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PROCEEDINGS

MS. HUFFMAN: Let's get started. Hello, everyone. It is great to see you all. Welcome back to our fourth roundtable session of the Square One project. It is wonderful to see you all here again and we are really looking forward to continuing our conversation together. We had a great discussion last week. And I think it has been on a lot of folks’ mind since then, and so really looking forward to moving ahead.

Before we get started, I have a few updates for all of you. First, a reminder that we have a three-week break before we will reconvene again for our final session on September 16.

We designed the timing this way for this series of meetings, in part, because many of us will be adjusting to new fall schedules, school schedules for our families, for ourselves, and many of those whom we hope will be joining us for that as observers will also be adjusting to new fall schedules. And so we wanted to wait until folks got through the first week or two of September to reconvene.

So these next few weeks will give us all time to get prepared, get into that schedule, and then have time to kind of ruminate on the ideas we have been discussing here, these past several weeks, and that we
will be talking about today.

When we gather again in September, we will be focused on our aspirations for what comes next.
Aspirations for the new social contract. And we'll continue to thread our thoughts into this tapestry of ideas that we have been developing together over the past month.

So during those few weeks, we ask that you think about the things that we have been talking about. We ask that you read Danielle Allen's amazing paper on the principle of association, a history of the principle of association alongside the principle of alienation, and how that can shed light on what a shift in justice policy and practice should actually accomplish for society.

So please come ready to put that into the context of everything that we have learned and generated here. And in the meantime, we will continue to be in communication via Slack. It has been great to see folks continuing to join there, and we hope that you will continue to engage in that way.

Also, we wanted to mention that if you haven't already received one, you will be receiving the biweekly Square One Spotlight every other Friday. It is a short email newsletter that goes to all of our Square One family, our executive session and roundtable participants.
And it features the work of all of you. We keep a lookout for events, for news coverage, for exciting things that you all are doing and accomplishing, and compile into that format to share it out to all of you. But we also invite you, if you have something going on, and you would like to forward it to us for inclusion in that newsletter, please feel free to do that, at any point. And we will be happy to share it out with all of your Square One colleagues.

Last thing on the September meeting that is coming up, a reminder that the final session, unlike these where we have been able to gather together, and while we are recording the sessions, they haven't been livestreamed. That last session will be livestreamed on YouTube, and we hope that we will be joined by hundreds of observers for that discussion.

We will be sharing the Eventbrite link for that, and a social media kit for all of you all. It is going to include a short video promotion that features these discussions, and our wonderful technology.

And video producer Michael Kleiman at MediaTank has put together a clip that just, you won't believe how exciting he has been able to make Zoom boxes look, in generating sort of a summary of our discussion so far. And an invitation for folks to join us for the next
conversation. So be on the lookout for all of that.

So again, we won't be gathering for three weeks. But we will be looking forward to seeing everyone then. And hope that you will invite your networks to come and join us for that discussion as well.

So with that, welcome to everyone. I see more folks joining in. Great.

An overview of our time together today. Today, we are going to be continuing our discussion of what the components of a new social contract might be. We have terrific papers from Bruce Western and Vivian Nixon to get us started. And so we are going to follow up -- a sort of a flow really similar to what we did last week.

We will open up hearing from Bruce on the relevance of poverty and economic mobility in the discussion of justice reform. We have an opportunity for quick clarifying questions for him, if anyone has any.

And then, we will move directly into hearing from Vivian, who will offer her thoughts on the relevance of access to education in this conversation. Quick clarifying questions for her, and then we will move into the group discussion that will carry us through most of our time together today.

Because Bruce is leading us off with his paper, we have invited Jeremy to listen to the discussion and
provide us with a short wrap up at the end. And I will be
playing the role of facilitator, as I did last week.

So as we join in this discussion, again, I
courage you all to keep our past discussions in mind:
the thoughts and questions that emerged last week, and
that have been on your mind since then. Last week, we
talked about housing and healthcare as needs that people
have. But also as systems and industries that are,
themselves, powerful actors within society.

We talked about how we can avoid
remarginalizing people from bringing the problems of our
existing structures along with us into a new social
contract, into new ideas, and a new Square One. And we
talked about incrementalism, and how it relates to our
work, how it relates to the idea of a foundational
rethinking of justice.

Is it a strategy? Is it a goal? Is it a
timeline? What is the difference between change coming
incrementally versus incremental change, or is there one?

And finally, we talked a lot about what it
means to dream big. This was something that our Square
One colleague Matt Desmond had mentioned during the event
that happened in the context of the Democratic National
Convention. Encouraging us to dream big, and how do we
think about, as Courtney said, not just what is better
than where we are now, but what really is the best we can
do. What are we really working towards?

So with that, just a huge welcome, again, to
everyone. We will turn to Bruce and let him kick us off.

A reminder to everyone: just when you are ready to get
into the conversation, once we get to the stage of being
able to talk, you will raise your hand in the chat, as you
have before. And those of us on the host side of things
will be able to see those hands raised and be able to put
you into the queue in order.

And we also always have available to people the
insistent wave. The “I have something that is
particularly relevant in this very moment, and don't want
to lose it.” And that is the physical wave here, so that
I can see you, and can bring you into the conversation
that way.

And lastly, please keep your video on when you
can. Just because that is part of the way that we are
recording this and making it most user-friendly for those
who are going to be watching afterwards. But I know we do
have a couple of folks who, for logistical or other
reasons are joining by phone, or at least, sometimes have
to go offscreen briefly. So we certainly understand about
that, too.

So with that, let's get going. It is just
great to see you guys. Bruce, we will hand it over to you, and let you get started. And then, turn to Vivian.

Bruce.

MR. WESTERN: Great. Well, good afternoon, everyone, and thanks for the chance to talk about this work. This paper that I circulated is incredibly provisional.

And I guess, really over the last 25 years, I have been writing about, thinking about, researching the relationship between social and economic inequality on the one hand, and processes of punishment on the other. Over the last ten years, I have been doing a whole bunch of different kinds of field studies that -- in different localities, going into prison a lot, talking to people who are incarcerated, or going into communities that are experiencing high incarceration rates, and talking to formerly incarcerated people.

And what this paper tries to do is say something about what I see as this intimate connection between incarceration and poverty. And you know, if we look at the formal features of the criminal law, and the formal features of prisons and jails, nowhere it seems to me is it recognized that these are fundamentally poor people's institutions that are designed for the control and punishment of low-income communities and the people
that live in them.

So I am trying to sort of make sense of all of this, through all of these different field studies. And I will just hit -- I meant to start my clock there. I will just hit my four main empirical conclusions.

I wish I could say I had, sort of, some systematic argument that was running through all of this. But I am definitely not there yet. These are more just empirical observations that I’ve made from these different field studies.

So the first one, you know, I was going to Australia, to the top end of Australia, for a number of years and doing field work up there. Going into prison there and talking to formerly incarcerated people. Very different setting, a very different policy regime from the United States.

Much less punitive. And yet, rates of incarceration in Aboriginal communities in the top end are very similar to rates of incarceration in African American communities in the United States.

So what was going on there, the very poor communities where the rates of incarceration was very high, but poverty was multidimensional. And I think that, for me, this was important in understanding the relationship between poverty and incarceration.
What does that mean to say that it was multidimensional? Well, people were dealing with a whole variety of problems that went beyond just trying to live in a household on a very low income. Notably, violence, particularly family violence, was very much in evidence in the field sites I was visiting.

Untreated substance use problems were very, very common in the communities I was visiting, too. And in the Aboriginal communities, at the top end, this mostly took the form of alcohol dependence.

Poverty was very, very spatially concentrated. There was deep racial segregation in the communities I was visiting. And, of course, a long history of racial marginalization through the historical experience of white settlement, very insecure housing.

So a number of these things, right, even though this setting was completely different from the American setting, this multidimensional poverty, I think, is not completely unfamiliar for us who are more steeped in the American setting. So that is point one.

Point two, this is an observation from a field experiment we are conducting in Oklahoma City. Oklahoma has, I think, still the highest incarceration rate of the 50 states. A very red state.

We were studying fines and fees. Going through
a misdemeanor court in Oklahoma City costs the defendants about $1,600, once you add up the court fees, the prosecution fees, the probation fees that are levied on people who are moving through the misdemeanor courts. Very poor people in the misdemeanor courts in Oklahoma City.

So point two, there was no safety net. And I have done a lot of field work in New York City and in Massachusetts. Food stamps, Medicaid coverage was very common in the Northeast, and very important for the process of reentry. None of this was really in evidence in Oklahoma.

So in the place in which incarceration is highest in the United States, there is really hardly any safety net by Northeastern standards. Little healthcare, apart from the emergency room. Very, very insecure housing -- no one had any publicly supported housing.

Third thing, and this comes from a jail study we did in New York. And here, this was a quantitative study. And we were trying to understand the footprint of the jail.

And so much research in the field was focused on the prison as an institution, but of course the footprint of the jail is vastly larger. Six hundred thousand people go into prison each year, but about 10
1 million people go to jail each year.

2 New York City's jail system is very, very small. It has the fourth lowest jail incarceration rate of major cities in the United States. 26 percent, we estimate, of all Black men in New York City have been to jail at one time, at least, by the age of 38. And that is in the lowest incarceration rate in the country. In poor neighborhoods, it is about 35 percent.

3 So one in three Black men in poor neighborhoods in New York City, the city with the lowest incarceration rate in the country -- one in three Black men have been to jail. So even though there are some success stories in the country now, the footprint of the criminal justice system remains remarkably heavy.

4 Final thing, we were doing field research on solitary confinement, and going into solitary confinement unit in a maximum-security prison in Pennsylvania. Very large racial disparities, very large disparities by mental health status. So people with serious mental illness, which means psychotic conditions, schizophrenia, schizoaffective disorder, bipolar disorder had very, very high rates of solitary confinement in that system.

5 You combine these two things, and Black men in Pennsylvania prisons, if they have serious mental illness, are at very, very high risk of solitary confinement. And
the duration of solitary confinement for those men is around 30 days, so double the maximum standard, international standard under the Mandela rules. So not only is the system creating disparities that we are familiar with, but the experience -- the severity of the experience of incarceration is also experienced disparately.

