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MS. HUFFMAN: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Katharine Huffman, and I am the Executive Director of the Square One project at the Columbia University Justice Lab. It is my great pleasure to welcome all of you to the final gathering of Square One's fourth roundtable on the future of justice policy.

The goal of the Square One project is to contribute to a real transformation of the meaning and experience of justice in America. We are working together to reconceive how we respond to violence, poverty, and the many other social problems that emerge from our unique American brand of deep racial inequality. Problems that we typically respond to with the tools of punishment and enforcement. Problems that are not just decades, but centuries old.

At Square One, we have the privilege of working with a huge and growing network of what is now hundreds of activists, academics, policymakers, practitioners in many fields, advocates, artists, faith leaders and more. To start with a clean slate, at a new Square One, and imagine a policy framework that relies less on the tools of traditional punishment and enforcement, and more on equitable access to, and engagement with, healing, healthy and safe civic life, and a thriving democracy.
The incredible group of people who are joining us today are part of the fourth of five Square One roundtable meetings that have been taking place since 2018. Each one digging in on a different aspect of these large questions.

Our gatherings began two years ago in Durham, North Carolina, with an examination of our country's history of racial and economic inequities, and its relevance to foundational justice reform. Then, we moved on to Oakland, California, to discuss overcriminalization and punitive excess, in which the United States is a global outlier, locking up more people, and for longer periods of time, than anywhere else in the world.

At our third roundtable, convening in Detroit, we dug into the problem of violence in the United States, examining violence, ranging from interpersonal violence to state violence, to structural violence, and how all of them relate to the justice reform endeavor. And all of that has brought us to today.

Today's roundtable on aspirations for the new social contract is building upon these past conversations, and the conversations that this group of people who are with us today have had over the course of recent weeks. If you missed those events, we encourage you to visit SquareOneJustice.org, to access videos, transcripts, and
papers from all of them. And next year, in early 2021, we hope you will join us as we finish this roundtable series with a conversation about the values that should guide the future of justice.

We are so glad to have all of you here with us for this final public session. Now is the time to be having this discussion. The problems are urgent, but the potential for change is great.

A huge thank you goes to Danielle Allen and Bruce Western, who will open our discussion. To the Ford Foundation, and the Charles and Lynn Schusterman Family Foundation, whose support has made this fourth roundtable convening possible. And most of all, to our incredible group of participants, who have spent so much of their August and September thinking, reading, and talking together about these crucial issues, sharing their wisdom with us, and with each other.

Before I hand things over to Bruce, we would like to share with you a brief video that highlights this group's journey so far and prepares us for today's conversation.

(Whereupon, a short video was played.)

MR. WESTERN: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Bruce Western. I am a member of the Square One project. We are going to begin today's Square One
roundtable by talking with Danielle Allen. Danielle is the James Bryant Conant university professor at Harvard. And she directs the Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics at Harvard.

So as a country we are facing a health crisis, an economic crisis, a political crisis. We have a sense that all of these things are related right now. And I think Danielle has done as much as anyone over the last six months to connect the dots and propose real solutions.

We will be talking about her roundtable paper in just a minute. But to get the ball rolling, I want to turn to current events. And as we all know, a social movement is rising up to protest police brutality and stake a claim for racial justice right now.

In Portland, Oregon, we have seen cases of extreme violence around the protests. One counterprotester was shot dead, and the suspect in that case was himself shot dead by police.

Speaking about the shooter who was killed by police, President Trump says, This guy was a violent criminal, and the U.S. Marshals killed him. And I will tell you something; that is the way it has to be. There has to be retribution when you have a crime like this.

Attorney General Bill Barr appeared to agree. The Attorney General said, the tracking down of the
dangerous fugitive, admitted Antifa member, and suspected murderer, is a significant accomplishment in the ongoing effort to restore law and order to Portland and to other cities.

So when we talk about justice, I think we often assume a commitment to the rule of law. We are governed by rules, not men. We stand as equal citizens before the law.

And the progressive side of politics has a kind of a love/hate relationship with the rule of law. It is an ideal that it is often disappointed in practice. But it seems to me that we really need the rule of law right now. Not as an ideal, but as a reality in order to make change.

Danielle, welcome to the Square One roundtable. And I want to jump right into the deep end here. And I want to ask you, what is the status of the rule of law today come roaring out of democratic institutions, principles of equal citizenship. Are they up to the task of creating a more just society right now?

MS. ALLEN: Well, thanks very much, Bruce, for the powerful introduction, both in the film and in the table setting, and in the question. I think, to talk about the rule of law, it is useful to put the concepts of war and peace on the table also.
So with regard to the police killing of the suspect in Portland, I have to say, I think that that has become the norm in our culture. I have, myself, over the last 20 years, really since September 11, registered the way in which in cases of mass shooting, for example, cases of suspected terrorism, we have come to be sort of numb to the use of lethal force by the police in the taking of suspects.

And I think this really reflects the fact that September 11th really put this country on a war footing, put us in the middle of military engagements. And ultimately, we brought that home into our policing.

So tactics of militarization have traveled from the military practice in the engagements in the Middle East into our domestic behavior. Rules of engagement often look more like military rules of engagement than they look like what the rule of law requires in context of peace.

And it matters, of course, that the military has been an important recruiting source and pipeline into American policing. I think as we consider the question of the health of our social contract, the health of the rule of law, we have to directly pay attention to the ways in which we have militarized our culture and our processes.

And I think that is what we saw in Portland.
We have seen that in a number of dimensions. At the end of the day, if you have militarization in your domestic practices and activities, you don't have peace. You don't have the rule of law.

The job is, indeed, to restore a healthy rule of law that is delivering peace and public safety. But yes, as you said, sort of on the terms of the rule of law, leaving decisions in the hands of our procedures, our practices. Not handing over the discretion to individuals carrying guns with the authority of the state.

MR. WESTERN: Yes. I mean, such an interesting analysis. I often think that the project of justice reform right now needs a domestic peace movement. And an internal peace movement, which -- you know, the value of nonviolence is elevated, not as a political tactic, but as something that we should aspire to in the quality of our civic life.

MS. ALLEN: Well, I agree. And I mean, I think that is true across the board. So in other words, I think the call for nonviolence in protest is, there is also a need for de-escalation in the use of force in policing.

So in other words, the call for peaceful tactics applies both to the process of protest, also to the process of pursuing public safety. I think, accidental that the African American Mayors Association is...
tackling police reform, themselves articulating it, as
they call it a peace pact. I think they have put their
finger on the concept that should be at the heart of our
efforts for transformation.

      MR. WESTERN: Yes. Yes. Let's pivot to your
wonderful paper, your contribution to the roundtable
program.

      So let's begin. Could you tell us something
about the paper?

      MS. ALLEN: Sure. I mean, in fact, I think
this conversation has set it up perfectly. The paper is
ultimately about peace. And it is about the problem of
lodging principles of war in the heart of your society.

      So the paper starts from acknowledging that the
right and fair administration of justice is the backbone
for legitimacy in every healthy society. And we are
overdue for building a right and fair approach as to the
administration of justice in this country.

      And I don't need to tell you the many ways in
which we have failed: from the magnitude of incarceration
to the racial disparities and the impacts of policing and
arrest. And the intersection of all of these questions
with matters of health in communities of color, in
particular. So the problems are legion.

      People have been raising the questions for
years. And there are numerous reforms cascading through the landscape. Yet, somehow, we don't seem to coalesce all the specific reforms into a consolidated effort that achieves a paradigm change.

So the question is, well, what then do we need to achieve that consolidation. And my suggestion is that we need an overarching principle that can give us shared purpose in pursuing reform, so that we can amplify each others' efforts.

And the shared principle I propose is something called the principle of association. But to make sense of that principle, I have to be clear about what it is replacing. It is replacing what I identify as a principle of alienation. This is also -- you could call it the war principle, that we were just talking about.

When we look at the problems in our criminal justice system, we do often start by analyzing the problem of systemic racism. And that is a fundamental feature of what we are all experiencing.

