to get into the conversation lineup still apply. So this is in addition, not in place of that.

So moving on to get us started on our conversation today, first I have some regretful news to share, pertaining to our discussion today, and our group moving forward. Unfortunately, Vesla Weaver, who joined us as our participant -- one of our participants already, has had to step away from the roundtable for personal reasons.

And so, she will not be able to join us over the next few sessions. That is a loss for our group, not having her perspective in the discussion every day. And also, she will not be able to share a paper and present during our conversation next week.

So given that, we have shifted the schedule slightly. Vivian has graciously agreed to move her
discussion of educational opportunity over to next week, which will be a terrific complement to the conversation that we were already planning to have next week, with Bruce's discussion on employment and economic opportunity. And today, we will be focusing specifically on the two important topics of housing and health care as they relate to the social contract.

And again, nothing else has changed in terms of sort of the format of the discussion and the overviews. We will be starting off -- we will be starting off with presentations from our authors, and then moving into a conversation there.

Just really quickly, before we move into that discussion, I want to just acknowledge a few folks. We have observers, again, as we have in the past. A special welcome to Nancy Fishman from the Schusterman Foundation, who has joined us today. Great to have you here.

And we are also going to be joined by Ananya's co-authors for her paper, Terra Graziani, and Pamela Stephens. Hedy's co-authors are Liza Weiss and Finola Prendergast. So thanks to them for their great work on these papers, as well. And we are just really excited to have the full discussion.

So with that, I will just invite us -- and I want to just quickly reference back to Jeremy's words last
week. As we think about our goal over our time together, of really weaving this tapestry of thoughts together, and bringing threads from our past conversations to bear today, and to think about where we are going.

I just mention that, so that as you are listening to the presentations today, and as you are thinking about what you are hearing, please do think what we talked about before. Feel free to take what resonates with you from these papers. Hearken back to papers from last week, and to the conversation of last week, and build upon those thoughts by responding as our conversation goes along.

We certainly don't want -- you know, this is not an academic paper defense session by any means. It is quite different from that. And we really want to encourage people to take the conversation where you will, and to tie the thoughts together as you will, and to move us forward.

So with that, we will get started, unless Sukyi or Bruce has anything that I have missed in my attempt to play the role of Jeremy Travis, very briefly here.

MR. WESTERN: No. That was right on.

MS. HUFFMAN: Great. Well, in that case, we will turn it over to Ananya, to get us started in our conversation. And Ananya, we will let you introduce your
colleagues as well, and share with us your thoughts.

And just so everyone knows, Ananya will present. Then, we will move pretty quickly. We will ask any direct questions of you, Ananya, with regard to the paper, as we always do.

Then, we will turn to Hedy, and do the same with you. And then, open up for our conversation on the broad subject together.

So with no further ado, Ananya.

MS. ROY: Good afternoon, everyone. This paper, which is titled, “Unhousing the Poor: Interlocking Regimes, Operationalized Policing,” is part of ongoing research at the UCLA Luskin Institute on Inequality and Democracy to analyze new geographies, operational segregation in Los Angeles, and in other U.S. cities.

The paper is co-authored by Terra Graziani of the Anti-eviction Mapping Project, and Pamela Stephens, a [audio skip] student at UCLA. As with all of the work of the Institute, we acknowledge that we are on stolen lands, and that we owe accountability to the communities and movements that are on the front lines of what we call racial banishment.

In my very brief presentation today, I want to focus on a key aspect of the analysis in the paper, which is the relationship between property and personhood. I
will argue that police, specifically, what Nikhil Pal Singh has called “the whiteness of police,” is essential to this relationship between property and personhood. Whiteness, Singh argues, and I am quoting, “emerges from the government of property and its interests in relationship to those who have no property and were therefore imagined to harbor a potentially criminal disregard of property toward” -- [audio skip]

Together, property, personhood, and police, constitute a key structuring logic of racial capitalism, and what I call its lifelong companion, liberalism. So let's ground ourselves in the City of Angels with an LA icon, Nipsey Hussle. A member of the Rollin 60’s Crips since his teenage years, Nipsey Hussle came to be known for his extraordinary contributions to hip hop, and for his vision of community power.

At the heart of that vision was the strip mall at Crenshaw and Slauson in South Central Los Angeles, where he opened The Marathon Clothing Company Store in 2007. And I hope some of you are thinking about “Grinding All My Life” as you listen to me today.

On March 31, 2019, Nipsey Hussle was shot dead outside that store. One of LA's writers, Sahra Sulaiman, has noted that the fight to claim place and space at Crenshaw and Slauson would become the defining struggle of
Nipsey Hussle's life. It was also the site of his death. Days after his death, the New York Times broke the story of an ongoing criminal investigation, by the LA Police Department, of Nipsey Hussle. Soon, David Gross, Nipsey Hussle's business partner, posted on Instagram the nuisance abatement demand letter that the LA City Attorney's Office had sent to The Marathon Clothing Company a few months before Nipsey Hussle's death, noting that the artist and activist had been subject to persistent criminalization by the City.

I knew the letter. At the Institute on Inequality in Democracy, we had just procured scores of nuisance abatement lawsuits filed by the LA City Attorney's Office against property owners. That regime of policing, nuisance abatement, is in turn, part of a broader process that we have come to call racial banishment.

Racial banishment reminds us that gentrification and displacement are not just market-driven processes, but rather, enabled by state organized banners that expels and even kills Black, Brown, and Indigenous people. So one example of this is the ongoing national discussion of how Breonna Taylor's murder must be understood in the context of what many have called a major gentrification makeover, which involved a police operation
called Place Based Investigations, presumably focused on narcotics crimes. But it was more about speeding up Louisville's multimillion-dollar Vision Russell development plan.

In our paper, we analyze the territorial logic of interlocking regimes of racialized policing, and argue that such regimes have played a key role in the systematic unhousing of the poor in U.S. cities. And let me just mention two of these regimes of policing.

The first is the proliferation of municipal ordinances that criminalize those who are seen to be outside of, or a threat to, propertied order. Namely, people experiencing homelessness. In Los Angeles, such ordinances enable the confiscation and destruction of the personal property of the unhoused by sanitation workers in collaboration with the police, what are known as sweeps.

Other ordinances prohibit vehicle dwelling, illegalizing a really important form of shelter for the unhoused. What is at stake is the use of legal reason and legal authority to carry out the criminalization of innocent behavior. This phrase was used in a Ninth Circuit ruling against an earlier version of the vehicle dwelling ordinance.

We argue that such ordinances have created a state of civil death, social death, actual death. In Los
Angeles, the unhoused, disproportionately Black, are subject to the forms of premature death that abolitionist scholar Ruthie Gilmore views as a hallmark of racism. So today, the average life expectancy of an unhoused woman in LA is 48 years. And the average life expectancy of an unhoused man is 51 years.

The second regime of policing returns us to Nipsey Hussle, and it is nuisance abatement. In the paper, we focus on something called CNAP, or the Citywide Nuisance Abatement Program in Los Angeles, which started in 1997, and targets properties.

Typically, CNAP cases imbues a combination of narcotics abatement, public nuisance, and unfair competition law to enact what they call the reformation of property and uses what -- nuisance as a well-recognized established exercise of the state's police power. CNAP is part of a variegated national landscape of crime-free rental housing ordinances and nuisance ordinances whereby landlords are required to evict tenants who are found to be causing nuisance.

So as evidenced in a series of legal challenges mounted by the ACLU, these nuisance ordinances have often become punishment for those experiencing domestic violence. What I term the criminalization of vulnerability. Our research in Los Angeles shows that an
overwhelming number of nuisance abatement cases have been filed against properties in South Central Los Angeles, specifically in census tracts where Black residents make up 30 percent or more of the population.

What is at stake, we argue, in such filings, is the construction of an intimate relationship between police and property. So, narcotics and nuisance abatement serve as the pretext for a vast expansion of police presence and surveillance, from the inspection of guest and tenant records, upon request and without warrant, to multi-camera video monitoring systems with direct 24-hour feeds to police departments, to key fobs, codes, and clickers for specific police officers to all access points at these properties.

Essentially, a CNAP demand letter, such as the one sent to Nipsey Hussle, places the property in the direct control of the City Attorney's Office, and the LA Police Department, who then determine the maintenance of security and safety. Behind each demand letter stands a police investigation, typically, into gang activity.

So recently, information activist Michael Kohas [phonetic] revealed that in 2018-2019, the City Attorney's Office filed 13 nuisance abatement lawsuits in LA for the office issued 479 demand letters against properties in the same period.
We view city-level programs such as CNAP as the consolidation of what the Stop LAPD Spying Coalition has called, the Stalker State: a sprawling apparatus of surveillance systems, predictive policing algorithms, and spatialized imaginations of crime and terror. It is our assessment that such programs concentrated in neighborhoods that are on the frontlines of gentrification enact racial banishment.

We also argue in the penultimate section of the paper, and in keeping with the work of Elizabeth Hinton, that this kind of restructuring of public housing that we’ve seen with the war on drugs sets the stage for the legal and carceral regimes that are now being implemented through nuisance abatement ordinances. In particular, nuisance abatement has become, as the LA City Attorney's Office itself would say, gang injunctions by another name, at a time when gang injunctions and gang databases are under increasing scrutiny.

Now the paper itself, of course, provides this analysis as a way for us to collectively think about housing as a social contract. The paper was written in quite a different moment.

So let me conclude by saying that what we are facing now in Los Angeles and in many other U.S. cities, and what we’ve been trying to sound the alarm on, is going
to be possibly the largest mass displacement in the
history of the region, since Indigenous genocide and
dispossession. Our research shows that nearly half a
million renter households are at the risk of eviction in
Los Angeles this year, when the eviction courts reopen,
which will most likely be on September 1st.

The paper concludes with the discussion of what
it might mean to think about rights -- housing rights
without conditions, and what it might mean to reimagine
social housing in the United States. But I think we face
a somewhat different moment now, where the struggle for
housing justice, of course, conjoined with the uprising
for racial justice requires mass mobilization. And that
mass mobilization is underway in LA with rent strikes,
eviction blockades, and a reimagining of housing itself.

So we might very well be on the cusp of mass
displacement. But I think we are also on the cusp of a
necessary reimagining of housing as a part of the social
contract in the U.S. And that, I would argue, entails,
necessarily, a reimagining of the relationship between
property, personhood, and police.

So let me stop here and turn it back to
Katharine.

MS. HUFFMAN: Great. Thank you, Ananya, so
much, for that overview. Does anyone have any clarifying
questions for Ananya, before we continue?

(No response.)