So these are a set of observations about the links between socioeconomic disadvantage and the severity of the penal experience. But for all this, there are definitely points of disruption in the system, off-ramps, and points of resilience.

Social policy made big difference in Australia. Old women in those communities were fundamentally important points of social stability for people who had been incarcerated. And I have seen that in other field settings, as well.

In Oklahoma City, charitable relief was really important. We have talked a lot about community empowerment already in this meeting. And I would like to talk more about non-state sources of support and resistance in the face of an overbearing criminal justice system.

In New York City, how did that jail incarceration rate get so low? Massive social
mobilization has advocated against jail incarceration in New York, to a point where a policy decision was taken to close the jail, in fact. So that case underlines to me the importance of social mobilization.

In Pennsylvania, in the many interviews we did in solitary confinement, human resilience, the power of human agency in the face of what seemed to me to be crushing, absolutely crushing, conditions of penal confinement were remarkable. And it reminded me of, you know, the energy, the creativity, the human brilliance that persists even in the face of significant repression.

I end the paper by saying, I wonder if our criminal justice institutions are much more brittle than they appear. And they are brittle, perhaps, because they are in a profound legitimacy crisis. The stated mission is to keep communities safe, but of course, they cause tremendous harm, and they lack legitimacy as a result.

And so I sort of end with a question. Can all of these points of disruption and resistance somehow be drawn together to make transformational change?

So that is what I got. I wish it were a little more coherent, but that is where I landed.

MS. HUFFMAN: Bruce, thank you. That was a lot. And that was really incredibly helpful. And you know, really bringing home the inseparability of these
issues, and these questions from each other.

Before we turn to Vivian, does anyone have any quick clarifying questions for Bruce? We will have a chance to talk more fully. But if there is anything that folks would just like clarification on?

(No response.)

MS. HUFFMAN: Great. Okay. Well, with that, then, Vivian, we will turn to you to hear your latest thinking on the role of education in all of this.

(No response.)

MS. HUFFMAN: I think you are still on mute, Vivian.

(Pause.)

MS. NIXON: There we go. Thank you. It is good to see everybody. Thanks for your paper, Bruce.

So I don't pretend that this paper solves any problems, or even has any answers, but it does articulate what I think I am continuing to learn, as I do this work, about the ways in which we compartmentalize education into these buckets. And then, also, have preconceptions about what the goals of education are. And those goals are different, depending upon who is receiving the education.

And it is very much in draft form. Because I know that there is a story there that needs to be told about the ways in which we somehow know, as a society,
because we have spent lots of resources and time studying educational outcomes for a reason.

And we have devoted billions of dollars into constructing institutions of higher learning that absolutely attach such a brand to people, based on where they got their credentials from, that it changes the impact of their entire lives, and the trajectory of their entire lives. Whether they got into that institution because of a legacy agreement, or whether they got into it because they are really brilliant and thoughtful, and want to change the world, right.

So we invest as Americans, I think as a -- Western culture in general, invest a lot in education for a reason. And we have ascribed a value to it, a very high value. Yet, it is extremely difficult for certain people to access education at almost every level, which includes really high-quality public education from, you know, pre-Kindergarten all the way through advanced degrees.

And why is that? I have my theories. And I have little nuggets that I try to point to in the paper, that are really far apart from each other. And I know there is a lot of information in between those nuggets that I need to find, to connect those dots. But I believe that there is a connection.

That what we do know about education, is that
when it is achieved at a certain level, and when a certain type of education is promoted, people begin to have an ability to argue against structures that impact them in different ways. And they begin to think about the world in different ways, and to see themselves and their own thinking as part of a solution. And have the confidence to articulate that.

And so rather than me talk about a really quite simple essay that doesn't need a whole lot of explanation, I tried to find something that kind of took it out of the cerebral frame for a minute, and put it into more of a spiritual frame, an emotional frame. Where, we have seen evidence of that type of brilliance change the way generations of people have thought about issues of incarceration.

And I have a clip that is exactly three minutes. And I have talked for exactly two minutes. So I will be within my time.

MS. HUFFMAN: You are good.

MS. NIXON: And if I can get share-screen permissions, I think I can share this clip. And it might promote a discussion that is based on my paper. Which is, again, clearly just about my own experience, and an idea that I am trying to explore in a much deeper way. So if somebody could give me permission to share my screen.
MS. HUFFMAN: Yes. Vivian, I think you are now the co-host also, so that should --

MS. NIXON: Okay. I will try to find this clip. I should have had it ready, but I didn't.

(Pause.)

MS. NIXON: Here we go.

(Whereupon, a short video was played.)

MS. NIXON: Was I sharing?

MS. HUFFMAN: No. But we could hear it. So we could -- that was -- we got the information.

MS. NIXON: Okay. Good. Then, I will continue to play it that way. All right. Because I couldn't hear you guys.

(Whereupon, a short video was played.)

MS. NIXON: So in my view, when a person is educated to that degree, that they can find the wherewithal to inspire a nation, and to articulate a history that is in many ways a shared and common history, and in other ways, a completely different history, that is power.

And because education creates that kind of power, it is the least invested in solution when we have these conversations about our justice system, which I believe is the closest thing we have to the beginnings of structural racism through the institution of chattel
slavery in this country. And that is it.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Vivian. Thanks for that. And I am glad we were able to hear all of that. Before we open up our discussion, just again, does anyone have any clarifying questions or any sort of specific follow ups for Vivian on what she just shared?

(No response.)

MS. HUFFMAN: Okay. Great. Well, then in that case, we will move into our conversation. Welcome, Chas. And I see others. Welcome, Emily. Great to have you guys here. We will move into our discussion.

And I will just remind folks that you can get into the queue by raising your hand, clicking on the participants tab below, and raising your hand. And you will show up in order.

Again, feel free to use the insistent wave. And we will be able to have a conversation together. So with that, the floor is open. And Jorge, you are up first.

MR. RENAUD: Yes. Hi. Vivian, I want to thank you for that -- Bruce, also for your paper, but Vivian's especially.

I was -- just a quick anecdote, I think, that might illustrate some of the -- especially the people who have the power, in fact, to extend or to allow education
in prison systems. Maybe not those that are the ones that result in degrees or certificates, but it is the ones that actually provide some sort of educational foundation, right.

TDC -- the Texas Department of Criminal Justice about, I want to say, eight or nine years ago, a few sessions ago, when I first started working, actually going to the Capitol and pushing legislation, had cut like, 1,500 seats at the Wyndham School District. And hardly any uproar whatsoever, of course. But the people who had come out of prison, who were involved with trying to transform that system, knew the importance of that.

And we went to them. And we proposed something along the lines of peer-to-peer education, right. They had already allowed and encouraged some sort of peer-to-peer education when it came to talking about STDs, when they are talking about how to tell other individuals who are incarcerated about PREA, and what to do if you’re in PREA and some of the other things.

And I brought to them a study that had been done, I want to say, in Tennessee, where they had lifted people who were never going to get out of prison, and what prison in fact, had done to them. That it wasn't the goal of accomplishing -- of getting a certificate. Again, of getting a degree or something, but the actual
participation in some sort of education that gave you the foundation to have some sort of intellectual discourse, right.

And how I proposed to them -- I showed them how that had brought an incredible decrease in institutional violations, specifically, violence on staffers. And of course -- and I came to them with a full slate of individuals who I knew who had been -- they had been out, like, four years at the time, who could teach quite a few subjects, right.

And I gave them a structure. I gave them everything. And of course, they came back with the idea that it would just be used as a way for individuals who were in gangs to -- whatever excuses TDCJ wants to use. Whatever excuses that that sort of system wants to use, to not allow individuals who are incarcerated to get any sort of education, right.

And of course, part of it was the fact that -- what knowledge can one individual who is incarcerated actually give another one? And of course, any knowledge that matters has to come from someone like y'all, right. It has to come from the outside. Right. Because we don't have the capability, the wherewithal, the education, the conversational skills, whatever, the communication skills to impart anything worthwhile, right.
So I think that is more, sometimes, of a barrier, and something that needs to be overcome -- that we need to overcome, is that idea that we are all a bunch of shaven-head, tattooed idiots. Yes. Sorry. I can get off that soapbox now.

Thank you, Vivian.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Jorge. Thanks a lot. You are bringing up questions that we are also seeing echoed in the chat.

Which reminds me to remind folks, if you would like to put anything in the chat to the full group, that seemed to actually work really well last week. It was great to have folks' thoughts. So feel free to do that.

And now, we will turn to Aisha. And then, David Garland. Aisha.

MS. MCWEAY: Hi, everybody. So thank you, both Bruce and Vivian, for your papers. It popped a ton of thoughts in my head that I wanted to engage with in this discussion. But I am going to limit it to three, and the three do not go together.

So my first thought, your language Bruce, around -- in the paper, you talked about the criminal justice system not being this crime control institution, but a poverty trap. And I just, I would really like to engage in that discussion as we think about the social
contract and what it is, going forward.

Because that is something that very much resonated with me. And I would just want to amplify and prop up that, as a reality for the clients that we work with, that I see -- or clients that I have seen for the last decade plus, throughout my career as a public defender.

The second non-sequitur, is for me, in reading both papers, there was this wrestling for me, or taking to -- so Bruce talked about the space that charitable organizations fill in -- who are trying to fill some of those gaps in social safety nets, in service provision within -- he used Oklahoma as an example, and Oklahoma City, specifically.

And I know there are some sort of funders or foundation folks on this call. So I say this with all respect to you all, but I went down the rabbit hole in reading these papers, of how -- as someone who is funded and supported by a very generous foundation, the -- also damage that foundations do, in propping up systems that are problematic.

And as someone who benefits from that, as the executive director of an organization, I still have to name it, right. And in reading the papers, it just highlights to me. I name it all the time, but I also need
to name it in this space.

And for us to wrestle with who gets to be -- who gets to solve the problems, and who should be at those tables. And I think it ties into something Jorge was just mentioning, of whose expertise or experience is worthy in whose eyes.

And so that ties into my third point, which was tied to Vivian's paper, and this way in which we look at whose expertise or experience is worthy in whose eyes.

And so that ties into my third point, which was tied to Vivian's paper, and this way in which we look at education. Again, as an organization that has -- that hires, you know, lawyers and advocates, and investigators from different spaces.