And in the paper, I want to argue that systemic racism is actually parasitic on an older, deeper principle of punishment that continues to operate in our society, though it is no longer reasonable or in any way health-bringing. And that old ancient principle is what I call the principle of alienation.
So after I explain the history of that principle a little bit, what it basically is, is the notion that core constants of punishment in Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome turned around the concept of outlawry. That is, somebody broke the law. They broke their social compact. They are out of society.

And you would cast them out. They would become an outcast. And this sounds horrible. It sounds full of the terror of criminality. And indeed, to an extent, it is.

Yet, in antiquity, the principle of exile, of alienation, was also a second-chance principle. So the principle delivered healing to the community at home, because the person at the heart of a relational problem was gone. So victims were healed. Society was healed. But that wrongdoer had also the chance to go someplace else and establish a new life. So although they were alienated from the community from which they came, they did have a chance to establish themselves on a new footing.

So that principle of alienation defined penalty all of the way up until the middle of the 19th century. So if you think about the United Kingdom's use of Australia for a penal colony, for example, that was the principle of alienation operating literally until about
1865.

And at the point when the world could no longer use exile, for the globe had been divided up into national territories, and so forth, that is exactly the point that incarceration came in as a punishment to replace exile. And that principle of alienation was at the end of the day, a principle of sort of war. That is, we will send you out of our community. We will get along with you, as long as you are not actually here in our community.

And that principle was taken and activated through incarceration. So we began to alienate people inside society, taking that principle of war, and putting people outside, embedding it inside society. As if you are saying, we are going to take that broken social contract relationship, and make it sort of the heart of what we are doing with penalty in our society.

And I think the magnitude of incarceration really reflects the ongoing grip that this principle of alienation -- again, sort of a wartime principle -- has on our society, and our culture. And then, of course, systems of racism and racial domination are also practices and patterns that set people out, that other them, that put them aside. And so, the two converged in a really powerful system of alienation.

So this, I believe, is what we have to replace.
And my argument is that we replace it with the principle of association. I can't claim credit for inventing this principle. It is the principle that is used in the Netherlands. It is used in Germany, to think overall about the project of public safety and about responding to wrongdoing.

And the core idea of the concept is, I mean, in some sense, it recovers the ancient idea. The goal is to heal society, all right. We can't heal society by sending people out of society any longer. So we have to rethink our approach to healing society, in the wake of wrongdoing.

The victim needs healing. The offender needs healing. Society needs healing. So you bring a health lens, to considering the entire suite of activity in a wrong. So from violence prevention, you bring a health lens to that, through the process of trial and prosecution through sentencing, and so forth.

The point about the principle of association is that it recognizes that human health depends on healthy human connections and relationships. So from the concept of health, and the need to restore health, and have a restorative justice approach, one moves to really focusing on, again, the health of social relations.

And so this is what then distinguishes systems
of sanction and public safety, that takes the principle of association at their heart. If you look at the German system, for example, there are many alternatives to incarceration in play.

So whereas, in the U.S., we use incarceration for 70 percent of our penalties, in Germany, that figure is 6 percent. In the Netherlands, that figure is 8 percent. Instead, they use work release, and apprenticeship programs, and training programs, and service restitution programs, and home leave, so that people can maintain connections to family and community when they do use incarceration.

And they structure the experience of halfway houses, or incarceration when they use it, in such a way that those who are experiencing that sanction have the chance to cook their own meals, to form social communities. To dress in street clothes, not need to wear a stigmatizing uniform at all times.

And then, those who are responsible for administrating sanctions are trained as social workers in healthy relationship development. So it is a complete transformation of the whole structure of justice, once you have put the principle of association at the heart.

So then the last thing I do in the paper is really try to go through existing reform efforts and
categorize them, according to whether or not what they do is mitigate the hard edges of a system based on a principle of alienation. Or actually try to rebuild that system, based on the principle of association.

And so, just to give you one example of a contrast. If we take policing, I think the ending of stop and frisk is mitigating a principle of alienation. Stop and frisk is an excellent example of the use of the principle of alienation.

And arrest diversion programs where police divert people prior to arrest, to health services may look as if they are moving in the right direction. But they actually expand the purview of policing authority.

They put police in the place of responsibility for health. And in that regard, I think that is also expanding the principle of alienation, not just mitigating it, rather. Not designing away from it.

Whereas, if you were designing for the principle of association, you would really focus on demilitarizing policing. You would be making de-escalation a standard element of police protocol.

You would be doing as the ACLU has recommended in Houston, building up a new first responder corps that is not a policing corps, but is a health and human services corps. A different emergency call number. Don't
call 9-1-1. You call the Health and Human Services first responder number when it is a case of mental health, it is a case of homelessness. It is a case of an issue that requires support at a relational level for health and wellbeing, not criminalization.

So I hope that gives a sense of the paper as a whole. I really look forward to the discussion of the principle of association, whether it helps to categorize potential reforms in this way. And whether people think that we can achieve a sort of overarching shared vision of the direction we are trying to go, as a way of trying to coalesce our reform efforts. And in fact, you know, finally achieve that tipping point that permits a paradigm change in how we approach the administration of justice.

MR. WESTERN: That is great. That is great. I mean, I love the paper. And I love just the intellectual design of it, in part, in which, you know, you reach back to antiquity, and analytically, you know, try and understand our foundational democratic institutions, and draw the lessons for what we are dealing with at the moment.

The principle of association, I feel, over the previous roundtable meetings, we’ve -- in different ways we have talked about similar ideas. And the principle of association was very resonant for me.
I feel like we have talked about shared humanity and social solidarity, and the importance of healing and restoration as core functions of justice. And the idea of the social contract itself as an aspirational idea, as a normative value, I think, captures a similar sentiment to the principle of association.

But then in these, building a conversation, I feel like we are also talking a lot about the real conditions on the ground, in which the criminal justice system is operating. And you know, a centuries long history of virulent racism. Very deep, and very harsh poverty in the United States.

And in my mind, they present challenges, really fundamental challenges to promoting the principle of association. What do you think? Are there preconditions of this social -- preconditions -- this project, this disassociational project to develop? How should we think about that?

MS. ALLEN: So I guess there are two things I would want to say about that. So it is not that I think that, say, the economic realm or the realm of education is sort of a precondition to our achieving this in the realm of justice. It is rather that I think the principle of association should be operative across all of these domains of policy.
And I think a full reform agenda would really be clear about how, in each of these other domains, one would be transforming things, if one put the quality of relationships that people are able to develop at the core of the work that was being done. So then, for me, the real question about preconditions is, what are the preconditions for achieving policy reform of this degree of magnitude.

And there, I do think the question is political, partly. And then also, conceptual, or a matter of our kind of shared moral imagination.

So it is political in the sense that there needs to be actual pressure for change. And elected officials need to understand themselves accountable, and need to have motivation to be responsive. I do think the protest movements we are seeing are producing that condition for change and transformation.

We need institutional mechanisms that themselves support responsiveness. And I could say more about that. But for that reason, I do actually think the democracy reform agenda is central to a justice agenda, that they can't be separated from each other.

But then, there is the issue of our conceptual and moral imagination. And I do -- this is, I think, the thing I wrestle with the most. The thing I am most
puzzled by or confounded by in the justice reform space.

I mean, we have visionaries in this space. You know, we have Angela Davis, who has been articulating a visionary picture for decades, for example. Yet, somehow, my own sort of finger to the wind feeling, and I am very curious to know what other people's feeling is, is that what we have managed to do is coalesce a shared picture, a critical picture, a shared critical account of what we have, and of what we want to get rid of.

But that we have not managed to coalesce a shared positive picture of what we are trying to build. That is my hypothesis. And so, that is why I wrote the paper in the way that I did, to sort of say, well, let's try for a hypothesis this principle of association.

And what if we imagine trying to build around it? Would we coalesce a sort of shared positive vision of what we are trying to build? And so, I may be wrong about that.