MS. HUFFMAN: I would like to very happily note that we are joined by Jeremy Travis, who is with us, and hopefully will not have connectivity issues. But to be on the safe side, I will sort of continue to help manage the queue during our conversation today.

Jeremy will jump in as a participant and with any thoughts he might want to contribute as well, but we will just continue to move forward with everything. So Jeremy, welcome. And glad things worked out.

So with that then, we will turn it over to Hedy. And Hedy, you can give us a little bit of an overview to follow that. And then, we will open up for group discussion.

Hedy.

MS. LEE: Great. Thanks. Please stop me if you can't see or hear me. I am also having trouble with my internet. So just let me know. Just shout it out.

Because I am using headphones to listen to you and talk, and then the video to see people.

So today, I am going to be talking about health care as justice reform. And I want to thank everyone for the opportunity to engage with you. I have really learned a lot over the past two meetings already. And my comments
reflect and are shaped by the conversations that we have already had, as you will see.

I also want to recognize my co-authors, who are joining the meeting. Liza Weiss, who is Executive Director of Missouri Appleseed, and Finola Prendergast, who is Director of Research at Missouri Appleseed. Missouri Appleseed focuses on the health and health care of those impacted by the criminal justice system.

And we have been working together on several initiatives in the State of Missouri, related to the health and wellbeing of individuals in jails and prisons, but also their families. And some of that was discussed in the paper. And I am happy to talk more about that, as we talk through some of these issues, as well.

I am going to try to be brief with my comments, to ensure we have time for discussion and debate. Sukyi said to try to stick to five minutes. So I am going to try to stick to my notes, and not be the academic that talks on and on. So you can hold me on it. Stop me anytime, if I am starting to do that.

So I think from the perspective of a sociologist, and a demographer who studies population, health, and health disparities -- so, if you got a chance to read the paper before today, you might notice that we put care in parenthesis in our title around Health(care)
as Justice Reform. And that was on purpose.

Because although healthcare matters, and we really do need to focus on healthcare, thinking about and talking about health also matters, and care for persons outside of the healthcare context might matter even more than healthcare. And I think Ananya's point kind of alluded to that already.

Unhoused populations having much lower levels -- higher levels of mortality and lower life expectancy means there is other kinds of things that are impacting our health, more than just the doctors we see. And I actually spent a lot of time talking about the fact that even if we were able to equalize healthcare in the United States, we would continue to see health disparities. That is not to say that we shouldn't be focusing on and thinking about equal access to healthcare to all.

But, we should know and be clear about the fact that even in countries we compare ourselves to for having superior welfare states, some of the countries that David discussed last week, most of which do have universal health care, we still see very significant racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic disparities in their health and mortality. So even in populations that have healthcare access for everyone, we are still seeing poorer health outcomes for marginalized populations.
And this is because of the many reasons we have been discussing, some of which were outlined in our paper. And I think one of the major points that, you know, we want to talk about is that we cannot address health disparities until we address social structural upstream factors, like economic, criminal justice, housing, educational, and environmental policies that make us sick way before we ever get to the doctor’s office or the emergency room.

The COVID-19 pandemic has brought this idea, I think, or we think, into sharp relief. Containing the virus, and protecting people from infection and the negative consequences of infection, requires attention to things like conditions of confinement, job conditions, housing conditions, as well as the things that we often talk about in the news, like testing and health care. And it also requires us to imagine in a more inclusive way what community and safety mean.

Because for a community to be resilient, every member of that community has to be resilient. And for a community to be safe, everybody in that community also has to be healthy.

In our essay, we suggest that policies to improve the health of communities need to target individuals in prison and jail, both during incarceration
and after release. But policies must also aid incarcerated people's families and communities. Families and communities aren't usually the unseen collateral damage in discussions around mass incarceration.

And these policies have to extend beyond healthcare interventions to focus on some of the structural changes that I mentioned. So we must begin to see health in all of our policies, not just in our healthcare policies. And in many cases, and as our examples show in the paper, the kind of policies that will support individuals, their families, and communities are usually beyond the scope of healthcare, or even traditional public health activities.

So things like alternative sentencing practices, that keep families together, can positively impact the health and well-being of families and children in both the short and the long term, by allowing a caretaker to remain in the household and in their community, and support and provide for their community as well.

And also, importantly, is that it is imperative to bring narratives of public health and public safety together. Since public health is a matter of public safety, policies that threaten public health, including mass incarceration, cannot be considered a public safety
Another issue not talked about in the paper, but important to this discussion is that good health is also, fundamentally, a human rights issue. Of course, healthcare, again, is an important piece of the story. But when we are thinking about health as a human right, we can't just be talking about healthcare.

Our country has yet to fully recognize health as a human right, in our policies or our practices. And lack of universal health care is just one example of why that is the case.

Many groups often clamor to say that the U.S. government champions human rights around the world. We insist that other countries protect human rights. We even impose sanctions on other countries who fail to support human rights. But we don’t do the same job in our own home front.

So effective changes to improve health are going to be unlikely until health advocates can leverage a framework broader than health to mobilize political action. So they need to be able to collaborate with non-healthcare sector advocates, including those in housing, which was talked about today, and education, which will be talked about next week.

Achieving good health for all, how will we
define health, which is a whole another bag we can talk about. It may seem like an elusive goal. But like the many things we have talked about in these roundtables, it requires outside-of-the-box thinking, opportunities to test new ideas, and to fail forward.

Okay, I am going to stop there, so that we can have our conversation. Hopefully, you heard me, and I am not talking to nobody right now.

MS. HUFFMAN: Yes, you came through. You came through loud and clear, Hedy. Thank you so much.

Anyone have any clarifying questions for Hedy, before we open up for conversation?

(No response.)

MS. HUFFMAN: All right. Seeing none. One other quick note, our colleague Erik Bringswhite has joined us. He is on by phone, so you are not seeing his face on the video. But Erik is here as well.

Erik, it is great to have you. And Erik, feel free to kind of pipe in, if you want to get into the conversation. And we will make sure to pause, since you are not able to raise your hand on the chat.

So with that, I will invite folks to raise your hand. Reminder that you do that through -- by clicking on the participants button below. And then, you can click to raise your hand. And we'll be recognizing folks in the
order that your hands are raised.

Reminder that if you do have a comment that you
would like to make out loud, right in the moment, the
insistent wave is always available to you. And feel free
to do that. Just literally, physically raising, waving
your hand so that I can see you, and we will bring you
into the conversation right then, if you need to speak.

So with that, I will open it up for folks who
have a thought prompted by those papers, and
presentations, and by other conversations that we have had
over our time together.

(Pause.)

MS. HUFFMAN: Kristian, why don't you get us
started?

MS. CABALLERO: Happy to. Can you all hear me
okay?

MS. HUFFMAN: Perfectly.

MS. CABALLERO: So again, as far as my
background is concerned, you know, not just a longtime
community activist and organizer on a variety of social
justice issues, but I also served on the Human Rights
Commission here in the city of Austin.

And one of the many issues that I continuously
try to address through the Human Rights Commission is that
housing is a human right. And so, in the city of Austin
of course, like many other cities across the country, we are struggling with the effects of gentrification and displacement, especially in our historically Black and Latino neighborhoods.

And you know, with COVID right now, I think we are just seeing that a lot of these issues that have been issues for a while being magnified. And the rate of displacement, you know, being exacerbated even more so. But what I would like to go back to the hope of the time that we are going through right now is that while these issues are being magnified and exacerbated, hopefully, we take it more seriously, and actually start defining these as a human right.

Not only a human rights issue, but that we have a right -- that people have a right to housing, and they have a right to access to resources. Especially with the intersection of you know, healthcare and you know, access to food, access to education, technology, transportation, and so forth.

I think one thing that I really appreciate about both of these topics is that you all are kind of showing the intersection of a lot of these issues. So from housing to you know, policing. And then of course, healthcare to criminal justice. But also back again, how it goes back to housing.
I think one of the things that we are seeing here in Austin is a push -- especially in response to COVID, is a push to making a lot of these resources more accessible, and mobilizing things, where we typically expect people to go to, to receive services. We are actually seeing more of a push and a need to mobilize those services to where people are being displaced, and being pushed further out of the inner city core.

So I think that is all I have to add for now.

That is my hope and my optimism with these issues being magnified, is that hopefully, we do become a little bit more innovative in how we address these issues, and making sure that people have access to the resources that they need.

MS. HUFFMAN: Great. Thank you, Kristian. So we will go next to Emily. And just so folks know, next up will be Danielle, and then Eddie will follow that.

Emily?

MS. WANG: Great. So I really appreciated kind of reading both of these papers as well. And really appreciated, kind of racial banishment. That kind of is a term that is not familiar to me. And just this whole concept. I just found that piece really powerful.

My comments are mostly directed towards, I am looking for you, Hedy, on the screen, and I don't see you
now -- Hedy and your co-authors are really thinking about health and healthcare as a driver, an important piece of how it is that we reimagine a just society. And there is two places that I want to reflect on.

And I think oftentimes, I mean, I am, as a practicing physician -- I see a sign saying my internet is unstable, and I am at Yale, so that is disappointing.

MS. HUFFMAN: We hear you, Emily.

MS. WANG: Okay. Good. So I will keep going. I want us to push us thinking about -- I mean, I am a physician. I see patients at the individual level. I think it is really important I am the first to say is that, you know, healthcare is a small little bit, but it is critically important of how it is that we are in -- really kind of create healthier communities.

But people do need healthcare. And it should be a human right and it isn't. And also, you know, the health system is a huge actor. And it is never ever discussed as an actor in criminal justice reform or how we reimagine a just and safe society.

And I just, I want to bring into this space, that, you know, accounts for right now, 20 percent of our gross domestic product every year, 20 percent, one out of six new jobs is in the healthcare industry. It is a force in New Haven and in many of the communities where we have
Transitions Clinic Networks, a major force for
gentrification and for this racial banishment. A major
force.

And so, you know, I want to introduce this
important piece, is that, you know, it is not just the
provision of -- the delivery of services, the healthcare
delivery. It is, I think, an infinitely blown up
industry. You know, like it is profiteering at all levels
and also, it drives our economy. It creates spaces that
are -- where some people exist and can exist safely, and
others cannot.

And so, I just wanted to say that first and
foremost, is that many of the settings that we have been
in are thinking about, and I think it is important, the
patient, or the individual. I mean, it is not the patient
to you guys, but for me it is. And the people that have
been incarcerated, their families, their communities. But
it is a mammoth that has ties in all sorts of ways. So
that is the first big piece.