The idea that, to do this work well, that you would be better qualified to do this work with a degree from Harvard or a degree from Columbia, or a degree from any specific place is something that I actually push back against. I don't think that it ties at all to whether you can do this work well. It really has no bearing.

And so I think there is a space in which we amplify -- we prop up expertise in areas that really don't tie to the work that we are doing. And it is really important.

It is not to say that being able to obtain a prestigious degree is not something that folks should strive for. I went to Vanderbilt. I did that intentionally, as a strategic move. So I say that with
all acknowledgment.

But when we think about who should -- who holds expertise. Who holds -- who can educate in these issues, around these issues, I think we are really disconnected from some of -- even as we sort of sit in some spaces like this one right here.

Like, we are a highly, I think, educated group, predominantly. And I think that there are real -- there has to be real push of expanding our mind of who should be at the table, and whose expertise really is expertise.

And so I will sort of conclude with this idea. In our organization, we had a fellow who was funded through a funder for the past year. And the entire goal of his project, was sort of tied to what Bruce talks about, is these gaps, identifying what are the gaps in the social safety nets in Tulsa.

Like, how do people actually access or not access the resources that exist or don't exist. What does it actually look like, when you walk into these spaces?

And one of the things that resonated with -- that we learned from that experience. And he spent a year doing this. So he visited over 150 different locations more than once and engaged.

And what we found, is that there is a space in which providers only want to help the people they deem
worthy. And only want to help the people that they believe is -- it will be a success. And success is often determined by funders. And I think that they are -- all of those things have to be addressed if we are even going to be able to wrestle with this.

And so I will conclude there. I made my three points. And I would just say that I really enjoyed both papers. Thank you.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Aisha. Thank you so much for all of that. That question of, who is at the table? Who is making decisions? You know, what is the purpose of education, and what is that for? How do we value it?

All of those things are so closely connected. And I appreciate you tapping into Bruce's point about the poverty trap, and the relationship between people living in poverty and the justice system.

So we will continue with our discussion. Folks should jump into the queue. Up next is David, and then will be followed by Ananya, and Kristian. David?

MR. GARLAND: Thanks. So I am going to follow up on Aisha's point about criminal justice as a poverty trap.

But I just wanted to say not only did I enjoy reading Vivian's paper, but I enjoyed listening to the
clip about the FBI's description of Angela Davis. I, half an hour ago, finished reading Angela Davis' book, *Are Prisons Obsolete?* So I kind of think we have heard a very different version than wanted and dangerous, and an armed criminal that couldn't be too closely confined.

So Aisha pointed out that in Bruce's paper, there is a characterization of criminal justice as a poverty trap. And that is obviously right.

And one issue that springs to mind is, are we talking about American criminal justice, or criminal justice as such? And it is usually, and probably, criminal justice everywhere is a poverty trap. And that one of the things that characterizes America's mass incarceration and huge penal state is just the nature of poverty in this particular country, as compared to others.

So one of the really striking features of Bruce's paper was that he was describing in Australian northern territories, the safety net that is experienced by the men who are being released from prison there. That they each have healthcare as a right. They each have access to public housing, not all of them -- accessing public housing is available, and they each have $600 a month provision.

And that, contrasted with Oklahoma or large parts of this USA, really is so shocking in a way.
Because Australia is not an especially generous welfare state. This is not Norway, or Sweden.

This is, you know, another liberal market-oriented welfare state like Britain or Canada, like the USA. So just, it shows the extent to which the USA is kind of in a league of its own, amongst the liberal democratic nations, when it comes to impoverishment and criminal justice.

I wanted to raise a question that might be -- my interest, some of us might be academic, in which case, let's drop it. But one of the other ways that, in Bruce's paper, criminal justice is described is, you say at one point, at its core, criminal justice is a type of state-organized violence, right.

And that is a kind of characterization that we are kind of familiar with. And often you see like, interpersonal violence and crime, and state violence and punishment as equivalent in some kind of way. And I kind of wonder about that, whether it is rhetorically or analytically the right way of describing it.

I mean, I certainly think policing, imprisonment, criminal justice generally are ways of exercising legal compulsion. There is no question about that. They exercise state power. State power is compulsory, not optional. Not just a suggestion.
It is ultimately backed up by violence. That is its, you know, distinguishing characteristic. But legal compulsion is not always violence in the sense that we mean it. In fact, one of the things that we want to do, much of the time, is to minimize the extent to which the police and legal compulsion, or the prison and legal compulsion are violent.

We want to distinguish between what it is they do, and the extent to which they do it violently. Which is when they are, I think, doing it in a way that we should minimize, and if possible, prohibit.

So I just wondered whether I am shying away from what is a powerful rhetorical description, or whether it would be useful to make that contrast between legal compulsion that criminal justice -- you know, that is its stock and trade -- and violence, which is when American criminal justice is too often beyond the bounds of legally acceptable behavior.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, David. Putting more questions on the table for the group. We are going to turn to Kristian and follow her with Gabriel. And then, Elizabeth Hinton.

And we will do what we did last week. In a few minutes, we will kind of give a little pause, and let Vivian and Bruce have a minute to jump in and respond to
what they are hearing as well, before we complete our discussion.

So Kristian?

MS. CABALLERO: Yes. I just want to first thank [audio skip]. Can you hear me?

MS. HUFFMAN: Yes. Yes, go ahead.

MS. CABALLERO: First, thank both of you for these papers, very insightful, as usual. I guess the only thing that I would want to add is that I think we are pretty -- especially for those of us on this call. We are pretty familiar with a lot of the issues and how they intersect, and how it does feed into this cycle of poverty.

But I think, even more so, looking at the discriminatory practices of how we keep people in, you know, those vicious cycles. And addressing, you know, the various barriers, and removing those barriers.

So for example, I know as far as the organization that I work with, Texas Appleseed, one of the many things that we try to address is like, payday loans. Here in Texas, it is extremely problematic. And a lot of those businesses are specially placed in, you know, neighborhoods of color.

And you know, you are looking at interest rates of 500 percent or more. There is also the reality that
you know, credit background checks prevent people from
getting loans, and housing, among other things, even jobs,
you know. Taking a closer look at those kinds of
policies, and trying to remove those barriers that are
continuously discriminating, you know, against people, and
continuing putting them in the position that they are in.

And I would say that, you know, in addition to
all the financial institutions and various institutions
that discriminate against people, and continue to
perpetuate that vicious cycle, I would say education for
sure is kind of, you know, part of that. The beginning
stages of discriminating against people, you know. Not
only giving them -- limiting the access that they have to
quality education, and higher education.

But even when it comes to employment, right.
More and more, we are seeing requirements for, at the very
least, a Bachelors degree, if not higher. And you know,
valuing that more so than the personal experience that
people might have, especially, if let's say they do work
in the field of politics and community organizing and
policy.

You know, speaking from experience, I can say
that I have come across many people in the community that
don't have degrees, that haven't had the privilege to not
only seek higher education, but complete it, for various
obstacles and barriers that present themselves. But that
doesn't speak to the knowledge and the personal expertise
that they have, and the value that they have, that they
bring to the table.

And so I think we need to change that system,
and that social contract overall, of how much we are
valuing these scholastic degrees over human and personal
experience. Because at some point, we have to value that,
if not equal to, more so.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thanks, Kristian. My apologies,
I misspoke a moment ago. We are actually going to go next
to Ananya, and then Gabe, you will be coming after Ananya.

So with that, Ananya.

MS. ROY: Thank you, Katharine. And thank you,
Bruce and Vivian, for these papers. My comments build on
the comments that have already been made. And so two
comments: one to Bruce, and one for Vivian.

So Bruce, I really appreciate that the paper
focuses on the relationship between poverty and the
criminal justice system. I think one key site at which
poverty is entangled with policing and criminalization is,
in fact, relief and welfare.

So if we are thinking about the distinctive
characteristics of the U.S., and its forms of settler
capitalism, it is quite clear that the welfare state has
always been a site of intense racialized differentiation, exclusion, and policing in the way that welfare recipients are subject to certain forms of intrusive control that others are not. And this also applies to the sort of relief, charitable relief, philanthropic relief that are noted in the paper.

And this [audio skip] important comments made by Aisha, that what we have now is the so-called shadow state, a nonprofit industrial complex funded by philanthropy. And the wealth of philanthropy, of course, comes very much from the forms of extraction and exploitation that we have been talking about.

And often, the nonprofit industrial complex funded by philanthropy replicates the kinds of policing and differentiation that the welfare system has kept in place. So I am also very interested in that relationship, which, to me, runs alongside the forms of discrimination and disadvantage that you mention in the paper.

And then, for Vivian. I am so glad you raised this question of education. I want to echo some of the comments that have been made here. So on the one hand, we are clearly part of a meritocratic system where having a college degree makes a difference in terms of one's economic life chances in the U.S.

But on the other hand, the question of
education, an education that leads to building power and making change might be something else. And you know, in the work that I do at the Institute on Inequality and Democracy, and our accompaniment of social movement, I have always said that the best theorists and the most inspiring intellectuals I know are movement leaders and those who head community organizations.

But what is interesting about those processes of political education that go on in Skid Row in Los Angeles or in East Los Angeles, in the tenant movements, I have learned over time that it is not that our citationary structures are different. It is not that I am reading Fanon and that they are not, it is not that I am reading Foucault and they are not. I think they are reading Fanon and Foucault more carefully than we are, as academics.

So there is that piece of what political education does, and what the traditions of political education are, whether it be in Black power and Black liberation movements or others. And I think it is really important for us to be able to have that conversation. It is inspiring to have that conversation.

But I also want to raise this question of the institutions within which education happen. So I am committed to being a scholar and teacher in the public university. But I am also acutely aware that the public
university can be an institution of harm and exclusion. We uphold that meritocracy that I talked about. So I am also very interested in how education then takes place in different institutions that might not, in fact, be playing this role in upholding the status quo. And of course, the work for those who are academics is precisely to imagine and build a different kind of university.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Ananya. Gabe, let's turn to you.