I am really curious for the conversation. You know, whether this distinction between our critical vision and our constructive vision holds, or whether the constructive vision exists, and I have not myself seen it in that kind of coalesced form. I see it in pieces and parts everywhere. I see it beautifully all over the place, but not somehow coalesced.
MR. WESTERN: Yes. Yes. I have a bunch of questions that sort of follow from that. But I know our time is limited. And before we turn over to the full group, I need to really -- I just, I won't ask the question, but I will just sort of plant the seed for the group.

And I loved what you said about, you know, we would want to see this principle of association multiplied across all of these different policy domains. I think it is a very challenging question whether the domain, the set of institutions that deal with wrongdoing, right, is necessarily the most fertile ground for promoting a sense of social connectedness among all the members of society. I think that is one of the more challenging domains, in fact, where such a project can be launched.

I want to -- my final question might be about that. But it will be about a slightly different issue. Because I thought it was just a gem of an observation. And you sort of make it in passing in the paper and move on.

And it is the relationship between democracy and human flourishing. And I just thought it was a beautiful observation. And I wonder if you could just say what you meant there. Elaborate on it. Tell us a bit about that idea.
MS. ALLEN: Sure. I am happy to. So I mean, I skipped over a portion of the paper, which is about sketching the broad objectives of a constitutional democracy -- of society, generally, and then a constitutional democracy.

And so, the goal there is to sort of move from a concept of legitimacy to a question of what our larger aspirations for our society should be. And the point is that, you know, there is a kind of first distinction between decent and indecent political systems. And that is borrowed from political philosophy. That is not my distinction.

And that distinction turns only around the question of whether or not the regime is delivering material security to the population. And so, my point is that that is a sort of first pass at the picture of human flourishing. But it doesn't suffice.

And the argument of democracy is that full human flourishing for people requires empowerment, personal empowerment, in relationship to their own lives, and the lives of their communities. And so, the question is, for my sort of -- as a political philosopher, my work, sort of theory of justice work is about fleshing out the way in which empowerment is what you need to deliver full flourishing.
And the reason is not just because one needs to chart one's own life course, and have the space to do that as well, as having the material foundations to do that. But also, because, you know, structure is imposed on us by definition.

And in order to have the autonomy that permits the sort of growth of spirit and well-being, one needs [audio skip] words, a co-creator of those structures, in order to ensure that those structures themselves are health-bringing and not producers of domination. So one needs that control at the level of sort of structural decision making as a part of achieving a full human flourishing.

MR. WESTERN: Yes. Beautiful. Beautiful. I feel there is a lot of eagerness around the roundtable, our virtual roundtable, to jump into this conversation. This is just a great way to kick off our final event, Danielle.

I will now hand it over to my good friend and colleague, Jeremy Travis, to open up the conversation to the whole group.

MR. TRAVIS: Great. Thank you so much for this. And a big thanks to you, Danielle, for this paper, which is so perfect at the end of our time together on this roundtable on reimagining the social contract. You
have elevated our discussion already. I can feel it.

And you have tied -- helped us tie together
some loose ends. And it is also this wonderful challenge
to us, to take on your hypothesis about whether there was
a new vision emerging beyond critique.

And so, we are going to open up the floor for
discussion within this group. You all know, since we have
done this before, what to do, which is to, on the Zoom
function, raise your hands.

And Jorge has already got in first in the
queue, which says that he is eager to ask a question. And
you know that if you have to talk, because you just have
to, you will find your way to exercise the insistent wave
exception to the queue.

As we do always, we will ask first for people
who have what we will call clarifying questions for
Danielle. If there is something you didn't quite get, in
order for the discussion to be well grounded, you want her
to clarify that. So that is hopefully a short question
and a short answer.

But then, we will open it up to a general
discussion. We will ask Danielle to sort of sit back.
She can come in at the end of this time together to help
us understand how she heard this reaction to her paper.
Some of the best responses, or most constructive
responses, will be those that weave in some of the themes from our other discussions about housing and health care and education and the like, so that we are really making this the final roundtable in the reimagination of the social contract.

I will also say to those people who are observing in the cyberspace, that you have a way to get into this discussion, which is to pose a question through our YouTube channel. We will leave ten or 15 minutes or so at the end of our time together, before we wrap up, where the Square One team will consolidate some of those questions to put them to the group.

And then, of course, I will ask Danielle for some of her final observations. So that is the plan. And as I said, we have done this before. And I look forward to the discussion.

So Jorge, you were first in, by your early insistence that you had something you wanted to ask Danielle. So these are clarifying questions, please. And if it is not a clarifying question, Jorge, you will hold off. Thank you for that.

MR. RENAUD: Yes.

MR. TRAVIS: So who has a clarifying question? That is the first category here. Heather, yes? Okay. Heather is the first in with a clarifying question. And
then, we will see if there are others.

MS. RICE-MINUS: Thank you, Danielle. I really enjoyed your paper. Just a clarifying question, in terms of how you feel the principle of association relates or doesn't relate to, like, principles of restorative justice.

MS. ALLEN: Thanks. No, that's --

MR. TRAVIS: Good question.

MS. ALLEN: Am I supposed to wait?

MR. TRAVIS: No. You do. Yes.

MS. ALLEN: Okay.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes.

MS. ALLEN: No. It is -- it is a version of restorative justice, without any question. So I absolutely am building on that tradition. And I think the reason I wanted to call out the principle of association as a way of really capturing what is at the core of that, is because I think it really -- it makes the link between health and sociality which, I think, you don't get to with restorative justice.

With restorative justice, one focuses really on the, you know, specific place where the offense happened, and the need for restoration there. Whereas, I think the principle of association is saying something very deep about the relationship between social ties and social
relations and health. And that is what I wanted to call out.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. Great. Final call for any clarifying questions before we open it up?

(No response.)

MR. TRAVIS: Okay. Seeing none, now, Jorge. You have a way to get the conversation started.

MR. RENAUD: Yes.

MR. TRAVIS: Triggered in part by Danielle's paper, but -- wherever you want to take it. Go ahead.

MR. RENAUD: No. It would be totally on her paper. Thank you so much, Dr. Allen, for your paper. It so much clarified and shed light on a lot of the things that I have actually thought about.

To be more specific, I have given a lot of thought to the rites of passage theory, right. How it relates to individuals who have been incarcerated, right. And of course, the tripartite foundation, the separation, liminality, and incorporation.

And I have always thought that -- of course, I met Shadd Maruna. And in the context of studying his book, reentry as a rite of passage.

And he talks a lot about the status degradation ceremonies. Of course, right, where we all stand before the Judge. And the Judge says, you are hereby remanded to
the custody of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, in my case.

You are -- you stand before the panoply of the power of the state. And then you go in, of course, and you assume the identity, the sort of stasis. Right. And you know you will get out someday. You might be human.

And there is nothing at all, no ceremony whatsoever to welcome you back to society. And that is a lifelong process, pretty well, right. You hear people sometimes say, oh well, any sentence is a life sentence. And in a way it is, because of the way that we are ostracized.

One of the things that he recommends, of course, is some sort of ceremonies of return. So I do want to comment on your thing about shared positives. That process has been so perverted that in many states, many people coming out of prison, or many people with just a criminal conviction are prevented from associating with other individuals who are on supervision, under the penalty of incarceration.

This is real. Two years ago, there were 64,000 people incarcerated for technical violations. Many of those just hanging out with someone else with a criminal history.

I would like to know if you have thought of, or
anyone else here has thought of -- all of the studies that I see on what works, or whatever, focus on the needs, on the negatives associated with being [audio skip] -- what this person did not have. I have yet to see a study look at the positives, of the 70 percent of individuals who get out and stay out. And they have been able to create those ceremonies for themselves.

Have they been able to somehow find a way to find that positive within themselves? Because this is difficult work. I have been out twelve years, and I still struggle. I struggle quite a bit with substance abuse. I struggle quite a bit with PTSD.

And this is real. The idea that I am somewhat other. That no matter the position I achieve in this society, I am always going to be that person that has been assigned to a cage for 27 years.

So I would like to know if you all have actually thought of that. Thank you.