And then, for Hedy, and I still don't see you,
within healthcare, and I will be the first to say is,
again, I think insurance is deeply necessary and deeply
not sufficient. There are two good papers out there that
show that with the expansion of the Affordable Care Act,
it did move the needle.
And increasing insurance rates, you know, using national data, showing that individuals that have criminal justice involvement did get insured, and also at increased rates, compared to those never incarcerated. And also, they just didn't make it to primary care. They don't know how to make it to primary care, that this is a place that is not trusted. It is not a place that invites people in.

And so, the work that has to be done is critical, but Medicaid, healthcare expansion, the Affordable Care Act, what has happened brilliantly in Missouri is critical to this. At the individual level, there is something profound. I actually do think it is one of the biggest piece of criminal justice legislations we have had in the last decade is the Affordable Care Act.

And I also will say is that the literature that crosses over looking at healthcare interventions and how it impacts future justice involvement is growing, but it is small. And the work that we have done in Transitions Clinic Network shows that, you know, even in a study where we had people in Transitions, compared to those never in Transitions, and maps them.

People that were in Transitions, this is a program that you know, exists across the country, that Hedy references in her paper, and which I deeply believe in. We hire people with histories of incarceration to
work in the health system, you know. Felony records, in
the health system, working alongside primary care doctors.

It reduces future criminal justice contact, as
we might all expect. You know, that people go in less.
They spend less time in. And even, you know, any amount
of time is worthy of an investment, kind of, in our
primary care infrastructure to kind of get people out.

And so to me, some of that I think is important
is that we haven't pushed what can be done within
healthcare systems, both as the delivery agent of
services, nor as a huge economic engine. Huge. Like,
think about all the barriers for hiring people to work in
the healthcare system if you have a felony record.

That is kind of a lot of what we do in
Transitions. It is huge. One out of six every new jobs.

You know, and so, to me, it is that piece also
that is really critically important. It is something
profound, and has -- reaches way beyond just the delivery
of services.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Emily. And I will
just let folks know, it looks like Hedy is still on, but
she is not on by video at the moment. So when you are
speaking to her, she is hearing you. But just, you don't
see her face.

MS. WANG: Good to know. I was trying to make
Zoom eye contact, and I couldn't.

MS. HUFFMAN: Right. Right. The magic of Zoom eye contact. So Danielle, our queue is growing. Danielle is up next, then Eddie. And then after that, Deanna, Fatimah and Dona are in the queue.

And I encourage others to join in. We are going to be going through, in this one session, to the end of our time together today. So we will be able to fit more folks into the conversation.

So Danielle?

MS. ALLEN: Thanks a lot. Thank you for two really super interesting papers. I want to make just some observations about resonances across conversations. And then I have a question for Ananya.

So I mean, I just -- when we get to my paper, you will see that the kind of concept of banishment is important to me, too. So I really appreciated seeing it come out so concretely in your paper. And I think it is a very useful concept, racial banishment, for talking about what is at the core of a cluster of contemporary practices linking policing and incarceration.

And you know, and in some sense, the kind of job is to reconnect the conversation about public safety to the opposite of that. And your paper does a great job of kind of articulating the opposite. And that is also
what I am trying to do and I think many of us are trying

to do.

And I think, relatedly, Hedy's paper does a
beautiful job of really making the point that you know,
incarceration -- and this is a point others make, that it,
you know, degrades health. And in that regard, we have to
measure its negative public safety impact. And it has a
kind of measurable, you know, impact on public safety,
that there is sort of broad communities of health, where
health is degraded as a consequence of incarceration.

As I just wanted to sort of say out loud, that
it is beautiful to see this sort of field of -- coming
together. That sort of across the spaces of the
relationship between policing and housing, incarceration
and health, and so forth, you can have a kind of negative
picture of the damage done to health and wellbeing across
these policy domains. And therefore, also the inverse, a
sort of positive picture.

So, okay now -- so, the question is very
specific. But it is one I always myself get personally
stuck on. So this is kind of a plea for help. It was
super interesting to read about the way in which the
nuisance abatement procedure has replaced, or you know, is
building on a kind of gang databases and approaches [audio
skip] race-based investigations, stuff like that.
And you know, LA's history is obviously extraordinary on that front. And the thing I am wondering, is something along the lines of the folly. It is sort of -- within this network of research, I really am curious to know what the sort of state of the art on thinking about gangs is, at this point in time, insofar as you know, in my own, the way I sort of thought about gangs, sort of work I have done about sort of gangs in the '90s.

I have tended to focus on gangs as offering a kind of alternative principle of social, sociology, socialization, and so forth. So that you know, people who are participating are making a choice between different structures of social participation. And so, that -- you know, if we are sort of serious about reimagining how policy tools support community health and the strength of social relations, I think we actually have to take seriously the challenge of gangs, too.

So in other words, you know, fully recognizing the problematic nature of the tools that have been used, because they are part of this field of banishment, basically, because they are racial banishment, sort of like the conversation with violence.

We -- what is our answer, then, to how to think about the ways in which gangs do pull people into an
alternative form of sociality. It has some benefits, granted, but also has a whole lot of negatives, so --

MS. HUFFMAN: Yes.

MS. ALLEN: I sort of, right. I don't know where that question went --

MS. HUFFMAN: Right. Thank you, Danielle. You know, given the length of our session, normally, we would say, you know, Hedy. Hang on to those questions. You are going to get a chance to respond to them. Let's get a few folks, more folks in the conversation.

And then Hedy, and Ananya, maybe we will pause for a moment, and give you guys a minute, kind of halfway through, to respond to some of the ideas that are coming up. Just so we can keep you in the conversation in that way as well, if that works for everybody. Great. Thank you, Danielle.

So Eddie, and then, Deanna.

MR. BOCANEGRA: Yes. Thanks, Katharine. I appreciate the -- both reports that were shared right now.

I want to just take a couple of minutes, just to kind of piece together what I -- what that kind of resonated for me.

So if I think about, you know, I managed one of those large antiviolence programs in our city, here in Chicago. And you know, we are very explicit in terms of
who we serve. And so, just to kind of give you a
snapshot, the men in our program have 17, 18 arrests.
Four or five of them are fighting the arrest. 60 percent
of them are fathers. 60 percent of them have done prison
time. And over 80 percent are victims of violence, which
about 200 of them have been victims of gun violence,
right.

So there is a lot that I know about, about our
men. This is not self-reporting. This is police and
hospital data that helps inform, right, the profiles of
the men that we work.

And ironically, there is a few things that I
wanted to lift up, right, when we think about this kind of
framework around health and justice, right. So one of the
biggest concerns that we continue to see in our state is
that if you have done your time, you completed your time.
And yet, you have nowhere to parole to.

You are violated at the door, right. The
minute you are going to step out that door, you are
violated, and you are held in the corrections for a longer
duration of time. And that to me is an injustice, right,
in many ways.

Because the onus is pretty much, like, they are
stating that if you aren't able to parole somewhere,
right, you could have done 20, 30 years, and you have no
family to go to, because of that, right, we are going to further punish you. Because of your inability, right, to access housing, ultimately. And that is just -- it is an injustice in so many ways, right.

And then, the other part too. COVID, for example. You know, by standard definition, which is the Chicago Public School definition, 17 percent of our men are homeless. But really, in terms of unstable housing, it is a little bit over 80 percent.

And by that, I mean 80 percent of the men in our program, despite of the fact that they are receiving a job through us, they are couch surfing. They are living with their sister, their grandmother, you know, a friend. Most of the time, it is actually friends they are living with.

And in some cases, some of these friends or family members, and this is what COVID taught us. That while they were received, right, in these homes, homes that, you know, 800, 900 square foot apartments, that often you would find, you know, between five and twelve people living, including kids. Because of COVID and because of the restrictions of our state, of not being able to, you know, shelter in place, and so on, they were stuck in these homes.

And so, we saw an increase of domestic violence
as a result of that and we are continuing to see an
increase of violence in our city. So between Memorial Day
weekend and the 4th of July weekend, we have had 153
people killed in Chicago. Five of them were the men in my
program. And those aren’t the ones that are in the
treatment group, right. Those that are in the control
group are probably twice as much.

So housing has to -- it is the inability of
housing, right. One of the fundamental Maslow hierarchy
of needs, right, the housing, safety, it is something that
we are unable to really provide for many of our men in our
program. And then we’re shocked and surprised why we see
an increase of violence, right.

And I think the more that we frame it around
kind of a health disparity, right, I believe, based on
what I heard right now, allows us, right, to think about
different frameworks and different opportunities for
funding streams. Whether it is through philanthropy or
the public sector.

But I just think that there is an injustice
there, right. That we further punish those who aren’t
able to move forward or to find stable housing. And I am,
you know, curious.

And I am taking notes from other people's
comments. Danielle, your comments right now were really,
really well. I am taking notes, so I can bring that to my team.

Because I just think about even today, when we are thinking about the census. It's where we are trying to collect more names and numbers. I think about, our men are often excluded from there. Not just simply because of the housing, which is a major part, but the other parts. Because they are already marginalized. They are already excluded from direct service.

They are not social service seekers. Like, our men in READI are not social service seekers. Like, I am going out to them, and finding them in the streets to bring them in, right. And that is another major challenge as is associated to the housing.

So I just wanted to say thank you for that. No question, but just more of a comment.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Eddie. Yes. It is really, you know, kind of hearing in all of these comments and questions, the ways that these systems are both -- they are part of the answer, but they are also part of the problem. And you know, the sort of ways in which they can be part of a punishment system as well.

We'll turn to Deanna, and then, Fatimah, you will be up next. Deanna.

MS. VAN BUREN: Thanks, Katharine. Both of
these presentations and papers are really resonating with me, particularly the housing piece.

I have just been thinking about housing a lot, and in particular, reentry housing for folks coming home, since there are no financing structures for that, is a big gap in the market. And then just sort of -- just have a -- just a comment, but also some queries. And maybe just a plea for help, with the brain trust we have here.

We also advocate for housing as a human right. It just is, as it is a base for our lives. And I think the gentrification piece, wherever we go, is the biggest source of trauma for a lot of communities.

Usually people are incredibly terrified of that. And it sort of is something we are constantly having to address and deal with, and often don't know the answer.

And you know, while we are even looking at reentry housing, also been approached by housing developers, non-profit housing developers, and the non-profit housing developer complex, right. Because that system itself is a whole host of problems that don't actually help people get out of poverty. They don't actually help people own their housing.

So we have been inviting them into conversation about what can we actually do to make this form of housing
equitable, and to sit down at the table. So the design of these facilities, but also the financing of them. It is just not equitable, right. It is not culturally relevant. It is not culturally responsible. There is no pathways to ownership. All of that. And so, whatever.