MR. SALGUERO: I want to echo all the good words, to Bruce and to Vivian, and all your good work. I think a few things that have stuck out to me. And one is, both our theory of change, and our theory of pedagogy. And I think that part of what I hear in both presentations is, what are the philosophical and, in my case, theological underpinnings on who has the capacity to learn and who has the capacity to teach. I kind of heard my -- James Cone, who was my thesis advisor, in my ear, quoting Paolo Freire, right, *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. And that the kind of underpinning here is, education as transmission, vis a vis, educational transformation. So I think what I would like to hear more of, and I [audio skip] much more unpacked in the papers is,
how do -- if we are talking about Square One, how do we
speak to the philosophical and theological underpinnings
of what it means to be human, and who has the capacity to
learn and teach.

I think the second thing is, we talk about the
Sitz im Leben, or the locus of learning. I think Ananya
spoke to that a little bit. There is kind of these high
academic institutions, Vivian and others.

But what are the alternate places of learning,
where we are reading Foucault mas de cerca, or more
closely -- or reading Derrida or Levinas. You know, and
this is particularly interesting to me, because my father
has an eighth-grade education, but was incarcerated for
many years.

And then, when he came out, and he started
rehab programs, and reentry programs. And it was
fascinating that I, who did PhD work, didn't know half the
stuff he knew from his life experience. And was able to
empower, he worked mostly with men, but also with formerly
incarcerated women.

He had a lot more to learn. So I was more the
student, than I am the teacher. And I have a graduate
degree, and he has an eighth-grade education. And so I
think that as we speak to these alternate places of
learning, and teaching -- I think I want to say learning
and teaching, both.

And the last thing is, what is our fundamental philosophical assumption about education and incarceration? They are places of what? They are places of learning. They are places of transformation. They are places of punishment.

And I lived in Newark for a long time.

Shoutout to Fatimah. And my sons went to a public charter school. I was offended by the assumptions on how they thought Latina, Latino and African American children could learn. Hyper-militarized, hyper-punitive.

We got into some choice words, as far as a Reverend can use choice words, with the educational system. And there are some fundamental assumptions about, in theology, *imago dei*. In other language, what it means to be human.

There is a fundamental philosophical anthropology, or theological anthropology that creates these systems of incarceration: of jail, of education, on who can learn, who can teach. And thank you, Vivian, for the Angela Davis clip; I think that is what brought it to light. And I think that as we begin to create institutions or deconstruct institutions, that those questions need to be at the forefront.

The last thing I want to talk about is
religious education, as I have heard it much in a
collection that is happening in these days. What is the
assumption, this from a pastor who had a public charter in
an economically challenged context.

What is our assumption about these places of
learning, and these children and teachers that are in that
system? So there is a lot to say there. But thank you,
Vivian. Thank you, Bruce.

I should say this. The largest school in the
church where I pastor is about a mile and a half from the
largest jail, from the church where I pastor. And it is
interesting to see how many of those students end up in
that jail.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Gabe. Thank you very
much. We are going to turn to Elizabeth next. Folks
should jump in the queue if you have thoughts to share.

We are getting a lot of questions on the table
here, about our assumptions about learning, about
teaching, about decision making, about replicating
institutions, and about the relationship between poverty
and all of these things. So I encourage folks to raise
your hands and jump in, too.

Elizabeth, over to you.

MS. HINTON: First, Vivian and Bruce, thank you
again, just to echo what others have said, for two really
important and thought-provoking papers to add to a number
of other really important and thought-provoking papers
that we have had. I have a lot to say.

I first just want to pick up on something that
Gabe raised on education and incarceration. I have done a
lot of work on these issues. And one of the things I
discovered in doing archival work on prison education is
that in the post war period, the Ford Foundation actually,
based on the model of Norfolk Prison in Massachusetts, had
devised plans to basically start a prison university.

They wanted to build a prison that really
looked like a college, and that offered classes, and a
really robust learning experience for the people on the
inside. And that plan didn't come to fruition, obviously,
although the Ford Foundation, as many, I am sure, of you
know, are very involved in prison education programs in
San Quentin prison. And there are all kinds of
problematic strings attached to the funding of those
programs.

But you know, this allows us to think about
like, what -- and I actually posed this in a New York
Times piece I wrote a few years ago. Like, what if we did
turn prisons into colleges? What if we you know, did
think differently about what the purpose and functions of
those institutions could be?
So thank you for that comment, Gabriel, and the paper, Vivian, because that really brought that out for me. So I want to think about -- I guess we have been talking a lot about kind of who gets taught, and meritocracy, and who has access to certain elite institutions.

But I think another really important question that Vivian's paper raises is, what gets taught. And this -- Angela Davis in that clip is saying, like people don't understand.

People don't know about the kinds of violence that happened in Birmingham. Why her father needed to arm himself, in order to protect his family. And that this miseducation or obscuring the deep roots of structural racism and injustice has led to many of the problems that -- or has fostered many of the problems that we have been talking about, and that Angela Davis herself was confronting.

And I think, you know, this could -- I am not going to make these links seamlessly. But I want to try to think about this education as a process, and education as a vehicle for societal transformation in the context of how Bruce ended his talk, which was posing a question that I hope that we take up. Which is that, especially in our own moment, can disruption and resistance be drawn
together to make change?

And that question, coupled with Vivian's paper and presentation made me think about Bryan Stevenson's work where he, or at least a lot of what he advocates. Which is that, we need to have a kind of reckoning with our history, and that the first step towards any kind of major transformation is going to be coming to terms with the history of racial oppression, slavery, and genocide in the U.S.

And one of the things that he advocates is, you know, based on sub-African models and Germany, where you know, he basically says like, nobody should visit the American South without being made aware constantly of the very important impact of slavery in shaping social relations and power and oppression. And so I am kind of just, like, rambling here.

But I guess I want to think about in terms of, you know, all of us coming together in pursuit of imagining or coming back to square one and imagining a different kind of system, the role that education for everyone, for our entire society, and a reckoning with our history in the way that Bryan Stevenson is talking about -- what role that plays.

Like, can we -- are we going to be able to realize or build popular support or political will for the
kinds of transformations I know that we are all trying to bring about, absent the kind of education that Angela Davis and Bryan Stevenson are talking about, right. Education as a process of national healing, and as a vehicle for a larger kind of social change.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Elizabeth. I am trying to take my own notes while I am tracking the queue here. Thank you very much for that.

You know, you are just reminding me of a friend who did research on prison towns, and what sort of develops politically in prison towns. And one of the things that really stuck with me from that was an interview she did with a local elected official, who was talking about their having gotten a prison in a sort of a rural county.

And he said, you know, we would have loved to have had a community college instead, but they weren't giving out money for community colleges. They were giving out money for prisons.

And it just -- it's such a stark tradeoff in that situation, anyway. It is really striking. So Dona is up next, and then Deanna.

And folks should continue to get in the queue. In a minute here, Vivian and Bruce, we'll pause and give you all a couple of minutes each to respond to what you
are hearing, and offer any thoughts, as we are getting close to sort of halfway through our discussion time.

But first, Dona, and then Deanna.

MS. MURPHEY: Thanks to Bruce and Vivian again for your papers. I thought they were wonderful, and a lot of food for thought. I had a couple of comments to make in this conversation.

One was about education. And I also agree with many of the people here who have spoken already, that it is important to think about education as a process. I think, fundamentally, we should be thinking about the importance of teaching what exposes societal discomfort, because I think that is the only thing that creates the opportunity for learning and for change.

And that is not usually how we think about teaching. I don't think that we are meaning to make people uncomfortable. But I really think that if we expect education to be a vehicle by which we create change, we have to think of it in that way.

I think I had mentioned before that run for local office, for school board, actually, in Pearland, Texas. And one of my platform issues, which I think, I had never heard of anybody running on an issue like this. I mean, among the other issues which I think were maybe more normal, which was a mental health platform.
And I talked a bit about whole child health. 

So apart from you know, academic, cognitive, what is it? Helping children develop in the cognitive domain, we also should invest in social and emotional learning, that it should be happening in our schools.

So those things, I think, are more normal platform issues. I also mentioned that it is really critical for children to understand. And this is not just children, I think people in general should understand what it means to be a participant in society, right. And to not just be consuming.

And I had phrased this as like active citizenship. Now, I feel kind of uncomfortable with that language, because I think that kind of language is maybe exclusionary for people who are not citizens, which was not the intention there.

But the idea that, you know, each of us has a role to play in making the community around ourselves better than it is. And we -- our responsibility as learners is to learn about the vehicles by which we can change the problems that we see in our communities. And as teachers, to teach people, you know, the power structures that exist, and the ways in which you can engage.

And I don't think people are doing this. In
Texas, we’ve really disinvested, historically, in civic education. I think what education exists there happens in maybe government classes. It really should happen in every subject. It should happen in English. It should happen in science.

It should happen in every subject, because it is something that touches everything. And I think our understanding of each of the subjects is much more relevant when you talk about how it matters in creating change.

And the other thing I wanted to share also, is that, when we talk about who matters in terms of experts, and people who have experience, who I personally consider experts in their own lives, in the lives of people in their communities. And I think maybe it is more than talking about [audio skip] -- I think we should talk about maybe domain specific knowledge, or roles, perspectives, right, to bear on different problems.

I think then we can maybe value the contribution that each of us potentially can make. And some of us come with multiple perspectives, right. Multiple identities. You know, yes. We are parts of multiple communities.

And then, I think also, this is something that comes up for me very often, in the work that I do. The
reason for which I am here, which is for Doctors for America, is this idea that there are certain people who, yes, are more relevant, I guess, in providing expert knowledge in certain domains, right.

And I think that while that is true to some extent, like, I think physicians for instance are going to have really relevant insights in terms of healthcare. But I also think that people who consume healthcare, right, who are the patients, have very, very relevant insights.

I think when we come into this with, like, I am an expert because I have this pedigree, or because I have this professional you know, community, and training, that should be tempered with the idea that to be real allies, I think we should be, first of all, very much in conversation with the other people who are part of that, whatever issue that you are discussing, right. And I also think that, yes, that we should be doing our work in service to the people who are movement builders and movement building in general.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thanks, Dona. We are going to turn to Deanna. And then we will pause for a moment and turn back to Bruce and Vivian. And if each of you all could just take just a couple of minutes to jump in.

Encourage others to get in the queue. And especially if you haven't spoken yet, please raise your
hand. We would love to hear from you.

So with that, Deanna.

MS. VAN BUREN: Thank you, Katharine. And thank you, Vivian, and Bruce, for the papers and the presentations. I was -- I have been thinking about a couple of things, both on the education piece, and then as it relates to Bruce's work around the trauma piece.