MR. TRAVIS: So let's get a couple of other questions into the mix. And then ask Danielle to respond to them. And she asked to be called Danielle, in the chat box. I will just say that. I appreciate the modesty.

Others who want to join in here. Jorge, any conversation that starts by citing Shadd Maruna is a good one, from my point of view. Chas, go ahead.
MR. MOORE: Yes. You know, I think this is always very interesting to me, when we talk about healing for people that cause harm. Right. And I think that is something that you highlighted, that I think is very important.

Yes, we want to make sure that the victims of “crime and harm” are taken care of. But we also have to understand that the people that cause the harm also deserve the right to be healed, as well.

And I think -- and maybe I have a question for you all, for the group. Is -- like, how do we get this mass mobilization around the idea that like, literally, like one crime is not greater than the other, right.

Like, when we talk about criminal justice reform now, at least in Texas -- I don’t know what people are doing around the country. But I know in Texas you know, we may decrim marijuana, you know, by a certain amount. We may, like, you know, loosen the reins on certain non-violent offenses, right.

But when it comes to violent offenses, when it comes to sexual assault offenses, those still seem to be areas for society that we haven't quite been able to -- just to let that tension go, if that makes sense, right.

I will give you a prime example. And by no means am I, like, advocating for this group of people.
But people that commit heinous crimes against kids, you know, they have a very very difficult situation when it comes to finding housing, right. Because they can't live so far in certain proximity with them.

So it's just like -- like how do we make sure or is it even possible to make sure we can include everybody in that process, right. Or, in your opinion, is there some crimes that these people are not -- right, like they are not afforded the right to return. Right?

It is like exile forever. Right. Like, go to space. You cannot go to the next county over, or the next state, and be redeemed.

Because, and maybe this is my own -- which is uncommon for a Capricorn, right. We are not typically optimistic people. But I still believe that we can get to a point to where we see the humanity in all. And that includes the people that cause the most harm, right.

VOICE: Yes.

MR. MOORE: And by all means, for the people watching, I am not advocating that, you know --

MR. TRAVIS: But you are articulating a stress test for the principle of association.

MR. MOORE: I think that is right. Yes.

MR. TRAVIS: And you know, Bruce had different stress tests, due to poverty and race. But you know,
these principles have to undergo stress tests. And that is what you are doing so perfectly. So the queue now is Kimá, then David Garland, Aisha, and Aswad.

MS. TAYLOR: Thank you. Danielle, I want to thank you for the paper. And I really love the frame that human health depends on human healthy connection and relationship. Because I have talked about my issues with the health care system. And it allows us to rip that apart and bring it together as a broader holding system.

So but I guess my question is, really, how to get people on board with that. So you know, talking about current events, we have heard about these mass sterilizations in Georgia, which break my heart. Like there are -- we -- a healing connection -- outside of alienation, we are in a space where people will take people out.

It is not even having you go away for your second chance. Like, eugenics. Like kill you, right. And think you are so less than, and not worthy, that they can't even see you as worthy of a human connection.

And how do we get those disparate folks to the table to even talk about this broader principle of association. Which is a question, and I apologize, but --

MR. TRAVIS: No apology. Great question. How does this become operationalized? David Garland is next,
and then Aisha.

You are on mute, David.

(No response.)

MR. TRAVIS: David, you are still on mute.

MR. GARLAND: How is that?

MR. TRAVIS: There you go.

MR. GARLAND: Okay. Perfect. So I really enjoyed this. And I was thinking about how one could use these broad ideas, alienation, and association to think about America in a comparative context. And to ask, what is it that makes the USA distinctive, compared with other places.

And so, it occurs to me that all penal systems of all societies operate with some combination of what you would call alienation and association. So they employ mechanisms of exclusion: ways of killing people, expelling them, incapacitating them. But they also employ mechanisms in inclusion, so ways of reintegrating, resettling and rehabilitating.

And countries vary in terms of the mix. And they probably explain to themselves that mix partly in terms of justice, which is the value you put front and center. But also in terms of other considerations. Considerations like dangerousness and enmity, or a fellow feeling in solidarity, or shared citizenship as opposed to
a dangerous class.

And I was thinking about an example that really struck me at the time, which was about Norway. Which of course, is at the other end of spectrum from the USA in terms of being much more solidaristic, having an incarceration rate less a tenth of the American one.

And back in 2011, Norway's kind of self-conception as a free society, a humane one, was really challenged by the crime of Anders Breivik who murdered 77 people, many of them young people, teenagers, government officials as well. And there was a huge debate broke out in Norwegian society.

And to everyone's astonishment, looking from the USA, or looking from Britain, people were demonstrating in the streets. Not to have Breivik put to death or locked up for life without parole, but to ensure that he wouldn't undermine Norway's principles of leniency and compassion and fellow feeling and solidarity.

And in fact, what happened, of course, was that he was sentenced, not to death, or life imprisonment without parole, but sentenced to 21 years in prison, in a prison which is very humane. Conditions which are very good. You know, far in excess of anything that America ever provides.

And at the time, Nils Christie, a radical
progressive criminologist in Oslo, wrote that Breivik should be considered not some monster, not some evil monstrous character -- although of course, his acts were evil. But rather, as one of us. That was the phrase he uses.

A Norwegian, a fellow human. A person for whom you should have hope and compassion as well as blame and anger. And it occurred to me, you know, that that conversation by the politicians, by the Norwegian people, by criminologists would just be unimaginable in the USA.

Because of course, the USA is entirely the other extreme. It is all about, or nearly all about exclusion and offramps. And very little in the way of capacity for reentering or resettling or re-inclusion after we exclude so many people.

And it occurs to me, and I wonder what you think about this, Danielle, that what we are really talking about here is less to do with principles of justice and more to do with relations of solidarity, and the lack thereof. And that basically, what characterizes criminal justice in this country is the same as what characterizes, you know, our social policy, more generally, our welfare state, such as it is, more generally.

Which is to say, our real lack of fellow
feeling that stretches across racial or ethnic or religious or regional divides. And it seems to me that until such time as we think about these issues, which of course, in Norway are produced and reproduced through the welfare state and so with democracy and so on, our notions of justice will actually be constantly undermined by the sense of who are the people we are dealing with, and how do we relate to them.

MR. TRAVIS: Thanks, David. A good comparative framing of this discussion. And I appreciate that Danielle also brought in the European points of reference to this.

I am going to call on Aisha next. And then, I think, let me tell you who is in the queue. Aswad, Elizabeth, Marcia, Kristian, and Dona.

And I want to just give you, Danielle, an opportunity for just a quick -- so many things are coming at you. It is sort of unfair to ask you to respond to all of them at the end.

So we will take a little break from the queue just to ask you to give -- so that you can order your thoughts in any way you would like to. Then, we will hear from some more people. And then, come back to you again.

Aisha, you are up next.

MS. MCWEAY: Thanks, Jeremy. I will not come
at you, Danielle. These are just questions that I --

MR. TRAVIS: We are not coming at you. We are
with you.

MS. MCWEAY: I am joking. I am joking. But so
I -- in reading this paper, I sort of had three maybe
really different thoughts that kind of came together. And
I will try to get through them really quickly.

First, I think the concept that you laid out
around a principle of alienation versus the principle of
association in the frame of a Square One, right. How do
we get to Square One requires that folks understand and
acknowledge that that exists, right. And I think there is
such a hesitancy to acknowledge this principle of
alienation at all, in certain spaces.

What I appreciated about the paper was that you
talked about it in the context of education and health
care, and then, this sort of amorphous, ambiguous term,
which is justice, right. My perspective is that justice
in this country is really defined by retribution and
alienation.

And so, when you used the principle of
alienation, I was like, boom. She hit it. That is -- I
am in love. I am with this, right.

And so, I think that tied back to the point
that Chas was making when he was speaking. All of that
presumes a fundamental -- or asks a fundamental question about how we see the world. And I think, as a country, we have accepted that there are good people and there are bad people.