I had just a question for Ananya, in terms of this policing piece that you have brought into it, the banishment piece. I almost felt a little down, because I hadn't even thought about that. Like, there is so many challenges for the housing piece.

Like, here is another one. And I am curious about its intersection with NIMBYism, Not In My Back Yard, which is a huge issue for our work. We can get something. We can get a housing, a reentry housing project shut down in five seconds with that piece alone, and how that ties into the calling of the police.

And I am also curious about ownership versus renting. And do those things -- are those things impacting what you are seeing in your research?

And then, my plea for help is always, like, just hoping that folks can -- we can come together as a community and begin to resolve, or at least brainstorm and think about how to address some of these housing issues. Because I think there is a lot of layers that we have to talk through and work through. And it just has to be
MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Deanna. Thanks a lot.

And Ananya, like I said, we will circle back in a few minutes to give both you and Hedy a chance to answer some questions directly. But that plea for help was to everyone. So you are all up.

And we will turn to -- let's do this. We will turn to Fatimah, Dona, Kimá and Lynda. And then, we will pause for a moment, give our authors a chance to respond to what they are hearing at that point. And then we will continue the conversation.

So Fatimah?

MS. DREIER: This has been incredibly useful. I also really enjoyed the papers and the discussion thus far. You know, Emily, I appreciate what you said. And Eddie, I want to thank you for also sharing about your clients.

I do note, I actually just came from a talk I gave to the American Hospital Association to talk about community violence and racial equity. And beginning this conversation about the default white supremacist ways in which healthcare kind of views or operates, without questioning or without interrogating its own history and understanding of kind of the impact on communities of color. Healthcare's impact on communities of color.
But then also, thinking about it as a place of power, as Emily said. And where there are opportunities, and we actually talked explicitly about housing, and about where hospitals as investors can align around community strategies for housing. And to do this equitably, right.

And so, we got into the minutiae of, well, what would this -- you know, how do you hire a private equity firm that actually is aligned around certain practices and principles in communities. What are, you know -- talking to -- sorry.

Let me take a step back, for those of you who don't know me. So I run the Health Alliance for Violence Intervention. And we are a national network of hospital-based violence intervention programs. So we are talking about violence.

We are talking about those who were at great risk were largely boys and men of color. Many of our clients overlapped with the sorts of patients that Eddie referred to. And their needs for housing are huge.

So we have programs that have found investors and are taking on housing projects. And they have to address the question -- I was just talking to someone today about this, addressing questions of risk and liability. That is always what comes up.

And so, how do you talk about equity? How do
you ensure that people get the support they need when --
and what are the financial vehicles to allow this to
happen equitably? And how do you get healthcare on board
as a player that is not just looking out for its own
interests, but actually aligning with community needs?

These are really big questions. But I do think
that it is taking the thinking here, and asking questions
like, in what ways could healthcare be mitigated with the
impacts of racial banishment as a healthcare issue, right.
As something we can look at it in healthcare.

We see police entering hospitals, right. And
particularly for our patients. And thinking about ways in
which health professionals are mitigating and buffering at
the site at which people are being harmed. So this is
happening in some ways.

So there is kind of a lot to be thinking about
here. I want to also just talk about -- I will say one
last thing. Danielle, you raised a question about gangs.
And you know, obviously, folks in the violence
intervention and prevention space have thought a lot about
gang intervention, how do you redirect?

How do you -- and what does it mean to bring
that work to scale in ways that encourage those who are
most impacted to be employed by programs to actually do
the work of redirecting. That is labor and work that is
really important, without professionalizing itself, becoming a tool to -- that can have deleterious effects.

So how do you keep the integrity of this incredible work on the ground, but also scale it commensurate to the need. Right. That has to -- so how do you structuralize this.

And as we think, I am excited to think with all of you, about in this new social contract, when you bring something to scale, what are the consequences for the intentional work that happens in small batches?

MS. HUFFMAN: Yes. Thank you, Fatimah. That is a really interesting additional quandary. Dona, you are up.

MS. MURPHEY: So I wanted to share some perspective that I have on a topic that I think we haven't really discussed here explicitly but is very relevant. The idea of banishment and racial banishment specifically, or deliberate displacement, intentional displacement of people, and the ways in which that intersects with health, healthcare, and the lack thereof.

So I do work with Doctors for America. We are right now building on a medical/legal collaborative between physicians and attorneys who work in immigration law and also in criminal justice. And we are trying to ensure that the people who have unmet health needs
basically have somebody to attend to those needs, but those people to be in conversation also with lawyers who might benefit from the input of physicians in doing advocacy, legal advocacy for those people.

So this project actually grew out of work that we do in Matamoros, which we started in December of last year, as the result of -- or yes. In order to meet some unmet needs there, after the U.S. Government had put into place a policy called the Migrant Protection Protocols, which we often refer to -- those of us who do advocacy around those refer to as the Migrant Persecution Protocols. And this was a policy to very deliberately displace people.

They would have otherwise come into the United States. They are asylum-seeking families. And there are somewhere around 60,000 people who have now been deliberately put across the border.

And these are people who aren't going to leave because they are fleeing circumstances that are far more dire. And they are willing to risk what they are risking now, in very dangerous communities, actually, along the border. So in some cases, many thousands of people in outdoor open-air encampments, where they are subject to, you know, all sorts of violence, in those communities.

And something that we observed there, actually,
is that, you know, I was part of a medical relief effort. So we have recruited physicians to come in and provide relief in the encampment itself, to meet, you know, basic needs. People who have chronic illnesses, to make sure those people are doing okay, and then, acute needs as well, as they came up. Now, they are dealing with COVID, actually, in the encampment.

What I had noticed is that Customs and Border Protection actually, the way that they enforce -- we would have people going to the bridge, the International Bridge, to get across the bridge to come into the United States, with attorneys, with physicians advocating for children who were seizing, who were septic. And the judgment that would be made about whether those people would receive care on the U.S. side, because that was not possible with the small medical relief effort that we had at the encampment. And it was left to somebody without any medical expertise.

And that was also, I am sure, very intentional. It is very intentional, the way that it is done. The way that health care is delivered. Or the way -- the many ways in which it is actually not delivered within the immigration detention industrial complex, is super problematic. As it is also in the criminal justice system, I have no doubt. But I was familiar with that.
So I did want to share that. The other thing I wanted to speak to is what Emily had mentioned about, just the monstrosity of healthcare.

In my community, I learned this in Pearland, Texas, right. I have learned this on a smaller scale, but I feel like this probably is true in other communities, the way in which healthcare gets instantiated here. And it is a huge industry. I think it is one of the biggest industries in Houston, if not the biggest.

I mean, we often claim that we have the largest medical center in the entire world, and Pearland is just south of the medical center. A lot of the people who live here are professionals working in medicine. And in my community in Pearland, the people who run the hospitals, okay, those executives -- the people who work in those hospitals, they live in our community.

And they are very imbedded with the people in local government, with the people who run our schools, everything. The religious communities, the social communities, they are all intertwined -- inextricably intertwined with one another.

So the problem, I think, far exceeds just addressing what is happening within healthcare itself. Because those people are so integrated into other very broken and problematic systems. So yes, that is basically
what I wanted to share.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you for that, Dona. Thanks a lot. So we are going to hear from Kimá and Lynda, and then we will pause for a moment.

Others should feel free to get in the queue. We have several people already jumping in to follow that discussion. So we will keep things going.

Also, just a reminder, if you do have comments, if you folks are putting resources and quick thoughts in the chat, which is really working well. So please continue to do that, for folks who have thoughts or things they want to capture in real time.

Kimá, over to you.

MS. TAYLOR: Thanks. And I have a comment, and then something that I struggle with. And since Danielle threw that out, I am going to take her lead.

But I would say, you know -- and another healthcare comment. But truly, the current health care system -- even in areas where there is opportunity, and there is ways to create the breadth of health -- cannot be part of the new social contract.

It is broken. It has mass disparities. It was created in a way that really embraces a system of racism and wants to continue these disparities. And so really, I want us to be very thoughtful.
There is a reason some places have Medicaid and expanded and some places don't. And a lot of times -- and I do tons of work with looking at opportunities. I understand the incremental approach. I will work through the incremental approach until we find a new one.

But if we are really thinking of a square one, that system cannot be part of the fundamental structure and needs to be changed in a way that really cares for people, individuals, families, communities in a holistic, culturally effective, culturally relevant way. So I have to say that, because I spent a lot of my lifetime to get there.

But it actually leads me to another kind of question in a lot of the conversations we have had, you know, talking about housing. How do you provide culturally relevant, culturally effective housing?

And I am really not using the cultural competency word, for reasons that I could go off on, for many ways. But long story short, you are never going to be competent in all ways, right. So how do you provide culturally effective services in housing and healthcare, and this and that.

And I think that really speaks to how do we care for one another? And that gets back to that fundamental social contract.
And so, my question is, which I alluded to in my comment, which I don't think came across as clear. So I will be as concrete as possible. What I alluded to in my first comment, it is like, even if we have these conversations, we are talking about people who are invisible, people who are not able to get their voices heard.

Talking about, even as we recreate systems, how do we make sure that we are not remarginalizing people? Because we have taken so much of what history has taught us unwittingly. And I really think we need to talk about that.

Because if we are creating new structures, if we talk about absolutely all of the land has been stolen, so then, on the next level, how are you giving it out to different people, when you fundamentally recognize it has been stolen, right. Like there is real deep conversations that need to happen as we are reinventing this structure.

And this is a place where I do not have answers, but I struggle with it consistently. And I think it is a conversation that we should have here, elsewhere, all the time, and think through.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Kimá. Thanks for that. And you know, it’s bringing back what Chas said to us, gosh, I think the very first time we were together.
You know, as we think about reimagining, as we think about Square One, how do we not bring all the problems that are in our current existing structures just along with us, into new ideas.

Lynda, shed some light on all of this for us, please.

MS. ZELLER: Well, what a great conversation. I wanted to go back to something Emily said, and then actually something I heard from Matt yesterday, as part of the Raben Group conversation, just to be challenged to dream big around housing in particular, because I think that is one of the toughest nuts to crack.

Because depending on the geography you are talking about, or the health status of mental illness, or the safety status of groups, it gets very, very complex. So what is starting to crystallize in my mind -- and when we talk about social contract, the components of the social contract, all of these should be available to everybody.

And the reality is, different groups would identify what is missing in their lives -- to feel safe, to feel heard, to feel they can get the care that they need -- is different. So when you think about the needs of neighborhoods or groups of people, what needs to move first, if you are talking about a group of people have
high levels of addiction, or a neighborhood who has really high eviction rates, we have got to think about this all as a matrix.