But my entree into doing a lot of this work was teaching a design studio in Chester Prison. Very, very segregated in Pennsylvania. And it was an inside-out program. And as the class gathered around, all of the incarcerated students were Black men and all of the outside students from the local university were white women.

And the stark contrast of that condition. I was also teaching at Harvard at the time. And going from working with those students to coming into the institution, there is something that just became illuminated to me, both in terms of the types of intelligence that we were working with, but also the amount of co-learning that was happening amongst all of these folks.

And it sort of started to shift the way that I practiced. And that we also understood together that the built environment looked a certain way, that the built
environment was structurally racist. That it had built for poverty, and it was intentional.

And this sort of illumination of that, within the context of these groups of Black and white students, was quite a revelation, and helped me to understand that this was a missing piece of understanding. The way that our schools and prisons and homes and communities get built was completely outside of everyone's education, all of us.

So I have been just curious about the concept of co-learning and co-learning models. We have been exploring that in communities, in teaching in prisons and jails and universities around the country, as we do the work.

It has been working quite well, and starting to hire systems-impacted folks to work with around development as they learn about real estate development and architecture, as we learn a lot from them about the system, the experience, this life, that there is just sort of this shared knowledge, is helping us to solve problems.

So it has been something I am very passionate about, and want to think through more, on how to do it. And trying to sort of be a bridge between the academy, and urging them to teach differently, and think differently about how it looks, but also working in community with the
information and the wisdom that they have. And to be able
to bridge some of that. So curious about how we do that
and do that at impact -- that scale.

The second co-piece that I have been
experimenting with is co-counseling and thinking through
therapeutic modalities. But I am very interested in
trauma and trauma healing.

When I hear folks that wreak the violence, when
I hear drug and alcohol addiction, my mind always goes to,
like, what is the underlying trauma that is causing
behaviors, and for us to be in so much pain, right. You
know, people are in severe pain.

And then people will have more traumatic
experiences, and [audio skip] -- the DNA of that. Right.
So we are looking at a lineage of pain and trauma. If we
don't address -- it is very hard for me to see about any
of these system changes going to [audio skip]. So always
curious about, Bruce, if that had been part of your
research, in looking at that. And how does trauma play
into thinking through our [audio skip] of our social
contracts?

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Deanna. Thanks a lot.
That is the perfect segue to hear from Bruce and Vivian
for a minute. And then, after that, just so you will
know, we will hear from Danielle and Fatimah. And others,
feel free to jump in the queue as well.

    Bruce, Vivian, who would like to go first?

    MR. WESTERN: Do you want to go?

    MS. NIXON: Sure. Thank you, everybody, for your comments. I think the things that I just want to reinforce is that, yes, what I am really concerned more about is the type of education that people are allowed to have access to, to the point of being so prescriptive in some cases.

    Especially when people are in confinement in the prison, that there are decisions made about what type of education people can have access to, that are based, for me, that have direct connections to this fixed classification of the Black body as production, as cheap labor. And even the education programs that are most accepted within the prison settings lead to that.

    And when I look back over the history of resistance to oppression that is related to chattel slavery and its relationship to capitalism, the suppression of education has -- there has always been an element of that in that process, whether it was state-based laws preventing slaves from being educated, whether it was people becoming educated under their own steam, under their own power, and changing the world anyway.

    I mean, the first generation of African
American men especially, and some women, who were able to
get educated, mostly in northern schools, changed the
world in fundamental ways. And then, the next time we saw
that happen, it really did come out of marginalized
communities: the Black Panthers, the Black Muslim
movement, largely self-educated in prisons, who used a
political education and indeed were reading very political
things.

And interpreting them in ways that they can't
be taught in the traditional institutions and applying
that to building real power in communities. And the
response to that was a concerted attempt to shut it down.

And on the flip side of that, you had a much
more traditional type of education that was received by
Thurgood Marshall and Martin Luther King. And that whole
generation of very educated leaders who were also building
a different type of power, but that was also shut down.
All the way up through Attica. I mean, this is a
repetitive thing. A particular type of education is not
permitted.

And so those connections are what is important
to me. How do we break the barrier of separating people
from that type of education? Who can be the providers of
that type of education?

Where are the spaces where that can happen,
despite the fact that the systems that are in control of
our criminal justice system certainly aren't going to be
the ones to invest in that type of education. Because it
is against their own interests, if they want to remain
what they are.

And that is what I have been trying to get at.
All of your comments make sense to me. It is knitting it
all together that -- and making a convincing argument that
building power amongst people who we have, I guess,
decided are too dangerous to have power.

How do we change that narrative? How do we say
that, actually, power doesn't make these folks more
dangerous? They actually make them more effective in
creating the kind of transformational change that needs to
happen at the very level of the community.

This even goes back to Elizabeth's work about,
you know, when there was some real investment in
eliminating poverty. That investment included increasing
access to every type of education, including the type of
education of that was transformative. And that all went
away when folks realized it was helping to build power.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thanks, Vivian. Yes. We just
were talking about education that builds power among those
considered too dangerous to have power, and how it is yet
another tool in the control toolbox.
Bruce, turn to you for a second, and then we'll go to Danielle.

MR. WESTERN: Yes. This is an incredibly rich conversation. I am just -- I'm blown away by how dialed in people are to this conversation.

So I hear us talking about three institutions, three big institutions. And it is the criminal justice system, there's the education system, and the welfare system.

And in different ways, we've all observed that in their functioning day to day now, they are reproducing inequality. They are sustaining poverty and social exclusion. But we can see in each of these institutions, radically reformulated, real emancipatory potential, right.

And this is what I -- how I read Vivian's paper. She is sort of struggling between the emancipatory potential of education on the one hand and the way in which it has functioned to maintain a social hierarchy on the other.

And it is sort of -- the whole conversation raises a question for me. So what does this emancipatory potential look like in all of these institutions: welfare, education, and criminal justice. And how do we get there? And I think there are -- were distinct from
the conversation.

We haven't talked so much about, you know, welfare institutions. And we did a deeper dive last week. But you know, Vivian's giving us a picture in her account of what this emancipatory education looks like. It expands voice, right.

You know, more people's lived experience is reflected in education, particularly voices that have been silenced through oppression. So it expands voice and it thereby expands vision. If people who have been kept out of the conversation are now at the table, they are bringing a different kind of vision.

And I think there is a real humanistic understanding of what this education -- the potential of it. And I hear it as celebrating, you know, human capacity for love and creativity.

What is the emancipatory potential of welfare institutions? Sort of a high level of material well-being that is unconditional on judgments about moral status. And this is, I think, Ananya's point about how welfare systems and charity reproduce inequality so often, because they are imprinted with ideas of moral desert.

And I think -- and so what is the emancipatory potential of a radically reformulated system of justice? For me, I think -- and this goes to David's question --
for me, it is about non-violence, right. Whatever institutions are in the alternative, they are radically non-violent and minimize the harms to the body and mind. How do we get there? I think we have been talking about this in many, many different ways. And there are practical implications. It is not super abstract.

And we have talked about expanding voice, expanding the table, bringing different people to the table. Opening up spaces that have been very closed. Making institutions -- elite institutions much more porous. Entertaining a variety, varieties of expertise.

I like Dona's formulation of domain specific knowledge, and Deanna's ideas about co-learning. I have had the same experience in prison classrooms as well. NCI Norfolk, actually, was one of them that Elizabeth was talking about.

And this is a democratic move, I think, right. Expanding the tent, making the institution more porous, accepting a plurality in forms of expertise. And this is something, you know, we can do.

This is immediately accessible to us in the work that we are doing right now. So it is not sort of pie in the sky abstract.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Bruce. Thanks, Bruce
and Vivian, both of you. So we are going to turn back to
our queue and invite folks in.

    Just to give everyone sort of a time check of
where we are. We are going to continue our discussion
together until about five or six minutes after the hour.
And then, we will turn to Jeremy for a bit of a wrap up on
things.

    So the queue right now, Danielle, Fatimah,
Eddie, Marcia, and Kimá and Hedy are in the queue. I
would encourage folks who would like to get in the queue
to please do so.

    Again, especially if you haven't spoken.
Welcome your hand up. But if you have spoken, you can put
your hand up, too, just be mindful of time.

    So with that, turning to you, Danielle.

MS. ALLEN: Thanks a lot. I mean, this is just
such rich material and thinking. I'm grateful to be
learning from it. I think, I am going to say something
that may be a repeat of things others have said, so I
apologize. But of course, one is always trying to connect
this to one's own frames of reference.

    I heard something of a kind of paradox in
Bruce's paper, and Vivian's and the relationship between
them. So I hear Bruce telling us a story about brutal
institutions without legitimacy, and, you know, moments of
agency and resilience. And I see Vivian telling us a
story about, you know, the real power that can be
harnessed for transformation through preparatory
education.

And I think both of these things are true. But
so then, the paradox that has to be explained is, why, if
institutions are brittle, and we also know what the
resources of transformation are, we are stuck, okay. And
so I want to put something on the table about the
stuckness part.

And I think this connects to the points that
have been made about trauma. But I think that one has to
recognize that for so many, experience of the criminal
justice system is really an experience of bare survival,
right. Like, you are literally just trying to survive.

You all know this. I am not telling you
anything you don't know. And you can spend so many years
just trying to survive that you lose all the years that
you might have put into working on transformation. And I
thought that part of the story just isn't -- we are not
saying that part loud enough, yet.

And there is a funny way which it connects to
education, because I have to agree with everything Vivian
said and wrote. And yet, I also know that so often, the
way people present education in this context, it is about
-- you know, it is really about deferred gratification. It is about what happens after a course of education, a long pathway.

And I do feel like we have a dynamic in the criminal justice system where people who are incarcerated are over and over again asked to engage in kind of projects of self-refashioning that take decades. And it takes a hell of a lot of energy to do that work. And all of that energy is energy lost from a project of collective transformation.

So I don't know exactly what to do with that. But I do think that that is the reason that we have brutal institutions. And we know what the sources of agency are, and resilience.

But those same sources of energy and resilience and agency, you know, have been necessarily harnessed to a project of [audio skip]. And so it is like, interrupting that dynamic, I think, is a thing we need to figure out how to do.