In a lot of ways, it is an oversimplified approach. And so, when Chas asks the question about are there different crimes that we sort of just alienate, I think that ties back to who we determine is redeemable.

Who do we determine is good, inherently good, and inherently bad? So worth the work, or worthy of justice. And I think until we wrestle with that as a fundamental piece of how we structure this country for all the reasons why that alienation exists for folks, we can't really have a square one.

And then, the last piece that I thought about, when I was trying to sort through all of these concepts was really this idea that the alienation isn't just in time back. It is not just in locking someone in a cage, which absolutely is an example.

And what Jorge exemplified, there are so many consequences to that. They are so -- every social structure in our country, there is an element of this principle of alienation and this principle of association.

And so, when we talk about sort of the recurring theme, we talk about going to square one, you
cannot -- I don't think you can do those separately, right. And you have to embrace and identify that this is a real concept in all of those areas, before you even begin to come up with a plan to address it.

I don't have the solutions, but I just wanted to say, I really, like, had a lot of thoughts. And my brain is spinning.

MR. TRAVIS: Great. Well, we are all having that experience, Aisha. Thank you for naming it.

So, Danielle, just any reactions you would like to offer to what you have heard so far from other members of the roundtable. And then, we will go back to the queue which starts next with Aswad.

MS. ALLEN: Well, the first thing I want to say is, over the course of these roundtable sessions, I have been so impressed by every single speaker. The clarity of their arguments, and their responses to questions.

But I am even more impressed now, because now I understand how hard it is to have so many things coming in, and to try to order one's thoughts. So thank you for all of those remarkable contributions.

I do think there is a really important throughline all the way through the questions, which is about solidarity. And going back to Jorge's question, I mean, there is the issue of reentry rituals that give
people back solidarity. But I would also say, there is
the question of throughout the entire system of penalty,
what would it look like for the rituals of a trial to, in
fact, express solidarity, right?

I mean, what would -- how would we redesign
that organizational practice to in, fact, embody
solidarity. And I mean, I think the hard question you are
all asking is something like this.

Okay, Danielle. It is all well and good to go
institution-by-institution and sketch out what a
solidaristic organizational redesign would look like. And
it is great that we have some examples in Norway and
Germany that we can draw on to help us sketch those.

But at the end of the day, in order to actually
bring those into place, people have to want those
solidaristic organizational designs. And it looks like we
have all around us a culture that has kind of cathected on
alienation.

So how do you address a societal cathexis in
order to open up the possibility of people connecting and
embracing the principle of association. And so, there, it
is -- I think there are sort of two poles of argument.

And I guess I would love to have this
conversation, because I am not altogether sure what I
think of these poles of argument, or how to put them
together. There is one pole of argument which is about our moral imagination. And then, there is also -- there is another pole of argument which is about political pressure and power, and institutional design.

    And I suspect these two things need to go together. And I think the struggle is to figure out how to put them together.

    So if you take Black Lives Matter as an example, it is both a kind of renovation of our moral imagination. And I think it is -- the slogan, the movement has done really good work to turn attention to the question of how we matter to one another, right.

    But it hasn't been taken through the path, or the idea of, well, I am going to convince you that we all matter to each other, right. We don't have to argue our way into feeling that we matter to one another.

    And so, you know, as a sort of pressure politics, Black Lives Matter has asked for the real organizational designs that would count as showing a mattering regardless of how people feel about it. Right.

    And so, there is sort of that regard. Slightly, grabbing the feeling -- the real feeling where it comes to exist, where they can, but also a way to hopscotch over it through pressure politics.

    And I am not sure there is anything wrong with
that. That is, I am not sure we do actually need
everybody to feel the full range of fellow feeling, if we
can start to begin to get people to actually use
organizational designs, which themselves will drive some
cultural changes.

And just to give you one, like, last example of
that. I do think [audio skip] pay attention to how
incentive systems structure culture, too. So it is not --
it is not just always culture to organization. Incentive
structures affect culture.

So I am a big advocate of rank choice voting.
You know, so people vote first choice, second choice,
third choice. It is kind of like instant runoff in the
voting procedure.

Your first-choice person doesn't get enough
votes, your vote rolls down to your second-choice person.
And there are many interesting effects of this. I mean,
it does open up more opportunity for minorities and women,
for example, to succeed in winning office.

But it also changes campaigning. So if you are
in a ranked choice election, you know, you don't want to
demonize your opponent, because you actually want to be
the second choice for your opponent's voters. And so
actually, campaigning becomes a more positive proactive
space of seeking solutions and not demonizing people.
Right.

Like, nobody, you know, goes out and says, let's have ranked choice voting so we can change our culture. But actually, that little mechanism incentive structure change does have a cultural impact. So that is where I have some hope, that if you could actually get some organizational redesigns in, and do some culture work, you sort of start to get a new dynamic going.

But I mean, I want to concede that it is a massive lift. And we are talking about a pretty wholesale cultural transformation.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. Great. Something you said earlier on was -- is that the democracy reform agenda is central to the justice reform agenda.

Which is, you know, the interplay between those two, and the sequencing of those two. And how do you change culture, one of the biggest questions that we can face.

MS. ALLEN: Can I say one more thing, actually?

MR. TRAVIS: Please. Yes.

MS. ALLEN: So there was another important theme in the comments that I haven't addressed, and I don't want to leave unaddressed --

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. Please.

MS. ALLEN: -- which is the question of violent
offenses, and violent offenders. And what it means to have fellow feeling also for violent offenders. And I do think that that is a really huge issue. And I do think that that too -- I mean, so I think the Norway example from David is perfect, and a great example for how we could frame up a conversation.

But I think it is also important to say out loud, I mean just sort of, you know, in my book about my cousin's incarceration, when I argue for restorative justice for him, I thought he should have had a restorative justice. I often would get like from audiences the question about, well, what about the victim. What about the victim. Like, doesn't the victim want retribution? And it is like they would have missed the fact that the other sort of big part of the story in the book is that my cousin was killed, right. So like, I am a victim, you know. And I was like, and I don't need retribution.

And so I do feel as if it is really important to find, you know, people, you know, who have been on both sides of the relationship, and can stand up and say, you know, I get -- I do get the pain. But I don't need retribution. And I want to see the person who did this wrong heal. You know. That is what I want to see.

MR. TRAVIS: Okay. So we are moving right
along here. The queue now is Aswad and then Elizabeth, then Marcia.

And this is the time to let me know if you want to be in before we close it out. Because my guess is that we will close it out fairly soon. So if you have something that you want to add, go ahead. Aswad, you are up.

MR. THOMAS: Awesome. Thanks. It is a good segue to just kind of talk about some of my observations from the article.

First, I think that we, you know, actually as we are looking at criminal justice, what we often forget is, you know, what happened to an individual before they came in contact with the justice system. And in this country, we know for -- you know, for decades, that there hasn't been an infrastructure into the needs of crime victims in communities.

And so, in the article, I think, it is a great article. I want to just highlight an area where I think there is a gap, also an area of improvement as well, as part of the case life cycle. So violence prevention and, you know, what is missing from the article is victim services.

And so, victim services is a key part of the criminal justice system. We know that, you know, even in
2018, there have been over 12 million crime victims in the country.

And we know from a survey that was released last week that only one in three victims report ever receive any assistance from victim service. And the majority of those victims that receive support, they came from friends and family, or they came from their local church, or it came from community-based organizations, not law enforcement.

And you know, as a way to kind of redesign and also lift up, you know, reform efforts of really investing in the infrastructure for victim services. You know, the need for more counseling, the need for more therapy.

We know that, you know, even in the past seven years, there have been about $13 billion that have came from the federal government into states across the country for organizations that serve and work with crime victims. We know that, you know, especially from the work that I have been doing across the country, that majority of community-based organizations haven't even heard of those funding opportunities.

And also, this is a federal grant. So you think of those organizations, you know, that are on the front lines, the violence intervention groups. You know, they will have a grant writer to go after federal grants.
And so, you know, being able to really invest in victim services that really address the mental health treatment that survivors need. Also, to think about housing and relocation. So I would love to see the importance of that in the article -- you know, really bucketing out victim services.