And we should think, from Emily's perspective, that 20 percent is already being invested in healthcare. And there is almost always a lever to be pulled in healthcare to meet the needs. If we could think about the voices of the people we are trying to get the policies moved for, for one group, we may need to lead with housing and safety issues, or changing supervision issues. With a different group, we may want to lead with housing that affects -- or lead with healthcare that affects housing policy.

We have got examples in Michigan where we have matched mega datasets and super prioritized housing supports that are completely publicly funded for different groups of people. But the social contract is complicated in my head because we first have to hear the voice of the people or the group of people that is needing to see the contract move, before we start pulling levers.

And it is different levers for different neighborhoods, for different groups of people, for different sets. So that is what I think is so difficult about the social contract. It is a set of things.

And different levers need to be pulled, based
on what we hear from the voice of those people. So that is what I think is so complicated about the social contract.

MS. HUFFMAN: Yes. Thank you for that, Lynda. So we are going to turn to our two writers and ask you each just to take just two minutes to react to what you are hearing, to answer the questions that were raised here about, you know, there was a question raised about the alternatives to the social supports that are provided by gangs. And I am dramatically oversimplifying. Sorry, Danielle.

Ananya, the intersection of policing and NIMBYism, and what are you seeing in your research with regard to that and, in particular, in relation to renting versus ownership. But any other quick reactions you have about what you are hearing. And then we will turn back to the group with Courtney up next.

So let's see. Hedy, why don't you go first, since Ananya got to go first last time? Just a couple of minutes. Any thoughts.

(No response.)

MS. HUFFMAN: No, not yet. Okay.

MS. ALLEN: I think she is trying to speak, but --

Ananya, you go first.

MS. ROY: All right. Well, thank you for these wonderful comments and questions, everyone. I am really enjoying the discussion.

So I will start with Deanna's points. You know, I am a urban studies scholar. I didn't think I would be as [audio skip] policing. And yet, precisely, I don't think there is a way to study housing insecurity in the U.S., especially in Los Angeles, without thinking about the logic and territoriality of policing.

This goes back to Eddie's points about how, what we have attained is not only decades of systematic disinvestment in housing, also systematic disenfranchisement from housing. And I am going to argue that the historical conjuncture of the war on drugs, which is a pretty drawn out moment, is crucial.

For me then, if we are to take up Kristian's really important point, about, well, how then do we imagine housing as a human right? For me, it requires two kinds of reframings.

One is a reframing of gentrification. And we argue that a reframing of gentrification as racial banishment -- and Danielle, I look forward to continuing a discussion of banishment. In other words, gentrification is not just a market-driven process of displacement. It
is the forced removals of people of color.

So in our paper, if you look at that map of the shift in the Black population of Los Angeles that comes out of the work of Pamela Stephens, it is a pretty extraordinary map. And it is not unique to Los Angeles. We are looking at the expulsion of working-class communities of color from cities to the far peripheries of urban life.

And that dispossession is really crucial. Hedy put in the chat the book by Herbert and Beckett, *Banished*, which is a starting point for us. But I think what they miss is how banishment is a legal process, but it is part of racialized dispossession in the U.S.

As I started writing about racial banishment, when I was doing work on the south side of Chicago with the Chicago Anti Eviction campaign, they didn’t talk about gentrification or removal from public housing. They talked about this as an ethnic cleansing, as a sort of a racial destruction.

Pete White out of the LA Community Action Network, therefore, keeps talking about how displacement is when you have somewhere else to go. Banishment, Pete argues, is when you have nowhere else to go. And sometimes, Pete will add, except jail or death.

So it is that kind of social and civil death,
that disappearing, and the territorial logic of it that I think we have to keep in mind as we are talking about housing, which also takes us back to Deanna's point. That this is not going to be solved by a non-profit housing industrial complex by trickle-down affordable housing, or any of that stuff. And that is my polite word for it.

But it also means a reimagining of public safety. And Danielle, thank you for raising the question of gangs, which is really essential to the imagination and practice of nuisance abatement.

If you look at these nuisance abatement lawsuits, and I am an ethnographer, so I read legal records with an ethnographic imagination. You get the most sensationalist descriptions of years long surveillance by the police, what they consider to be gang activity.

I'm really interested, then, in counternarratives. And for me, that counternarrative comes from hip hop. So I could have written the whole paper around Nipsey Hussle's music, for example.

I think in LA, in particular, hip hop gives us a really brilliant counter-imagination and counternarrative of public safety, communities, violence, and structures of violence. And it would be interesting to think more about that.
Finally, going back to Kristian's point about hope, and this political opening. So I invite you all to take a look at the website of the Institute on Inequality and Democracy. We have been working a hectic pace since the onset of COVID-19 to expose the deepening of inequality that is taking place, especially through housing dispossession.

I also head a National Science Foundation network, global network on housing justice in unequal cities. A lot of the work we do there is fair, but two openings that matter.

We are at a moment of quite unusual legal openings in the U.S. around the housing question. And that is a set of challenges with private property relations. Courts across the U.S. have ruled recently that the eviction bans are not physical or regulatory takings, under the U.S. Constitution.

Legal experts have ruled that government executives have extraordinary legal authority in a time of public health emergencies to commandeer private property. They are not doing it, as yet. But they will have to, at some point, as mass mobilizations take hold.

And so the other political opening is precisely the emergence of massive tenant power, and tenant movements. And such political demands, that to me -- that
give me tremendous hope.

One of those is rent cancellation. Not rent forgiveness or rent relief. That is rethinking tenancy itself, and what tenancy on stolen land, going to that important comment by Kimá, might mean.

The other is a reimagining of social housing. Not as trickle-down affordable housing, but as the decommodification of land and housing.

These ideas have been present for a very long time here, and elsewhere. But I think we are at a critical moment, when these ideas that once seemed radical are becoming common sense. But none of this is possible without also tackling how state organized violence in the form of policing keeps these property relationships in place.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Ananya. Thanks a lot. Hedy, do you want to weigh in for --

MS. LEE: Can you hear me now?

MS. HUFFMAN: Yes. We can. Wonderful.

MS. LEE: Yes. Okay. I -- there was a lot of really great comments. I am probably not going to do as good of a job as Ananya, identifying where they all came from. A lot of them were very synergistic.

I will start with Emily's beginning of some of the comments around thinking about the health care system
as an institution. Not always focusing on the individual level, but, you know, thinking at the macro level of the ways in which our health care system as its own monster drives inequalities and may potentially serve to improve health of communities.

There is, you know, you were, when you are talking about stuff that is a fail, just think about a lot -- the health care system as an institution. But as was also discussed in conversations, as we continue to have conversations around these topics, is the health care system has been a hurting institution.

The history of the health care system has been one of racism and racial oppression. It has worked in tandem with other institutions to maintain racial hierarchy. So how do we now use the health care system as tool for justice? How do we use it as a tool to improve outcomes for communities?

I think that is a big question. I think Kimá, you know, had put a big question mark on that idea itself. Can we do that. Should we be doing that. I think we need to have more conversations around those topics.

I think it also links to ideas around delivery of care. You know, why are certain populations less apt to reach out to primary care physicians? What about those institutions make them untrusting. What about those
institutions place them in areas that don't allow for easy access, et cetera.

I think those are other interesting questions. I think the intersection between housing and healthcare is an important one. I think the big point I tried to make, or we tried to make in our paper is that we really can't be thinking about these systems separately. We need to be thinking of them, as Lynda talked about, in this matrix.

And even when we are thinking about housing, I think Eddie talked -- you know, he was talking about some of the men he works with. When they leave, they are going to family members homes and they are couch surfing.

What about the homes of those family members? They are also living -- they are also housing insecure. They also sometimes face sanctions for even having people who are on probation or parole in their homes.

So when we are thinking about housing too, and the criminal justice system, and health, we can't just be thinking about individuals who are being released, et cetera. But we have to be thinking about the families they are connected to, pre- and post-incarceration.

So I think the story just gets, you know, more complicated and intertwined. I am going to stop there. But those are just some of the themes I was seeing.
Please correct me, or add more, for whatever I missed.

MS. HUFFMAN: Yes. No. Thank you. Thank you, Hedy, so much. It is -- you know, we are sort of hearing some of the same thoughts about intersectionality, about sort of what is used. What powers can be used for good, which powers are used for evil.

Kimá posed a question about the incrementalism versus the sort of square one approach. Are those two different things, in fact? Or how do those fit together?

So it is great to have this discussion continuing in that way. We are going to turn to Courtney. And then, Gabe, you will be up next. And then we will continue from there.

Courtney?

MS. ROBINSON: So many people sort of addressed some of the things that I was thinking about. Kimá and Lynda, and some things that Chas said in our first meeting. And Hedy and Ananya both addressed some of the issues.

I just want to sort of point out again, I guess, that in reading, there was something that really stuck out for me. And that was that housing justice is impossible without racial justice.

And so, I keep coming back to how all of these systems are sort of rooted in racial injustice. And there
is no real way for us to try and deal with a system if we haven't dealt with the structural racism within the society.

And I think Ms. Vivian, yesterday -- was that yesterday? My days are blending together. But Ms. Vivian talked about it beautifully. Talked about the trail of justice, on the trail of justice, during the panel.

And then, the other thing that really stuck out for me was, in reading about health outcomes for families, and in people who are connected to those people who are incarcerated, really stuck out to me. And one of the things I kept sort of trying to grapple with is that there was this pre-incarceration, non-custodial service caregiver policy.

And I think that at one point, I may have thought that that was very innovative and thoughtful. But where we are right now, and the families and youth that I serve every day, there isn't one parent, necessarily, that is more important than the other. And when we take out one, we have already, in effect, influenced that child's entire life.

And so, I think when we start talking about reimagining policies, I don't -- I think that as -- I think it was Matt who said it yesterday, we have to really dream big. We can't sort of think about, this is much
better than what we had. I think we have to think about, what is the best that we can do, versus, this is just a small step closer to sort of chipping away at this very awful and dangerous problem.

MS. HUFFMAN: Courtney, thank you. You were not repeating what anyone else had said. Thank you very much. We are going to turn now to Gabe, and then followed by Aisha.

We have some other hands in the queue. And encourage folks, if you haven't had a chance to say anything yet, then by all means, jump in. We would love to hear from you.

So with that, Reverend Gabe.

MR. SALGUERO: Thank you. So just a few things. I appreciate this conversation about incrementalism. This is Square One. And I think I am learning a lot and whatever my contribution or, perhaps, maybe my learning is.