(Pause.)

MS. NIXON: Yeah. I want to respond to that. Can I respond to that?

MS. HUFFMAN: Yes. We will consider that an urgent wave. Go ahead.

MS. NIXON: You know, Danielle, thank you for
that. Because it is just like, something just clicked for me. So you know, I have been doing this work for a really long time.

And the resistance to the idea of the kind of investment that an organization like mine is willing to make in a person immediately upon extraction from this place of confinement, where they manage to be lucky enough to get exposed to education, and realize that it was not just transformative for their own lives.

I have not met one person who did not understand that it wasn't just about them being better prepared to get a job, but who understood that if they were able to pursue this newfound resource of education, that they could change things that bothered them about their communities, and about their own lives. But no vehicle exists to tolerate that kind of long-term investment, because it is not the individual that necessarily wants instant gratification.

The individual wants to be able to survive in the meantime. But I have seen women invest five, seven, eight years in education while working minimum wage jobs, because the education was more important. And they didn't have that need for instant gratification to make a lot of money.

What they had was a need to feel powerful and
to have influence in the world. And it was worth the wait. It was worth working the minimum wage job, and going to school at night, and still taking care of the kids.

So I think the problem with instant gratification is kind of on the other side of the table. And how are we willing to invest in people.

MS. ALLEN: I hope that, I want to say I recognize kind of what you are saying, Vivian, about where people's spirits are. So I hope I didn't come across otherwise.

MS. NIXON: No, you didn't.

MS. ALLEN: Okay.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you. Thank you both.

Fatimah, let's turn to you. Do you have thoughts following on that, and or otherwise?

MS. DREIER: Yes. This is a very powerful, emotional thing, conversation. So I just want to thank you, Vivian, for opening this up. And so forgive me.

This is working through a lot of thoughts right now. Dona, I want to build on something you mentioned about children and reflecting on my own childhood.

So I started fourth grade living in a homeless shelter. And thinking about the ways in which school was part of a surveillance system that both -- and I was aware
of it, right. So it is not only that my father being in and out of prison, and my only access to him was through supervision by law enforcement.

But that -- the threat or the idea that my mother could also be taken away from me, through foster care, through all those systems. And education, school actually being the site of it. And also, the expectation to learn, and to do all these things that other kids do.

So the trauma is not only those events, but also the way that the expectation that school has to quash a child's natural response to bumping up against these systems, and the impact of structural racism. And, oh, Vivian, you so voiced the -- just this open-hearted desire in my neighborhood for the kids to be educated.

For you to somehow grab hold of the most precious thing you can have, which is education, and to go to college, right. Only to -- and this is actually, you know, my grandmother was a janitor at the college that my brother went to, right. Was the janitor, mopping the floors. And but being like, keep going, right.

Like, education is valued. And so where does disruption, where does this, like, movement of getting out, escaping, surviving meet with the opportunity to actually -- this is the trauma piece, the unlocking. I don't even want to call it healing.
It is the witnessing. The witnessing of trauma, to unravel the lived experience in the context of education to activate that political action, the political education. There is, like, a word I want, which is both about that unraveling of the witnessing of a trauma, the healing that is available, and the opportunity for political action. The opportunity to leverage that, to hold it, to nurture it, the speaking of it.

And this is where, I think, language itself is implicated. The violence of -- and you know, I spent a little bit of time at the Center of Applied Linguistics. The conversation about Ebonics, African American vernacular English, you know, literacy itself; that we are not even -- our dialect, our words aren't even valued.

You know, to have to learn standard English as an access to. And there are programs that provide an acknowledgment of the dialect of African American vernacular English. And then, you know, sure. You can use that.

So I did some research on mother tongue education. And the power it has, not only cognitively for children, to access to other languages. Right, we can be monolingual, but -- excuse me, multilingual.

But that fact, the violence of not even having access to that, as access to our own understanding of our
culture, our history. The beauty of our dialect is nowhere in the conversation about how education can be unlocked for us, alongside the healing. Alongside the witnessing. Alongside the political education.

So I wanted to just offer that up. And so much more to share. But I will stop there.

MS. HUFFMAN: Fatimah, thank you for that. And thanks to -- it has been true throughout. But particularly in this recent exchange, thanks to everyone for how much of your full selves you are bringing into this conversation.

So we are going to -- we have a -- we are going to do a quick little shift in our queue. Just because of a couple of folks who are going to have to jump off shortly.

So we are going to turn next to Hedy, with an H. And then, to Eddie with an E. And then, we will turn to Marcia, Kimá, Courtney, and Kristian and Heather are all in our queue right now.

We are getting close to time. We still have time. So folks should say your piece, but just be a little mindful.

And if you do want to get in the queue, please do go ahead and do it, so that we can plan accordingly. So with that, I will turn to Hedy with an H.
MS. LEE: Hi. Thanks for doing that. And hopefully, my daughter Zora won't make a cameo in the back. I don't have childcare today. I am sorry --

MS. HUFFMAN: Welcome. Who does?

MS. LEE: -- our video off. Anyway, so my comments also are going to echo or build on others. Particularly Ananya's comments, and some of Elizabeth's comments. I am really thinking about the role of universities in this process.

You know, we referred to PEP programs. But how do we grapple with the fact that we function and thrive in racist institutions? And you know, I know that. And I don't often process it.

I had a colleague who was a professor of surgery at Wash U. Mostly -- most of their work was working with gunshot victims, and a lot of work around trauma. And abruptly left the University.

And I texted them, and said, why did you leave? And they said, because this institution is racist. And I can't do what I am doing. I can't work with communities and be a genuine person, being part of the Wash U. system.

And it kind of stung, because you know, she said that, but I am still here. And I am still doing this. And I am still in the PEP program. And I am still -- and so I just -- I wonder, you know, how do we grapple
with that.

How do we function, knowing that we are in institutions that are racist. And as has been said, many who have not grappled with the histories of racial violence, however you want to define violence, in terms of connections to slavery, profit from slavery, et cetera. Functioning on stolen lands.

We can say that, but what are we doing about it? And so I don't really have an answer to the question. But I think it is something, for those of us who function in institutions, how do we rationalize that and move forward, and do our work?

You know, anyway. So again, I don't have an answer. But it is just something I was thinking about, as I listen to many of you.

And even the ways we also evaluate students, and their progress and success. I think -- so what Fatimah said, and others have too, how do we decide when -- even when an student tells their story, you know, what story gets the A. How do they have to write it. How do they have to say it.

I think these are really important questions we have to think about. Not just as faculty in PEP programs, but even in universities with students who have -- are connected to individuals who have incarcerated family
members, et cetera. I will stop there.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Hedy. Thanks a lot.
And if -- Eddie, if you don't mind actually? Sorry to do this one more time. We are going to move Marcia up next, and then you, Eddie.

So that we can again, just to try to capture everyone before people have to jump. So, sorry, Eddie. I hope that is okay.

Marcia, you are up, if you are still on.

MS. RINCON-GALLARDO: My goodness, thank you. I didn't mean to do that. I said I would just jump off. I have been multitasking, everybody. We just released our national report yesterday. And still addressing a lot of press. But this particular conversation hits home, very dearly to me.

It reminds me of my ex-mother-in-law Lydia Vegarín [phonetic], an Indigenous woman, Native American woman from Bolivia, who knew Paulo Freire and taught me at a very young age, at my young politization period of popular education, and how it was utilized throughout South America, Central America, Mexico, and how it has come to the United States.

And so having said that, I am going to frame my questions around education, power, resistance, and then, self-actualization. Mostly because, when we think about
education, for myself and the work that I do, mostly in
the youth justice arena, we know that the education has
not really been here for our young people of color. That
in fact, it is the cradle-to-prison pipeline, school-to-
prison pipeline, the SROs. So on, and so forth.

All the reasons why our young people who want
to get an education and sit in classes that don't have any
material that reflect back who they are. And that don't
reflect our original histories. And so our young people
just get, you know, bored out of just wanting to be able
to see any ability of life that reflects them and their
stories.

And so when I think about then, education, I
think about what education. And there is wonderful
examples like, in Tucson, the Mexican American studies
that came out of ethnic studies and pushes for that. How
Arizona did away with ethnic studies. Because again, the
fear of power. You know, the fear that these people
getting taught ethnic studies was going to, you know, come
and undo the government structure of Arizona.

And so yes, then. Indeed, what is the
education we are offering to our young people? Do they
see themselves reflected? Do they see themselves as
powerful beings that have a word, have a say in terms of
what needs to be and change for them to be productive
citizens, well-being, healthy well-being.

And then, most importantly, about that power piece of that. We actually -- even as we develop our own narratives, that that is power, right. That if we don't see ourselves reflected, that we can do our own participatory acts of research, that we build our own data. That we build our own histories, because it is not being reflected back to us.

And so power in all of its being -- you know. Who gets elected? Does it include non-citizens, and actual residents who also pay into income tax. And then more importantly, education power to provide, then, us for resistance.

When I think about the youth justice system, I think about how for 25 years, foundations really invested big time into the systems. That, as they thought about investing in leaders, they kept going back to people who had already worked in the system.

And you would see retired judges, retired probation chiefs, retired probation officers, retired law enforcement. That they were the ones being invested in, to be leaders within the field, to change the system. And so where did it ever occur to anybody to invest in formerly system-impacted young people, or their parents, or their communities?
The great work being done by Tia Martinez around school-to-prison pipelines is just invaluable as we think about how, especially for our young boys, which are the greatest percentage. But then our girls too, and our gender expansive youth, very specifically -- so that, getting then to self-actualization, that when we -- so for us, a lot of the work that we have been doing is developing our own curriculums.

Because when we think of formerly or directly impacted young people, it is like, who is going to teach them about the system, and the history of the system. And going all the way back even before Europeans arrived in this land to show that our ancestors didn't use cages to hold our -- to change behavior.

And that in fact, by doing, giving that lexicon, that vocabulary, to young people, then they can set up policy tables, and be able to speak that language, and be able to look at data. And be able to speak in ways that inform what they want, and how they want it.

So this all kind of brought up this conversation. I am thankful for it. We -- in our self-actualization, we are having to do our own research.