MR. TRAVIS: Thank you. Thanks, Aswad. Liz.

MS. HINTON: Hi everyone. Danielle, thank you so much for this paper. It has been such a treat for me to be able to sit here with you at this roundtable for these past few months. So thank you for your contributions and for your work.

In some ways, picking up on what Aswad was just saying about federal grants, this probably won't come as a surprise to my fellow roundtable participants who read my work on this, and anybody out there who is familiar with my work. I was really interested in your comments at the end about federalism. And I want, you know, all of us to think about, in returning to square one, you know, what should the role of the federal government be.

Danielle, I agree with you that in privileging the principle of association, which we should, that it needs to be a ground-up effort. And that perhaps, as we are reimagining criminal justice, and as, you know, if starting from square one, the square one should not be at
the top, but should be at the bottom.

At the same time, I guess, you know, like what then -- where does that leave us with the federal government, perhaps beyond giving resources to groups and to states and local governments? In thinking about the federal government's role historically, you know, we can't just throw it out, in part, because it has been so central to dismantling various forms of racial oppression.

And that, it has a track record of abolition. And that, it has a track record of abolition.

So of course, it took federal action to end slavery.

Federal interventions to help secure the successes of Reconstruction from Black education, independent institutions, businesses. Desegregation, affirmative action.

But then, it is also true that every time, following each of these interventions, when citizenship rights are extended, we get usually new forms of oppression. New criminal laws, new forms of confinement. New segregationist and exclusionary regimes.

So you know, on the one hand it is -- it is clear the federal government might be really important in bringing about a kind of structural intervention. And you know, it did on the other side, right, with the rise of the carceral state, the security surveillance state beginning in the 1960s.
And the federal government has also, in the realm of crime control, demonstrated that it can implement some of these local programs nationally in really successful ways, depending on your measure of success, right. So it takes zero tolerance, broken windows, these kinds of policing programs from New York and Chicago, and then implement them nationally in the 1974 crime bill.

Many of you know all this. I guess, this is just to encourage us all to think about -- yes, you know, these are -- I think the vision that many of us have been talking about over these past few weeks, but your paper points to, Danielle, is that, you know, true meaningful change is going to come from the ground up.

But then, what is the role of the national state? And what is the role of state and local governments.

Right now, you know, so much of the most promising and progressive programs and visions for a different kind of approach to justice and public safety, you know, are not coming from state programs. They are coming from grassroots organizations. So moving forward, what is the role of the state in that?

MR. TRAVIS: Great. So we have a queue that has seven people on it. Do the math. We want to be done with this section in maybe 15, 18 minutes. And we want to
give Danielle time to respond briefly.

So just -- you hear what I am saying? Just as succinct as you can be with the points you want to make, so we can get -- there is a ninth person -- we get one more in, get one more session in before we come back to Danielle.

So next we have Marcia, then Kristian, then Dona, then Courtney. And then there are others after that.

But let's hear from Marcia.

MS. RINCON-GALLARDO: Good afternoon, everyone.

Danielle, thank you so much for, you know, your presentation and, you know, the opportunity to read your paper, which was brilliant.

As I was reading it, and listening to you today, you really make me think a lot about settler colonialism, and the way in we’re -- the terminology we are using really made me think a lot about, you know, who was this justice, “justice system” developed for? Whose benefit was it for, at its most early, early onset in this hemisphere.

And I don't stay just with the United States. Because to stay with just the United States, we remove a whole group of people that have moved into the United States, whose history starts before 1600. And so, I start
with the whole -- you know, this whole continent. And I think a lot about sort of this individualism versus collectivism.

Because when you think about the early onset of this justice system, it had very strong Puritan values that were contrary to the original peoples, the First Nations’ values around community and collectivism, as opposed to individualism. So if someone committed some level of offense, it wasn't considered as an individual offense.

It was, what is happening in our collective that is allowing for this to happen. And the way in which it was responded to was in a collective response, as opposed to an -- we are going to get you, and we are going to put you here.

So you know, there wasn't prison. There wasn't cages for our peoples. And exile was the absolute last resort. There were a lot of other things that were done prior to exile.

And so, it made me really consider all of those things. Especially as we think about this notion of, you know, innovation, and what is the imagination, you know, for our new way of doing things. And there is just really beautiful ways in which our tribal nations are responding.

They have really -- you know, a lot of nations
developed the western approach, unfortunately. But others, especially, with the Elders, have come back to restoring their traditional approaches, which are absolutely beautiful.

MS. HUFFMAN: Great.

MS. RINCON-GALLARDO: And so, there is a way in which we need to remember that there are ways in which we need and want to respond, especially communities that are leaning more towards tradition. And that we need to look at those approaches, as well as maybe outside approaches.

But collectively, there are ways in which there is rich ways of responding to, how do we want to imagine our justice systems. And last but not least --

MR. TRAVIS: Great.

MS. RINCON-GALLARDO: It is this locus of responsibility is, in this country, left with the individual for an offense. As opposed to, what is the collective community response to individuals committing offenses.

And it makes me think about how OJJDP federal government goes to nations and consults with them before even designing how to respond. They are the only ones that they go to, to consult with, before even coming up with designs of how [audio skip] and such.

And I am thinking to myself, wow. That is
really beautiful. How come that doesn't happen all over this country? You know, that they actually consult with community before they even design these large appropriations.

MR. TRAVIS: Great.

MS. RINCON-GALLARDO: Anyway, those were a few thoughts.

MR. TRAVIS: Thank you. Thank you. Moving to Kristian, then Dona.

MS. CABALLERO: Yes. Thank you. I really appreciate this paper and everybody's comments so far. It definitely inspired me to speak up.

One thing that I definitely appreciate about the paper is showing the emphasis of how our culture is heavily influenced by the principle of alienation and how heavily ingrained that is. And how we use that as justification to continue to exploit and abuse, you know, people, and also push them into a category of second-class citizens.

But I think one of the things that I have been thinking about the past few weeks, after all of our discussions is, if we are trying to reimagine, you know, these systems, whether it is the criminal justice system, the housing, health care, so forth. I think one of the things that is problematic in relation to alienation is
our hierarchical structures.

You know, our economic and social status, and using that as justification to continue exclusionary practices, and discriminatory practices, and so forth. I think that whatever new social contract we envision, we need to completely eliminate that social and economic structure as it currently exists.

And stop using that as justification of treating people less than, and reducing them, and dehumanizing them, because that is a huge part of the problem. And we are not really going to see a paradigm or a cultural shift until we start addressing that head on.

So I think I will just leave it there briefly, and short.

MR. TRAVIS: Thank you.

MS. CABALLERO: I know there is a lot of other speakers, but I just wanted to emphasize that.

MR. TRAVIS: That’s very, very helpful. Thank you, Kristian. Dona.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes. So Danielle, I really really love the framework of association. I think it is super powerful. It is consistent with the concerns of a lot of other scholars articulating the atrophy of our civic institutions.

And the connection -- this connection between
the power of association and justice and democratic reform
is what personally motivated me to devote decades to civic
engagement, to community organizing, ultimately to run for
my local school board.

So, the next statement I am going to make is, I
guess, a provocative statement. And that is, what I
personally realized over these many years, which also
happened to collide with my -- with childbearing for me.
I have two kids. And my identity as a neuroscientist who
studies consciousness -- is that the focus of the shift in
collective consciousness, I think, has to fundamentally be
through parenting.

And the question is, I mean, I think for all of
us, whether we are willing to admit that, at some level
that is really actually crucial. And then, how do we
operationalize that?

MR. TRAVIS: Thank you. Great, that gives us
something to think about. Courtney is next, and then,
Deanna.

MS. HOLDSWORTH: Thank you, Danielle, for the
paper. As everybody said, it is fantastic. Lots to think
about. I am going to try not to repeat what other people
were saying.

One of the things that really sort of struck
me, or really -- that I was thinking about is that our
values as a country, this sort of moral imagination and how that wavers and wanes and looks really differently all of the time.