In civil society, a lot of faith-based actors run part of the housing industrial complex, so to speak. And the healthcare industrial complex, from clinics to kind of storefront aid, to -- there is a whole list, right, between Catholics and Protestants, and Jewish and Muslim.

And so, I think what I am thinking is, what is
the role, or how do we see the reimagining of civil
society, in both housing and healthcare? In this kind of
incremental -- so, there are thousands of churches who --
or organizations or FBOs who have hospitals [audio skip].
It is one of the largest employers. Advent Health is
probably one of the largest ones.

When I lived in New Jersey, Catholic hospitals
were some of the -- and not to mention clinics, and things
like that. And I think they -- let me not speak for
anyone. Many of us see ourselves as part of the solution.

But we have not done the deep work and great
work that we hear here, about contributing to the further
marginalization, alienization, or non-inclusion of these
people. And so, how do we move actors who are part of the
incremental response into the Square One response?

How do I talk to fellow faith-based leaders or
civil society leaders, who say hey, I am here. I live in
North New Jersey. It is where I live. So I will just use
my own example. I lived in Newark, New Jersey.

Come on, Fatimah, don't make me. Don't let the
Reverend fool you, girl. Don't let him do it. I will
start a party with nothing. Yes. You all thought I was
just an evangelical preacher.

MS. DREIER: All right.

MR. SALGUERO: And so, the reality is, that we
are in this space. We are conversing with limited levels of knowledge and analysis. And we are trying to be part of the solution. But we are also, paradoxically, part of the problem.

And so my question is, how do we move people who may see themselves as part of the incremental, or even part of the initial stage of the Square One reimagining, both around the housing industrial complex, right. And so, a lot of churches have low-income to mixed-income housing projects. A lot of churches have clinics.

A lot of major denomination -- Presbyterian Hospital in New York City. Catholic Hospital in Newark, where my son was born. Advent Health, here in Orlando, Florida.

How do we shift that? And how do we help them shift that. Where do we get them into this conversation, if they are not already? And again, I am confessing my ignorance.

So -- and that is very important. Because I think that oftentimes, I don't remember who it was that said -- I think it was Emily talked about the health system is a huge actor. Well, the health system in faith-based organizations and civil societies is a huge actor.

This is not to mention the clinics that Latino Evangelicals are running in Tornillo, Texas, for
unaccompanied alien children, as the government calls them. The refugee services and world relief. The clinics for formerly incarcerated persons of Teen Challenge and other organizations.

And so, I think my question is, I am learning. I am hearing. If we are really talking about shifting, I think that was last week, talking about shifting the political economy. Now we are talking about shifting the housing and the healthcare industrial complexes. How do we do that with actors who think they are actually part of the shift, and they may be part of the problem?

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you for that. That was -- thank you very much. So we are going to turn now to Aisha, and then Bruce. And we have quite a few folks in the queue. Just to let everyone know where we are.

We are going to be continuing this conversation until about five after 6:00 or so. And then, we will turn to Bruce for some wrap-up. Ananya and Hedy, I won't ask you to come back in again, unless you have one last point that you would like to make. In which case, just chat me, and let me know.

But we do have -- this way, we can hopefully get to most of the folks who are still in the queue, or all the folks. And please do raise your hand, if you are interested in piping in.
So Aisha, and then Bruce. And then Vivian will be next after that.

MS. MCWEAY: So thanks. I have really enjoyed today's discussion. And I really enjoyed both of these papers, in a way that, like, keeps you up at night kind of enjoyed.

So I think that several things that folks have said resonate with me. And one of the things that stuck with me, from what Kimá said. She dropped the word, holistic. And I think that that is really emblematic of what this entire conversation has to be, right.

I am struggling with, as I think through David's paper last week, and also Elizabeth's paper, into this conversation of how you shift the values of a country when it is built on capitalism. And all of the systems that we are talking about are sort of propped up by capitalism.

And so, when we are talking about a sort of think-through in Hedy's conclusion, where she says, you know, all Americans should have the opportunity for -- to make choices to have a long, healthy life, right. What happens when people don't actually think that, right? Like, how do you engage with that?

And let's even step back from, I think, it just being sort of racially structured, right. You have got
this capitalistic structure of like, hey, which I do think is racist. But like, let's see if we can separate that out, right.

I think that folks can tell themselves narratives about why it is okay to feel that someone shouldn't -- to feel that someone doesn't deserve housing, or healthcare, or an education, or any of that, right. And so I am struggling in reading these papers, of trying to think through, really, how do you address shifting values? Right?

Like, how do you get to the heart of that? It absolutely has to happen in a holistic way. But how do you get this country to see the dignity and humanity of everyone as being something that is a responsibility. And I think it has to start with some shifts.

I mean, there has to be some real concrete conversations. But where I struggle is, is this a space in which there are multiple tactics, right. So I think about a conservative sort of appealing to a conservative approach to some of these issues, by talking about it fiscally, and then, backing it up with some values. Is that the right approach?

Or is that -- as you juxtapose it with like, centering on the values and trying to convince people that if you actually respect the humanity and dignity of
people, that these are not issues. But how do you engage
with folks, when they are resistant to even identifying
that they don't respect the humanity and dignity of
certain people, and shift to these other concepts, like
pulling yourself up by your own bootstraps and those types
of things.

When I was thinking through this, I was
thinking about it in the context of the public defense
realm. So I am a career public defender. And so, I think
about a lot of things in that realm.

And I think about the shift in, I think, the
work today, versus, I would say, when Gideon rolled out.
I don't know that people were talking about the work in
the way that they talk about it today, and the values, in
that way.

And so, I think if I am hopeful, there may be
some lessons in the infiltration of that system -- of the
public defense system in re-centering the client, re-
centering their humanity and their dignity in ways that I
would say historically was not the case. It was, I'm
doing this thing, it is -- the Constitution requires it.
Does it matter who the person is?

And I think we are shifting to a new space
there. And so, I would -- I am still fleshing out if
there are some lessons to be taken from structures like
the public defense or indigent defense system, where you have seen a re-centering on, this client is an individual. It’s my responsibility to amplify their voice. And those types of things.

I will stop there, but those are my thoughts. And I really, really enjoyed both of your papers, so thank you for sharing them with us.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Aisha. Thanks a lot. Bruce, we will invite you to pipe in as a participant for a moment here. And then, we will turn to Vivian. And Elizabeth, you are up after Vivian.

MR. WESTERN: Two sort of -- two quick questions. Well, one is a thought, and one is a question. I thought, I found Gabriel's comment about sort of incrementalism versus square one really helpful as a way of framing this conversation and our earlier conversations as well.

And so, I would sort of offer this out as a thought that people might want to react to. And I think we are -- we often have these conversations, right, about incrementalism versus more transformational, fundamental change. And Square One defines itself as a project that is about more fundamental, transformational change.

And I think a piece of this, a piece of being attracted to fundamental change comes from impatience,
right. We see so much harm and damage in the world that we work in that we are impatient for big change. But as we all know very well, you know, change is often very hard won. It is very -- it can be very slow.

So the idea I want to throw out is that incremental change is self-defeating as a strategy for social transformation when two things are happening. One is, if incremental change somehow stymies the possibility of big transformational change. And an example that we are all very familiar with in criminal justice conversations is when reform efforts are focused on the non-non-nons as we say. Sort of hardening the distinction between people who are deserving of leniency and those that are not.

And so, people who are accused of and convicted of violent offenses, they have not been the beneficiaries of any sentiment for criminal justice reform over the last ten years or so. And I think that is why violence is such an important question in the justice reform conversation.

So incrementalism can stifle transformational change, but not always, right. Not always. And so, there may be a case for incrementalism, when it doesn't have that negative effect. So I throw that out to the group.

The other condition, I think, in which incrementalism is not a viable tactic, I suppose, for
transformational change, when it is unwittingly harmful. And Gabriel spoke to that. Systems that are meant to help people, and we have talked a lot about healthcare in this context, can be unwittingly harmful for the people that it is meant to serve. So that is sort of one comment on incrementalism.

The second comment, it is really a question raised for me by Ananya's paper. And you know, why is gentrification happening in American cities? And you know, this wasn't a problem that we would have been talking about necessarily in the 1970s, and 1980s. And conditions of urban life have changed.

And the affluent homebuyers are flowing back into cities, because the quality of urban life has improved in many ways. And one of those ways, I think, as we all know, is a very significant reduction in crime.

And a lot of our conversations are focused on, and I believe it, the importance of improving the conditions of neighborhoods and communities in this very multiplex, complex way. And so, the question is, how can we do that in a -- how can we do that, improve neighborhoods and communities without setting in motion a process of displacement that Ananya is precisely pointing to.

It is hard for me to see how this can be done
without a very largescale socialization of housing markets, actually. But you know, maybe there are other ways, too, like public housing. A massive expansion of public housing.

You know, how does that happen as a political matter in America, I don't know. But that is why we have gathered all of you here. But that is a question I want to put on the table, too. If we are really about community improvement, neighborhood improvement, could we inadvertently be setting in motion a process of gentrification that is clearly harmful to the communities we care about.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Bruce. Thanks a lot. So we are going to turn to Vivian, and then Elizabeth. David Garland and Aswad are also in our queue.

We are getting close to the end of our time. So if anyone would like to jump in the queue, now is the time. Please do.

With that, we will turn to Vivian.

MS. NIXON: Okay. I have got you. Okay. I thought there was some magic person that was going to unmute me.

MS. HUFFMAN: Got a lot of magic, Vivian.

Okay.

MS. NIXON: So I have some responses and some
thoughts. First, just a really tiny, short anecdote where I recently saw these issues of housing and health come together. So COVID, you know, wreaked havoc in California inside of the prison system.

And my friend Dorsey Nunn in Oakland, who is like, we have to do something like right now. We can't wait. And it can't be small. It has got to be big. We have just got to get people out, right.

So they started having lots of car rallies, got some decisions by the Governor and others to let certain categories of people out. And they rented all these vans and cars and went and picked people up. They rented out whole hotels.

I mean, like, just really, big, bold -- we don't really care what happens next. We’ve just got to get people out. And so, some incrementalists were saying, well, you know, what is going to happen to them when that months worth of hotel bills you are able to pay runs out, right?

Where are they going to go after that? Who is going to deliver all the services people will need? I mean, there was a lot of back and forth around whether or not this big bold move was a good idea.

But Dorsey just did it. Right. And now, however many hundreds of people he was able to get out
during that first wave are out. And the world didn't fall apart, right.

He did something big and bold in that moment. And the world didn't fall apart. And I think that is the first thing we have to start to believe is that sometimes people do really big and bold things, and the world doesn't fall apart. And that is, I think that underlying theme for me is one of courage.