So that is the purpose of our most recent report. It is to speak up, loud and clear, that Latinx youths are not counted, that we are invisible.
And that report is out. And I shared it with Suki, so that you all can get it, maybe, in the next couple of weeks. Thank you so much.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Marcia. Thanks a lot. And yes, that will -- you just did an advertisement for The Spotlight for us. So we will be including it there. And others of you should please also forward information when you have it. And we would love to share it out.

Eddie, the floor is yours. Thank you for your patience on that.

MR. BOCANEGRA: No worries. No worries, Katharine. My girls are all downstairs watching TV, so I am good.

Just a couple of remarks, based on what Bruce shared. But also just like, in terms of what others were sharing. So just -- I think about, I spent over 14 years in prison, right.

So like 5,200 days I spent in prison. And I would say that the best time of those 5,200 days was the time that I was in isolation. I was in segregation. Which was almost two years. And that was a time that I actually got to read books without having to be concerned about my safety, right.

But it wasn't until I took a sociology class, an introduction to sociology, that I felt for the first
time, kind of this light bulb just kind of lit up for me. Because for the first time, there was these, you know, this jargon, right. This language, co-culture, subculture. They really described things that I kind of just felt and knew existed within the gang culture.

And so I say that just to point out a couple of things, right. One, I agree. There is an appetite for individuals to think about various texts and literature out there that really appeals, right, to an individual based on where they grew up and how they make sense of the world, as well.

But I want to add a small caveat to that, that was also brought up in this conversation. And that is a sense of trauma. So what do I mean by that?

So I hire over 120 staff who do direct service. And about 80 percent of the people that I have hired are African American and they have very similar experiences to the men that we work with. Meaning, they have been involved in the systems as well. Some, ten, 20, 25 years, both men and women.

And what I have learned about how we train and develop a lot of our staff, is that you can't take kind of a -- there is this model around adult learning for this population. It requires a very different approach, a different curriculum, a different support net and
different language, in many ways, right. Different
stories you want to incorporate in the way that you train
individuals.

And the same could be said for, you know,
academically, right. I remember, when I was in grad
school, I was at U of C. And I remember, I had a
professor named Robert Fairbanks who was an amazing, good
friend. And he was working a lot around substance abuse
in prison, and so on.

Anyway, long story short, there’s 50 of us in a
class around policy. He made some really powerful remarks
that really bothered me. Really, really bothered me about
power, and institutions. Then after the class, I
approached him.

And I said, hey, Robert, you know, Mr.
Fairbanks, that what you said didn't sit well with me.
And he looked at me. He said, the comments that I shared,
Eddie, were actually directed to you.

He said, all this time, you think that power,
right, only comes at the community grass level, right.
Because one of his comments was, if you want to be part of
the community, you want to be part of community activism,
then you go to UIC, which is the university in Chicago, a
public school. U of C, being a private school.

And that is the comment that really kind of
bothered me, right, as a grassroots person. But really, what he was singling out for me is that, you have already done that. You have been there. You are now at this table.

And you are able to influence people, right, who are researching at this level, right. People who are you know, part of a billion-dollar endowment, institution. Now you get to bring that kind of mentality to change the systems here.

And that is when it clicked for me. Because right after that, I remember for a long time, I felt that every time I get invited to somewhere. You know, I was like, oh yes. I got invited to speak here by this foundation, or this board, or whatever the case is. And I didn't realize that really, what I was, was a token, in many cases.

And I remember, I was going to a specific foundation, which I won't mention. And they had a really smart individual, who I was really impressed by the way he articulated his thoughts and how he did his framework around gangs. He wrote a book called, Gang Leader for a Day, Sudhir Venkatesh.

And I remember hearing him and other, or another researcher, right. Two PhD folks, and here I am. Right. I am barely working on my master’s degree. And
after hearing them talk so eloquently, I was like, damn. These guys are good. I felt so disempowered there for a minute.

And then, he says something. And then I remember reading the book. And I said, actually, I don't agree about some of the stuff you wrote in the book. And I remember credentialing myself when I made my remarks.

And the way that I did so was by saying my perspective about this work is informed by the fact that I experienced both shootings, assaults, first homicide as a young kid. Gangs at the age of 14. And then serving prison you know, 14 years, coupled by my education, right. And so on.

And for the first time, I actually, at that moment, I felt like I took, you know, what was rightfully mine. Which was this experience that even somebody with a PhD can't speak to.

And so I say that because I want to raise what Bruce had mentioned, right. And what Vivian also mentioned as it relates to like, education and this poverty trap that we constantly further create.

Even those with the best intentions in the world. Because at the end of the day, you know, there’s this -- we can't provide direct service and kind of get ourselves out of this mess that we are in right now. And
the policy changes that are happening need to be led by
the people who are mostly impacted by it, as well. And
that includes some research. And so there is also a fine
line.

And this is my last point. As someone who
supports six different organizations to provide the direct
service in urban Chicago, I would tell you that I am not
often pleased with the rigor of quality of service that I
see, with the nonprofit sector.

And what that tells me is that one way or
another, even when we have the best intentions, and we
hire the best people, we have to double down, triple down
in the way that we develop people. And I am meaning in
the way that we really think about training, facilitating,
education, right. The pathways that we need to create,
and what is really -- what is lifting up and validating.

And I believe, as it was pointed out in this
call, if the people were to lift experience, not only is
it cathartic for them, right. And healing for them, when
they are able to do direct service, or be involved in
change. But there is also a process.

And it is the process that we cannot lose,
right. It’s like, what does it really take. What does
that process look like? What are the gaps of what we
don't know, and what we do know about that?
Because it is that process that would allow us, right, the system that we are trying to create, to really allow us to really make long systemic changes. Because otherwise, you know, we are going to continue to pimp out our communities.

We are going to continue -- and I apologize for the language, but that is the way I see it. We are going to continue to pimp out our staff, who are constantly hired for a specific skillset, because they went to prison, or because they have these networks in the community, but there is no upward mobility.

And that is a damn shame, to be quite honest with you. And that is something that I have been very vocal about. And unfortunately, I don't see much change happening there, to be quite honest with you.

MS. HUFFMAN: Eddie, thank you very much. That was worth the wait. Thank you. So we are getting close to the end of our time. We have four people in the queue.

And so we are going to turn to them, if folks can give us -- if you are able to give us an extra couple of minutes, we are going to end close to on time, but we will probably go over just a couple of minutes.

The four folks up are Kimá, Courtney, Heather, and then Lynda, you will have the last word. And then, we will turn to Jeremy for some quick wrap up. And we will
conclude our conversation for today.

So with that, I will turn to Kimá.

MS. TAYLOR: Great. Thanks. First, I really do want to thank Bruce and Vivian for their papers, but actually more so for their presentation. And it really spoke to incredible humility and questioning in a way that I think is the only way we are going to get to square one. And the ability to say, these are some thoughts I have. And I can't give you concrete answers is really what our country needs, right. And so I appreciate that. And I hope I can model it in my future endeavors.

But I do also want to thank them for their conversations that went pre-justice system. A lot of conversations are about how to improve the justice system and beyond. And you know, these conversations really spoke to how we treat people and how we think about societies in a way that people don't go into that system at all in first place.

And it brings me something to -- this brings me to something that Gabe said, when he said that -- and I wrote it down. There are fundamental assumptions about our kids and people. And I think that that is so important.

Because all of these systems, health, education, welfare, you name it. We talk about them
having systemic racism, which is true. But what we really
don't talk about and is fundamentally true, is that people
do not believe that we are capable.

That we’re -- people of color, myself, that we
are capable. That we are intelligent enough. That we
have the capacity. And that fundamentally allows them to
create systems that continue to discriminate and put us
into buckets of less than, and sometimes it is overt,
explicit racism.

Otherwise, other times, it is desire to keep
privilege, and it is something that Dona said, to not make
them feel uncomfortable. They don't want to have to think
about it, because they don't want to feel uncomfortable.
And so you need to keep your predetermined ideas about who
and what our kids and people are.

And it really, you know, speaks to me, Gabe.
Not only my own school experience, but even now, with my
kids. You are constantly having to fight, to say, no. My
daughter has a brain. This is what you did wrong.

And the amount of time and energy you spend at
school, while you are also spinning through all the other
things, in the space that you know that you are also
actually endangering your kids. Because they are like,
here comes that b, Kimá, again. Right.

And so it is just an interesting dynamic in the
sense of, we can talk about changing the system Square One. But we are really talking about how to fundamentally change the way people think about one another.

I don't have an answer. So I am going to take my -- I don't have an answer. But until we talk about, and deconstruct that, we are not going to get to square one with any of the systems we would like to see.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Kimá. Courtney, we will turn to you.

MS. HOLDSWORTH: Thank you both for wonderful papers. I am going to try not to repeat some of the things that everybody else said. Kimá sort of took some of the words out of my mouth, and so did Marcia.

In thinking about these two papers, the thing that stuck out for me, in the paper and in your presentation, were education is the thing that we invest least in, in this country, in terms of thinking about criminal justice solutions. That mental health and solitary confinement were so closely knitted.

And ignorance protects the government, not the people. So there were these sort of really poignant things that made me think about the work that I do around the school-to-prison pipeline, and the notion that we don't really think about children as human, or as people.

And how some of the same things that happen in our
criminal justice system happen in the same way in our
schools.

So children who have mental health concerns are
also the kids that spend the most time in ISS, that are
suspended, that we see in court, over and over, and over
again. And how -- if we could in some way dismantle
structural racism and really invest in education, maybe
our conversations about criminal justice education would
look different.

If we were able to fix the problems on the root
end of education, so that we can be productive about -- if
someone makes a mistake in our community, and we want to
help that person not make that same mistake again, then we
have tools in place that can educate that person. Can
inspire that person, can change that person’s life, and
really try and get away from this notion of punishment.
And really try and see the humanity.

But I think we first have to seek humanity with
our children.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Courtney. Thank you
so much. So we are going to turn to Heather, and then to
Lynda.

If folks didn't -- if you have anything that is
sort of remaining in your head or heart that you would
like to share, please do put it into the chat, as Sukyi
reminded us before. That is all being captured as well. And we will make sure to include that.

And then, we will turn to Jeremy. So Heather, and then Lynda. Heather, go ahead.

MS. RICE-MINUS: I was just thinking, between the papers, about -- Bruce, your paper brought out these moments in quotes, of incredible resilience, and connection to individuals' human dignity that you were interviewing. Yes.