And so, when I thought about Square One, I started to think about, in what ways have we continued to lean on our Constitution without revising, going back to it, and really treating it like a democratic, or a part of our democracy, versus this sort of piece of paper that holds us bound in a particular place. So how might we use the Constitution and look at the 13th Amendment and how it is worded? And the way in which it continues to place people in servitude and place people in enslavement.

Like, how do we go back to reconsider life, liberty, and the pursuit of happy -- like, how do we really start to reimagine who we are as Americans?

MR. TRAVIS: Another great provocation, just to think about. Deanna next, and then, Ananya.

MS. VAN BUREN: Thanks, Jeremy. Thank you, Danielle, for this paper. It is really powerful for me, actually. The principle of association, I think, is actually more of what we are doing in my organization, if I rethink it.

I go back to your question you asked us. Does a constructed vision exist in a coalesced way? I couldn't stop -- because I don't know of one.
But I wanted to -- thought, maybe a smaller example is what is happening in LA County with the Justice LA Coalition. Like, a broad-based coalition of community organizers that stopped the $3.5 billion bond measure, and then worked with the government to create alternatives to incarceration. A working plan with a roadmap.

And they had a kind of constructed vision. We are helping them with the implementation, but I am so inspired by that. And I think it is an example of what you are talking about. Maybe I am wrong, but please let me know.

But that is -- I am a solutionary. Right. So I want to talk about solutions. And this feels like a really good one.

MR. TRAVIS: Ananya.

MS. ROY: Hi everyone. Danielle, thank you so much for this paper. So I have one comment and one question.

The comment takes me back to the start of your presentation today, and the conversation with Bruce, where you centered U.S. empire. And the comment is that it is absolutely crucial, I think, for us to do that, if we are to think about a different world of justice and freedom.

And that in addition to the afterlives of slavery and ongoing settler logics, what we have in the
United States is this scene of endless war making, both abroad and at home, always entangled. And the forced sterilizations that Kimá mentioned are a part of the ways in which empire turns humanity disposable, without consequences.

So I think that piece of it is really crucial.

The question is this: I am curious to know as a political philosopher which genealogies of association inspire you. And this, of course, connects to thinking about what might lie ahead.

So there is, of course, a genealogy of association that runs through liberal thought, where association, political society, is really about the protection of property, and the protection of a particular notion of freedom of propertied men.

But there are also genealogies of association that run through abolitionist thought. What Du Bois would call abolition democracy through Black fugitivity, through Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination.

So those are very capacious and very different from the principles of association, say, that run through liberalism. So I would love to hear a bit more on the genealogies you have on your mind.

MR. TRAVIS: We'll put a pin in that one. That sounds pretty fundamental. We will come back to you in a
second, Danielle.

Here is what we are going to do, before we see what questions we have from the outside world. We are going to hear from Emily, and Vivian, and Lynda. And then ask Danielle to, in whatever order you want to, say whatever you would like to say in response to these observations.

And then, we are just going to leave you alone for the next year to write another paper. Because we have gotten so much raw material to work on in continuing this line of inquiry.

Emily.

MS. WANG: Danielle, I think this is a beautiful paper. And for me, it really sparked a lot of ideas.

And part of what I am thinking about is that we are living kind of in a pandemic, in COVID, where we actually are seeing kind of the numbers of people in jails go down. You know, a difference in kind of prison and jail populations, and also the inability for kind of our healthcare, housing infrastructures to really support those that are coming home and remaining home.

And so, you know, for me, when I think about the conversations that we have been having, and going to a square one, in the table, which I thought was really
helpful, you know, really pragmatic -- shows kind of what
you mean by the principle of alienation, and the principle
of association.

I would almost love to see a different column
there, of like, where do these other healthcare
structures, social system structures, educational
structures -- they are part of this Square One kind of
notion, according to the principle of association. And
that to me, seems like a critical piece that could be
expanded upon.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. I also love that table. It
just made it very real. And it would be a great
whiteboard exercise to sort of expand it and look at other
-- the other sectors that we have talked about in the
roundtable.

We will hear next from Vivian, and then Lynda.
And then, unless there is an urgent wave, we will come
back to Danielle. And then we will see what questions we
have from our observers in the outside world.

Vivian.

MS. NIXON: Thank you, Jeremy. Danielle, I
really love this paper. I loved all the papers, and I
loved them all for the same reason: because they really
challenge me to be a little bit more optimistic.

And [audio skip] thoughtful, very organized,
and structured. And yes, it makes sense that if we switch to this principle of association and put some of these practices in place that embrace that idea, we can definitely reinvent what we now see as our justice system.

And here is where I continue to get stuck, after every good idea. Because every good idea leaves me hopeful.

And Ananya kind of hinted at this, is that in the midst of that hopefulness, I am remembering that despite the connections to a world in which prisons were not the response to crime, when alienation and the ability to go somewhere else and restart a life, or exile to another place -- all of these things existed before prisons. I understand all that.

And I understand that the way society has occupied all of the territory have made another model necessary. But also things that made the very specific American model necessary. And the U.S. model is also rooted in very specific traditions, like chattel slavery and capitalism.

And the reasons we hold onto it so dearly and are so unwilling to release it are all tied to those things. And the more we see a -- and Elizabeth hinted at this. Every time we see a move to try to move away from it, we [audio skip] against that ingrained, you know,
ideology of white supremacy that just doesn't want to yield.

It fights back every time. And it fights back with such vitriol that it is literally frightening. I am paying attention to what is going on in the world, right. And that is where I get stuck.

So how do we have these really thoughtful ideas and conversations and never forget that. And try to incorporate how do you convince people who don't want to give up this thing that has very little to do with wanting to release this destructive thought pattern that keeps us stuck where we are, without having serious conversations about -- they probably won't give it up voluntarily.

This is about power, and somebody has going to have to force a group of people to do stuff they don't want to do. And that is just where I am landing. And so, that is where I get stuck on a lot of these papers.

But everything that you said makes sense. I was -- I learned a lot. I want to continue to learn more.

But I want us to never forget what we are up against in terms of the particular reasons we have the system we have in America. And who it impacts, and why.

MR. TRAVIS: So I am going to exercise the facilitator's prerogative to mix things up a little bit. And Lynda, I hope you will understand.
But I want to throw into the mix a question from one of our colleagues in the outside world. And some of you may know Sebastian Johnson who works with me and Arnold Ventures. And he has written up essays on each of the roundtable experiences in the past and will write something about this one.

So he sends in this question: The paradigm of alienation from society, social death, is deeply aligned with the identity of Blackness and anti-Blackness as an organizing principle. Is it possible to embed a different relational paradigm within our social contract, other than that between a social life and social death?

I.e., I am going to get back there, citizen versus slave, Blackness versus anti-Blackness. And one of the, you know, for me, most provocative, and I have looked at three of those observations in your paper, Danielle, that you highlighted in your opening statement was both exploring the relationship between and the difference between alienation and the legacy of slavery and white supremacy.

And the Square One project has focused a lot on that as being so foundational. I don't think you disagree with that. But you put a different framing around it. So could you just give us a deeper thought about that -- your observation and Vivian's question, and Sebastian's
question.

MS. ALLEN: All right. So it is over to me, now?

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. Just for this one. And then I'm going to come back to you, because I want to get Lynda in the mix, in a second.

MS. ALLEN: Right.

MR. TRAVIS: But it is just on the question of race and association, and race and alienation.

MS. ALLEN: If it is possible for me to go ahead and just take the whole pasture of questions, that would be great. Because I do think they are all connected to this.

MR. TRAVIS: Okay. Then, in that case, Lynda. What would you like Danielle to -- what are your observations on Danielle's paper. Then, we will turn it over to Danielle.

MS. ZELLER: So thank you, Danielle. I think that this paper provides a really helpful framework for illuminating some of the fractures in all the aspects of our social contract we have been talking about for weeks. In particular, if you look at association or disassociation from education. We have heard about that from health care, from communities.