And you know, I don't know if I have the answer, Gabriel. But I do have ideas about the faith community and other communities that may be in this -- stuck in this trying to help, but also having to participate in the structures that are available to us, right.

And the structures that are available to us are the capitalist systems that our government has. And you do become part of this machine. But I do -- it matters how you play your role in this machine.

And I can only speak to, with any real knowledge, in terms of theology, about the Christian perspective. I think we have to remind folks in that faith tradition just how radical -- and I don't mean radical like burn it down radical, I mean, getting at the root of problems -- just how radical the teachings of Jesus Christ are.
I don't know what Bible these folks are reading, right. Like, if you really study, if you really go back to the origins and the original language and exegete the text, this dude was seriously radical. And I think we have to keep reminding, you know, our community of that.

And truth goes a long way toward -- if you are speaking people's language, their own truth goes a long way toward, I think, changing hearts and minds. Because it is definitely about changing values. And that is a hard thing to do.

One of the values, though, that I think we need to embrace more on this, the Square One side, is not to be afraid of the word “power.” Because we are not going to be able to shift things to a square one level unless we are in power.

And that is a scary thing, because being in power puts you in the seat to be on the other side, to exercise that power in appropriate ways, or ways that hurt people. Well, that is why it matters who you put in power. But being in power is absolutely going to be necessary in order to make the kind of monumental shifts that we are talking about.

MS. HUFFMAN: Vivian, thank you. And thank you for putting all of that front and center. And I am
excited that Elizabeth is up next, when we think about structures of power and maximum peaceable participation, and the ways in which people take that.

So we will have Elizabeth. David, Aswad, and then Heather will be in our queue. And we will -- may have to stop there. Give Heather the last word, and then turn to Bruce. So we’ll see.

Elizabeth, go right ahead.

MS. HINTON: I am just going to be super brief, because a lot of my ideas have been shared, and I think this has just been such a fruitful conversation. So thank you for these truly fantastic papers.

I just wanted to first just kind of continue with a comment about gentrification that Ananya raised. I, for me, it was really -- the big connection between gentrification and the rise of mass incarceration in the late 20th century, I had never really linked before. And so, that idea has really opened up a lot of new questions for me. So thank you.

Also, thinking about what some of the counternarratives are, and how, you know, where we can seek redefinitions of public safety. I think the point about hip hop as a counternarrative is really good. But also, to add to that, I think that the crime survivors’ movement also pushes this discussion in a lot of really
new and exciting ways and provides us a greater context to think about how we might redefine public safety.

And then, I guess my larger comment, just moving forward. You know, Courtney invited us to kind of dream big. And I think both of these papers are rooted and engage with the kind of larger context of COVID.

But it seems to me that the COVID crisis is really bringing these connections between housing issues, health issues, and criminalization -- mass criminalization into very, very sharp focus. You have, you know, AOC last night, in her very brief 60-second slot at the Democratic Convention, really laying out these connections.

And so, I think for us, and to a certain extent, I was surprised that COVID didn't come up more directly in our discussion, although it does come up in the papers. And so, I know that our last discussion moving forward is really like, where do we go from here.

But -- and I am guilty of this as well, but I think it would be helpful for us to think about how specifically -- like, what new conversations are being opened up in this moment, and how we might be able to use this context of the pandemic to advance some of the larger transformations that we have been discussing, and that we will continue to discuss.

So I have more to say. But I will end there.
And thank you again for this wonderful conversation, and these incredibly strong and thought-provoking papers.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thanks, Elizabeth. David, we'll turn to you.

MR. GARLAND: Yes. Thank you, Elizabeth. Thank you, Katharine. So the points that Gabriel and Bruce made about incrementalism versus the kind of fundamental change of Square One, I wanted to say something that was similar to that, but slightly, I think -- something different from it.

Basically, I think of the argument there as being about small reforms in criminal justice, versus fundamental change in criminal justice. And the difficulties that maybe the first pulls to the second, or how one moves to the second.

But one of the themes that comes up all the time -- I have heard it in my old work. I have heard it several times today -- is the kind of trope that we can't bring about criminal justice change of this kind until such time as there is some change in a different system. In healthcare, in housing, in education, in political economy, in the structures of contemporary capitalism, in structures of racial formation.

And I worry. I mean, I recognize the kind of incrementalism versus major change, small versus big kind
of discussion. And Bruce has articulated some ways to think about what kind of reforms are building towards larger reform, what kinds of reforms are getting in the way.

But I think there is a different conversation and a different problem, just to do with the relationship between criminal justice change, and change in these other systems that bear upon, and maybe are the genesis of, kind of crime problems and our response to them as punishment, policing problems. And I am kind of wondering to what extent talking from a grounding in crime and punishment, or talking from a grounding in criminal justice, gets to be an effective leverage for talking about change in these other systems.

I mean, you might say that actually, all the people that have a kind of standing and an authority and a legitimacy for arguing for better healthcare, or housing, or education, or work, or equality, the clients, the people that we are envisaging are at the end of the queue, rather than the front of the queue. Now, that might be different right now for issues about racial justice, precisely because of police killings.

And the kind of -- the vividness with which looking at kind of the over-representation of, you know, unarmed African American men in killings, Latino men in
killings, has made that a kind of forefront issue for racial justice. But I don't see how economic justice and criminal justice so neatly coincide.

I mean, they clearly do, analytically. They clearly do in terms of how we understand the genesis of crime and social problems, and how we understand the response to these. But I am just -- I am asking a kind of question about political tactics and strategy.

How is it we would bring criminal justice issues to bear on economic change, for example, in effective ways? And I think that is part of what it is that Square One has to be addressing. We were thinking about changes in the social contract.

Changes in the social contract -- the New Deal is one. You know, it came about because major kind of parts of the social system, namely employment and economic security began to fall apart in a way that was massively experienced. And it brought about transformation.

My question is really, how does criminal justice and the kind of world of crime and punishment get to be part of that larger story in a system outside of, but bearing upon, criminal justice?

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, David. I am glad we are going to be able to continue this discussion next week, with our discussion about education and employment.
This will be a throughline, for sure, to those conversations and to that question you just posed.

Aswad.

MR. THOMAS: Thanks, Katherine. No, this has been great. And it's only my first session with you all, but I can sit here and listen all day.

And I really just -- I really appreciate all the comments and, you know, also the articles. Both were great. The one that really, you know, impacted me just from looking at it, healthcare as justice reform.

Because I think for many of us with loved ones that are incarcerated, it was just great to hear and read about this issue and the impact of incarceration on spouses and family members, right. And we know that, you know, when someone is incarcerated, like, your family do the time with you.

And just from a personal experience recently, that -- you know, my brother had a stroke in prison. He is in a federal prison. He had a stroke 42 days ago. And we weren't ever notified from the facility.

We received notification from his cellmate's family members, to let us know that he had a stroke. And for, you know, 42 days, our family, you know, mostly my mother, called the jail several times a day to just get any information about his condition. You know, sent --
the family sent emails about his condition.

And what the facility continued to tell us every single day is that they can't give us any information about his condition. The only thing that they could tell us was that he was alive, and no other information. And through, you know, this past month and a half of just getting information, some were good.

Information from his cellmates in there, right, who was communicating that they have heard that he had another stroke. That he was not doing too well. That, you know, folks think he might pass away.

And not having any type of communication and, like, the impact that has had on my mother. Health condition the past 42 days has taken a toll on our family and, you know, just now as of today, he was able to call home. We were able to hear his voice for the first time in the past 42 days, which was the longest time our family had ever gone without hearing from him, in the 19 years he has been incarcerated.

And to hear from him, you know, having a stroke, and the high risk that he poses now, because of COVID. He said he was scared of getting COVID. He was scared of losing his life because of now his health condition.

And so, just look at how families, you know,
are treated by the justice system, you know. And this is not just my family, I have been doing a lot of media searches and hear a lot of stories of families can't even get health information about their loved ones, you know, from facilities. Which is a policy issue.

But once again, this is just not looking at the humanity and the dignity of folks incarcerated. And also, the impact that incarceration has on loved ones.

And I just -- you know, as I was reading the article, just thinking about how do we continue to elevate the stories of so many families like myself who -- I know so many folks are incarcerated who aren't getting healthcare that they need. And so, reimagining, you know, the system. You know, have to reimagine how -- tell the story how families just are impacted by incarceration.

We don't talk about their physical health. We don't talk about their mental health, how there needs to be that type of support for family members who are doing the time with loved ones.

So that really -- the article really spoke to me, because it is personal. And being able to hear my brother's voice for the first time in 42 days, it was great to hear his voice.

But you know, he is worried now because of, you know, COVID spreading in prison, that he is at a higher
risk. So now, we have to, you know, try to get him transferred to another facility that can provide better medical care. But he mentioned that the care -- the facility may not be accepting anyone with his condition.

So it is just -- you know, this impacts all of us in so many ways. And just to hear -- just to read this article that I will be sharing, you know, at some point with others. It is just, like, really telling the story how families are impacted.

And the health impacts of, you know, incarceration has on these families and loved ones, which was -- are really great. So thank you all for really pointing them out, and really sharing what that article -- that was great insight.

MS. HUFFMAN: Aswad, thank you so much for sharing that. And I am so grateful to hear that you did hear your brother's voice today. That is -- that is -- just our thoughts are with you and your family, in an ongoing way, because that is not the end of the story, we know. Thank you for that.

And goodness, thinking about the ways in which not only his health but yours, your mother's, your whole family was affected by that. It really brings it home.

Heather, would you like to get in? You were in the queue. I don't want to put you on the spot if you
purposely took your hand down, but --

MS. RICE-MINUS: No. That is fine. I will stay in the queue. Yes. On second thought, thank you for sharing that. And I know we just held a webinar prison fellowship not too long ago with one of our volunteers who has an incarcerated husband. And especially during COVID-19, they were doing his will over the phone.

Just, absolutely, the anxiety families are experiencing right now is overwhelming, to be thinking of you. And I am kind of feeling bad that I am ending out. Because I feel like I am going to be a downer.

But I wanted to come back to this point on the reoccurring theme of incrementalism. And I am someone who definitely considers themselves a pragmatist. And to be honest, these calls, just to be a confession, have been really difficult for me, because I am not used to spending time with academics, and folks who -- my regular day-to-day for the last decade, while I have other duties, has primarily focused on lobbying and Congress, and trying to pass legislation.

And I think there is a GAO report I cite to my staff all the time about how the average bill in Congress takes seven years to pass. And I think that that is very accurate. And so, I think sometimes these questions that are coming up to me are like, really, really hard to wrap
my mind around.