I think there was even, I am going to pull it real quick, a quote that kind of gave me chills as I was getting to your conclusion. You almost have to lose your sense of humanity, because there is none.

And then, you know, those moments of people recognizing their need for human dignity, I think. Maybe because it is, as I think it was Danielle talking about the survival mode folks are in, in a prison setting, you are almost more in touch with the need for recognizing human dignity and perhaps are able to tap into a sense of resilience that those of us who haven't experienced that, can't have.

And I think the way I was thinking of this, in connection to Vivian's piece on education, and the value of education. I also think about at prison fellowship, we have our long standing -- this intensive program is called
the Academy, and there is curriculum that goes with it. But I think one of, like, the core components of it is community. We actually -- in the highest-level Academy, the men and women live together. And they practice what they learn together, and they talk together. And I think, you know, in some of the higher education programs in prisons I have been able to visit, you can kind of see that same built sense of community. And I wonder if these moments of human dignity, of resilience, are actually fostered in a way that it is maybe not even possible outside, because of that sense of survival mode.

And this finding of a community that otherwise, we would not be so tightly knit together. And it is offering something that people so desperately need. And I think that is why, you know, the inside-outside classes that folks were talking about that exist now, and are continuing to grow, are so important.

Because it allows students from the outside to get a glimpse of that sense of community that allows for learning, that I just don't think is otherwise possible. And I just see this tension when we talk about our programming in prison, or even higher education when I am talking about trying to restore Pell Grants on Capitol Hill, between, like, the link to trying to force making
the issue about linking it to a professional job or trades, and getting at what Vivian was saying, how do we craft an argument about the value of education in and of itself.

And what it does for people internally, in crafting competence, in crafting a sense of autonomy and critical thinking. And that -- you know, my last point is just how I think that is also linked to how we evaluate the justice system. And metrics in the justice system are something that is very interesting to me. We, you know, use recidivism, which is essentially a failure rate, to rank prisons.

And we are quite okay with, like, the high failure rate that we get from them. And most often, our programs, the question is, you know, what is your recidivism rate? Or like, do your participants get a job?

And my colleague Jesse, who is actually a graduate of our Academy program, and went on to get his law degree after he was released, is leading up our evaluation at prison fellowship of our Academy programs now. And he is really working to kind of spin this idea on its head of what we measure, and that we should actually not just measure the things that are failures of this system, did you commit a new crime.

But actually, the inputs. Things like grit,
and what people give back to their communities. And so he is creating this citizenship measure, that I think is truly unique.

And I think that, you know, that metric piece and evaluation piece is also part of how we can craft a narrative of the value of education in prison.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Heather. Thank you so much. And just, you have brought us full circle, back to what Jorge started us off with, of the value of education for people who are not going to be released, and how do we talk about that. And so thanks for that.

So Lynda. Lynda, you are there.

MS. ZELLER: Yes. My internet is back.

MS. HUFFMAN: Great. Lynda, we will hand it over to you. And then, we will wrap up. So go right ahead.

MS. ZELLER: So what this conversation has done for me has challenged me. That we are talking about housing, or education, behavioral health, or trauma, all of the things in Vivian and Bruce's paper, that to get to square one, we both need disruptors as we have talked about.

And also, we need more awareness of the shift of power. And more leadership that has power to, very deliberately and very consciously, acknowledge that change
in power, and embrace that power. And it feels to me like, when I look back at all the justice reforms, or health and justice reforms that have failed in my short tenure, it has been the system in power sort of losing sight of the change.

So for me, this conversation has just reinforced that I need to pay a little more attention. Whether it is philanthropy and challenging ourselves to acknowledge the importance of shifting power so that communities have maximum participation, to sustain those disrupting, good disrupting changes.

There needs to be a sustained shift of power. And that is tough. So thank you.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Lynda. Thanks a lot. Thanks to everyone. And thanks for folks who are piping in, in the chat as well.

So Jeremy. No small task. We turn to you to give us a few minutes of wrap up here, on a lot of ground that we have covered in a lot of different ways today. It has just been incredible. So I will hand it over.

MR. TRAVIS: Well, thank you for that. My goodness. What an amazing conversation. This is what happens when smart, passionate people get together, not once, but twice, and three times, and develop what we call our tapestry of just ways of thinking about the social
contract.

I am going to be very brief. In part, because we are over, but also, in part, because my head is exploding. And there is so much that we have talked about.

I want to just note, we want to, I think, hold onto that Bruce started from his case studies, his sort of topology of ways, of points of disruption, of methods of disruption. And we just want to build that over time.

We have done this in our earlier sessions. Talking about community organizing, about sort of solidarity movements. About separation and abolition as being points of disruption. Bruce adds the power of women in community as his first point of disruption.

He added, interestingly, and where’s -- I don't know if Aisha is still here. I'll only critique of the nonprofit and philanthropic world, we add to that, at least from the Oklahoma experience, as having disrupt potential.

And very importantly, again, consistent with our discussion, social mobilization. What does movement building look like, as a focus of disruption?

And then, the last one, which became, in an interesting way, sort of the theme of our time together today, was the notion of human resilience. So we talked a
lot about education. And we put so much, so many eggs in this basket. It was fascinating. It kept getting bigger and bigger, and fuller and fuller. And having more and more potential for -- as a point of disruption.

On one level, we talked about education as being a self-actualization, that educating individuals, and we have had our own experiences with this, is a point of self-actualization as a human being. Starting in, as Fatimah said, in her fourth grade.

So that certainly is a point of disruption, if education is as powerful as Vivian reminds us it is. In the American mythology, and in reality, it is powerful. We put a lot of other eggs in the education basket.

Remember that Vivian's paper started with history. It started with the intent to deny enslaved people the ability to self-actualize in that way. It was a crime to teach the slave people to read, to bring them into a school. So that was not just accidental. That was an act of suppression and oppression.

So Vivian's biggest point, I think, is that education, thinking about the educational enterprise requires us to think about power. Not just at the individual level, but at the societal level. So to think that we have denied incarcerated people in particular, but marginalized people more broadly, education means it's a
form of oppression. That denial is a form of oppression.

So to reverse that, education becomes a point of -- a method of disruption. So remember, Danielle had this wonderful moment, where she said, okay. There is a paradox here. We have this stuck system, that we have described over our last three sessions, where everything is just so deeply embedded with this racism, this capitalism.

This is our history, and is it also fragile? Is it also what Bruce sort of thinks it might be, lacking legitimacy? That is cause for hope. But what is going to break it open? That is what Square One is all about.

That is what we are counting on everybody to do. But know also that we had other hopes for the educational enterprise. And I just want to name some of them.

One was that as we think about who teaches and who learns. Great discussion about the pedagogy of education, about the pedagogy of the oppressed. It becomes a way of broadening the social contract, to bring voices, people, perspectives, uncredentialed perspectives, but credentialed in their own way, into a discussion about what are we going to do as our society. So it is democratizing at a very fundamental level.

Broadening the scope, but asking the question,
what is the content? Whose history? Elizabeth said, whose history gets taught? And who decides that? There is a moment of power. Who decides that?

Vivian said, all of the curriculum is decided by somebody else. Why is that so? So it is a point of power sharing, democratization.

Elizabeth then took this to some other level with a reference to Bryan Stevenson, which I love. It was, is it possible that education is also a -- when we think about what is taught, whose history is taught, it is a process of reckoning. But this is a way for us to think about bringing it to sort of right relationships: us, with our own histories, as a country.

Is it a process of healing? I was fascinated when you talked about the trauma, and how do we overcome trauma? Again, I am going back to Fatimah's observation about how she had to work through, as a fourth grader, all of these difficult questions, and realize who was in control. And deal with her own experience, there.

Is education a way of thinking about healing? Reckoning at a national level, self-actualization at the individual level. Power sharing, and actually empowering those who are now marginalized, and giving to them, or allowing them to take for themselves the power to imagine a very different world.
So education becomes this fascinating way of resolving Danielle's paradox, between being stuck, really stuck, and trying to find points of disruption. And in interesting ways, even though we had a critique. And I will own it myself, as a former educator -- a critique of the higher education system in America as being sort of perpetuating racist sort of hierarchies and the like.

Is education, in some ways, the one that is most accessible to us, as a point of disruption? Is it more accessible than, what we talked about last time, healthcare? Is it more accessible than housing as a point of intervention?

So this note of optimism in this discussion, notwithstanding the history that we were reminded of. And notwithstanding the ways in which education continues to support hierarchies, there is a note of optimism that if -- just take this Ford Foundation notion of prisons as being college campuses. And take the Black Panther history, and other histories of education, being a way of powering those to lead the resistance.

That is a very optimistic note to end on. So I thank you all for taking us on an amazing journey that we will pick up next week.

MS. HUFFMAN: Jeremy. Thank you for that.

Thank you so much. That was terrific. Terrific overview
of the path that we have traveled here together today.
And very much appreciated.

    Thank you to all of you all for this
discussion. And just -- it has been incredible to be able
to listen and learn from all of you today. I am really
struck by our framing of this conversation as about the
social contract.

    And you know, what are contracts about? They
are about value. They are about who is valuable, and in
what way. And how do we measure it. They are about
power, and how do we share power? And how do we divide
those amongst ourselves.

    And it is just striking how these are the
themes that are coming in so powerfully in each of our
discussions, over our time together. So with that, we
will wrap up for the day.

    Again, enormous thanks to all of you all.
Enormous thanks to Sukyi, and to the whole team that has
made today happen, and all of these days happen.

    Again, you get a couple of Wednesdays off
before we all come together again. But we will be in
touch, continuously. Hopefully not annoyingly, but
continuously with additional information. With
information for you all to share with your networks, in
hopes that they can be invited into this conversation.
And I just would really encourage folks. I have heard from several of you, over the course of this, that you are processing, and you are thinking about these things. Put all those processing thoughts into the chat, on Slack, if you have a moment to do so.

Just help us continue this discussion and sustain our connection until we are able to be together again. So with that, again, thank you to all. And if folks are able to stay on, you are very welcome.

We will shift to informal mode. But for those who need to drop off, thanks. And we will look forward to seeing you all again soon.

(Whereupon, at 6:28 p.m. EST, the meeting was concluded.)
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