And when we think in our work at Prison Fellowship about the choices of incrementalism versus idealism, we always try and root to our faith values. And I agree, Vivian. Jesus was a radical, for sure. And trying to get people to connect to that, who espouse the Christian faith.

But I also just think that our structure in our politics, whether at the federal level, or state, or local, is set up in such a way that — and I think David even brought this up in some of his paper and discussion. Like, the politics and governance of our country is set up so that, you know, you have to compromise to get much done.

And, you know, we make choices about what do we support that will permanently keep people out, going forward, in new reform. But as we try and look at laws where that is already the case, we try and pick away at them in many cases.

And there are often discussions about, like, is it worth it. Is it not worth it? But what I find, just working in the political sphere for so long on this issue, is people are incredibly divided on their values.

And just to move the needle and persuade folks takes so long, and so much work, and so much rapport-
building, and whether that is in the faith community, or with conservative offices. And so, I do take those incremental wins as wins, because they literally take years at a time. And so, yes.

And I don't think of them of as a loss, because at the end of the day, I think, like, the big monumental shifts to me in the way our governance are structured, is not really possible in the current system. And so -- and like, even the discussion we had the other week about, you know, efforts and folks say like, you know, we don't have to know what it looks like.

And I am like, I can't take that to a lawmakers' office. Like, I can't tell you. I can't persuade anyone if I can't tell them the exact steps it is going to be, and try and find a way to connect to their values.

And so, I guess my closing thought is just that I am an incrementalist. And I think about moving people out of beds and moving people home. And that is, to me, they are sort of almost like a moral imperative to be a bit incrementalist, given the current structure that we have, while still keeping our ideals and values aligned, and having that back and forth about what is worth it.

So I thought that the incrementalism theme this week resonated. And it is something I have been thinking
about, since being invited to these conversations.

Because these are not the kinds of talks I get to have.

So I appreciate you welcoming me to be here and
giving me an opportunity to listen to you all. I find
your courage very inspiring.

MS. HUFFMAN: Heather, thank you. And you are
clearly not just listening. You are also contributing
greatly to this conversation. And you are probably seeing
the chat, where folks are reflecting similar experiences.

Okay.

I said Heather was going to have the last word.

But I am going to give Chas, another on-the-ground
lobbyist and organizer, a really quick last word. Just a
couple of minutes, if you can, Chas. And then, Bruce will
wrap us up. And we will finish out shortly.

Chas, do you want to go ahead?

MR. MOORE: Yes. I will be super quick,
hopefully. So you know, I almost made it without saying
anything. But I do want to chime in on the incremental
part of the conversation. And I say this from Texas,
right, where you know, things move very slowly. When they
talk about slow boogie, like, I get it.

However, you know, I think the way the system
is set up, it makes us celebrate the incremental wins,
because they take so long. But you know, I think it goes
back to what Courtney was saying, right. I think, although the change comes very slowly and small, I don't think that stops us from dreaming big. Or it shouldn't, right.

You know, until very recently, because I realized like, what do I have to lose, a black man in this country, some of the messaging around how we would do stuff at AJC was very couched, right. Like, we would -- like you know, like our police union contract victory was every bit of defunding the police. It was every bit of breaking up that power structure. But we wasn't saying what we are saying now.

And now, you go to 2020, where we are saying, yes. We can get to a world without police. And that is the goal for me. Like, that is the overarching goal, a world with no police, no prisons.

We still have accountability in all these things. But the police, and the institution of policing and the idea of policing, cannot be a part of this new world that I always talk about.

But you know, I think the difference in knowing change comes incrementally and fighting for incremental change is two different things. And I don't think anybody on this call, at least I hope not, and if you are, I would challenge you to try a little bit more, right. But I
I think it is a difference in that, right.

Like, you know, we fought for a lot of money at the police budget here. You know, we wasn't saying five or ten or $20 million. We was like, we need 100 million bucks, and that is the base. And we fought to get that. And you know, they gave us a little bit more.

But you know, I am -- you know, I will wrap it up with this. I am just saying, as a Black person in this country, incremental change has never sufficed, right. Like, incremental -- you know, a lot of Black folks would argue that Obama was a very incremental change. I was so proud of him being, you know, the face in a moment for the Black community.

A lot of people would argue that you know, very little has changed for the quality of life of Black folks. I look at how long it took us to get to a conversation to end slavery, right. And I would also argue that after that, it has been nothing but incremental change, right.

So I think from somebody that has been just as impacted, somebody that is from a community that, you know, the system in this country chooses not to see us, at every turn, and every corner, we have to dream big. We have to fight big. Because you know, our lives, right. Literally, our lives depend on it.

So yes. You know, like I don't know. The
incremental stuff is very interesting. Maybe we can talk
about it more at happy hour. But I feel, until we start
seeing a shift in how Black and Brown and Indigenous and
poor folks are treated in this country, we have to dream
big.

And I also think, and I swear to God, I will
end with this. I think it is very wrapped up in white
privilege that white people don't have to dream big,
right. Because very much of the system, this society,
this world is like a big comfy couch. There is not much
resistance to your well-being, and to your life.

So it is just like, you know, you can afford
the incremental change as white people, as privileged
folks. But it is just like, you know, like Malcolm X
said, if you stab me in the back with a knife six inches
and you pull it out two, there is still a knife in my
back, right.

So I am about removing the knife completely,
and then, you know, fixing the wound so I can then go on
and heal a little, and do whatever I need to do. But you
know, incremental stuff, you know, is still leaving the
knife in my back.

And I think Black folks in this country are
quite over that particular point and mode of ideology. So
I am done. I won't say --
MS. HUFFMAN: Chas, thank you. And thanks to all of you. This discussion about incrementalism, what does Square One mean. How does -- where does the blue sky hit the ground, as we often say in our Square One conversations. It is just, it is so important and really much appreciated.

So with that, I will turn us to Bruce to give us a little bit of an overview of where we have been today. And then, as Chas mentioned, we will invite everyone to stay on for informal happy hour, if you are available, and to bring your friends, family, and pets. Bruce.

MR. WESTERN: Yes. I will be very quick, because we are overtime. I thought with here, we had two different conversations. There have been two halves to this session.

So I think originally when we conceived of this session, right, we saw potential in housing and healthcare as disruptive of the logic of punitive criminal justice. And we thought that because criminal justice fundamentally in its essence is a blaming institution. And healthcare and housing are about giving people shelter and taking care of their physical and mental well-being, and not, in their essence, blaming institutions in the way that criminal justice is.
But of course, Ananya and Hedy's papers showed us that in their policy manifestations, these are both policy domains that are amply capable of blame and, in fact, are insufficient as alternatives to criminal justice. And we have to rethink what housing could be. We have to rethink what healthcare would be in order to think of both of these areas of policies as credible components of a strategy for fundamental justice reform.

Each of these areas create their own kinds of harms, and often the harms are very much interlocking as Fatimah and Eddie both spoke to. The values of housing create criminal harms. The values of healthcare in addition to their own -- in addition to their own kinds of harms, are themselves a source of housing insecurity.

I think underlying all of this, actually, is a very unifying conception of safety, which is very different from the punitive criminal justice conception of safety. And so, when we talk about safety as we consider the interconnections between housing, health care and processes of criminalization, what does safety mean in all of these settings? I think it means to be secure in one's person, right.

Which is different from how the criminal -- the punitive criminal justice thinks about safety, where we often think about safety from victimization by strangers.
So to be -- I think, underlying this whole discussion is an idea of safety as to be secure in one's person. That was one half of the discussion.

Then, the other half of the discussion was about change. And how do you bring about change when you have all of these different interconnected areas of public policy, but all of these interconnected domains of harm, and threats to well-being that people are experiencing. And I think we -- and so, Aisha was saying, you know, there are a lot of chicken and eggs in this conversation.

And how do you sort of cut through and figure out what is fundamental. And I think we actually proposed a whole variety of ideas, strategies for change in this context, in which we have all of these overlapping and interconnected threats to well-being in the areas of housing, health and crime.

We talked about the necessity for holism. Kimá spoke about this. And I think this means policy coordination.

We actually talked a little bit about this yesterday in the DNC event; policy coordination across domains. And I think, you know, my own view is that executive leadership has a really important role to play, when no one department can ensure that all of these different policy areas are all pulling in the one
direction.

We talked about the necessity for cultural change. Can we imagine a world in which everyone is valued. Aisha said that. But then, quickly followed up with, well, you know, of course this has to be reflected in budgets and how departments are organized.

So you know, cultural change has to go hand in hand with institutional change. This isn't a cultural project by itself. Vivian brought up the importance of moral courage. And I think that is a real thing, right.

This is sort of the agentic part of social transformation, where people are imagining something different and acting to bring about the realization of that imagination. And to do something different requires bringing about something different. It requires doing something different. And that requires moral courage and power, I think, of course, underlies -- a shift in power underlies all of this.

So I am only going to mention two things. The last thing, very quickly. And Heather's comments, I thought, were really helpful for me, and sobering, in a lot of ways. Confronting as she does, in the political process, what she called -- there is a division over values.

And I think that is a very, very profound
challenge, actually. And we have got to take that comment really seriously. Often, we think about values as foundational commitments that join us together. That is the shared basis upon which a political process can work. It is the basis for productive disagreement.

If our value commitments are not shared, then I think the prospects of a political process in this sense are really, really difficult indeed. And I think we need to be thinking about how we articulate our values in a way that at least opens the door to a political process in which productive disagreement is possible.

Now, we are in a hyper-polarized political environment now, and historically so, in which that is a deep challenge. But then, I thought Chas kind of saved the day, at the end. And you know, for people on the ground, who are making incremental changes in my head, there has to be some shared value commitment there that allows that political process to operate.

And I like very much his distinction between incrementalism as a tactic and incrementalism as an end in itself. And it if is a tactic to larger change, I think, you know, that is a change process we can be really interested in. So that is my wrap.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Bruce. Thank you so much to everyone for your attention and energy, and
contributions today. It has just been a great couple of hours.

We started a little late. We are finishing a little late. We will not do that again next week. You will be back in the hands of the professionals. And we'll be able to continue this discussion.

But just a huge enormous thanks to everyone. Again, for those who are able to stay on after we wrap and join us, we would love to continue the discussion more informally. But just a huge thanks to our authors, and to all of you, for the great discussion.

Sukyi, any last comments before we sign off?

MS. McMAHON: (No verbal response.)

MS. HUFFMAN: She is on mute, but I saw her head shake. So I will take that as a no.

MS. McMAHON: No. We are all great. That was fantastic, you all.

(Whereupon, at 6:29 p.m., EST, the meeting was concluded.)
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