This allows us a really great way to have those
tough conversations Vivian was talking about, related to the realities of inequity, and inequitable treatment that have resulted in mass incarceration, whether you are talking about the over-representation of the mentally ill, people with addiction, races. I think it is a really helpful framework to talk about the degree of inclusion or association in those systems of various people, or alienation from them.

So it could be a helpful, unifying framework for discussion related to the aspects of the social contract that impact justice, not just justice itself.

Thank you.

MS. ALLEN: All right.

MR. TRAVIS: So Danielle, the floor is yours. And then, we’ll -- I have one more question from the outside world. But let's give you the chance to react to everything you have heard.

MS. ALLEN: Okay. No. This is really extraordinary. And I am just so grateful to have you all as readers, and to have your charitable and incredibly imaginative and powerful engagement with my arguments here.

So I think to frame this response, I want to start by saying something about division of labor. Roles, the different kinds of roles that are relevant to the work
we are doing together.

So to some extent as I have been speaking, I have been using three different roles. There is the role of political philosopher. There is the role of policy developer. And then, there is the role of, say, political strategist. I have used that role somewhat less than the other roles.

And so, I am going to kind of ring the changes on those three roles. Because to some extent, what we are talking about is how the different kinds of work fit together.

So the role of the political philosopher, for example, is about getting back to our foundational concepts, giving us stuff to work with, to rebuild. And then the role of the policy implementators, making it concrete or real. And the political strategist is about, how do you actually drive change in this mix?

The reason I go in this way is because, you know, Ananya's question about genealogy is really a question about the work of the political philosopher. But the questions of race start there, because our philosophical traditions themselves are racially structured.

And you know, sometimes it is like a crazy thing to think that the kind of, you know, driving change
in the world that we actually experience with racism as a real phenomenon has anything to do with the world of political philosophy. But actually, I think they are deeply related.

So because our entirely fluctuating inheritance has structures of racial domination built into it. So at the end of the day, we actually need a new theory of justice.

And I am not alone in working on this. I also commend of Melvin Rogers to you, Charles Mills, others. But I have, you know, a co-edited book that is out this month, called Difference Without Domination that I would commend to you. And I am about to send to press a book called Justice by Means of Democracy, which is a theory of justice that Ananya's question really is the vision coming out of the -- what I tend to call the minoritarian perspective.

So you sort of have the two genealogies. And yes, much of the vocabulary is the same as the vocabulary of liberalism. So there is a vocabulary of freedom, a vocabulary of [audio skip], a vocabulary of rights, a vocabulary of equality which falls out of liberalism in many ways, especially sort of, you know, liberal variance, a vocabulary of non-domination, which African American theorists, Indigenous theorists have kept alive all the
way through the 19th and 20th centuries, but which fell out of Anglo-American liberalism.

So we are in a moment where it is possible to reconstitute a theory of justice around a non-domination concept. And that is what I and others are working on. And in some sense, the principle of association is articulating that.

And so, in these books, I mean -- so I agree with everybody about the intersecting nature of these policy domains. And so, you know, there is a worked-out version around political economy and what it means to restructure political economy, and what it means to restructure membership and immigration and migration and things like that, to think about the global context.

So now, but that is like a whole lot of stuff to put inside a conversation about justice reform, right. And that is sort of, like, too much. I think we have enough on everybody's plates.

And so the luxury of being a political philosopher is that you can kind of travel at lightning speed across all these domains, and really imagine a kind of pretty thorough reworking of all of them. So that is where, from my point of view, to be a political philosopher, to do that honestly, you also have to be in the space of policy implementation, and the space of
political strategy, in order to figure out, like, you
know, what is the point in the sphere that actually makes
any of these things real, that starts to move these things
in this direction.

And so, to Deanna's point, yes. That roadmap
from LA sounds fantastic. I really, really want to see
it. And I would like to figure out, like, you know, how
to build on from that, or, you know, what I could learn
from that as a potential example.

And then, sort of in the space of policy, you
know, it is important to say that there are two, you
know -- there are kind of fundamental renovations that we
all collectively need. So we have let the concept of
federalism be coopted, given the meaning of let states do
their own thing.

I mean, that is not actually what the original
intention was, whether one cares about original intentions
or not. So their relevant concept should be about
harmonization.

So the real question is, like, what do we need
the federal government to do. To Elizabeth's point, there
have been places where the federal government has been
critical for the egalitarian project. And the job is to,
like, harmonize its role with what states are doing, what
you need at the kind of county and local level.
And so, there is a group of us who are trying

to imagine a different picture of federalism. And I think
there is like, a really basic thing, that we, like, all
know we need. But we don't actually kind of really
coalesce on working on it, which is putting like
consistent data across the whole country.

Like, we all know, like we can't get homicide
clearance rates across the country. We can't actually
figure out exactly who is being held where, under what
kinds of terms. We can't get consistent sort of data on
policing across the entire country.

Like, that data problem is like the numero uno
thing we need the federal government to solve. And from
my point of view, we should be putting all our energy to
driving that very specific policy change. Because it
would enable a lot of work at the state and local level,
if we could do that.

So then there is the political strategist
piece. And to Vivian's question, the sort of how do you
force a group of people to do stuff that they don't want
to do?

So for starters, you want to like try to shrink
that group to the smallest possible scale, right. So that
is where, like, the work of moral imagination and building
movements and building solidarity and forming alliances is
critical. Like, the more the merrier.

Like, you have got to get as many people on your side as absolutely possible, so that the folks who are going to have to be moved by new legal structures are the smallest number possible. And that is just politics. Like, it is just doing the work.

And so it is running for office. I loved the example from Dona, I think. Is that right? You said you ran for office. You said the answer is parenting. I say, the answer is running for office, people. Everybody in this conversation should be running for office.

So that is how I would sort of put the pieces together. And so, you know, to the question about race. There is a vision, in fact.

And that is what I was trying to describe: sort of a group of political philosophers who are working on a picture of how we build a constitution that is around the principles of non-domination. How we build all these areas of social policy around the principle of non-domination. It comes out of the genealogies Ananya was pointing to. And we can deliver that.

But in delivering it, it is a political project, frankly, at the end of the day. And it is not a silver bullet. And it is working across multiple dimensions simultaneously. So end of sermon.
MR. TRAVIS: Yes. Excellent. So we have one more question that I will sort of throw out to the group. It came in from one of our observers. Which is, how do we think -- we just talked about running for office.

We are in a political moment, where there are things happening in our country that is very hard to, obviously, predict the outcome of the election. But a heightened attention to political participation.

So how do we -- and you can help us here, Danielle, sort of think about the exercise of the franchise as being a form of association. And particularly, the decision by our state, to take a point that Aisha made -- I think it was Aisha -- to diminish the status of certain of us, in terms of their ability to exercise political power.

And I am very mindful of the 11th Circuit decision to disenfranchise many in Florida who have not paid their fines or fees. I was on the phone today with our executive session member Daryl Atkinson about his victory in North Carolina we hope will stick to reverse some of the actions by that state to remove people from the franchise.

But here we are. I would everyone to just -- anybody who wants to jump in, to think about, how does this principle of association fit with Danielle's
observation that democracy and democratic reform is central to justice reform? And the mobilization that is envisioned under that.

And I just would love to end our time together thinking about our democracy, and the social contract. Anyone have a thought on that?

Aisha.

MS. MCWEAY: Hate to be the person to end it. But so, I was just in a different session or discussion yesterday, with someone who does work in sort of, like, a bipartisan, you know, or allying. And I was thinking to myself, oh. That seems like a terrible job. And that is on a personal level.

And then, I really, like, spent all night thinking about how, like, that is like the prerequisite for this, for this conversation.

MR. TRAVIS: Right.

MS. MCWEAY: It is, like, what Vivian was just saying about -- and what Danielle was saying about shrinking that number. Like, there is no way we can shrink that number until we actually engage in democratic work which includes engaging folks who have really, really disparate beliefs and belief systems, or don't see the world in the way that we do.

And so, I think it is critical to reform,
because I think there are narratives even that the most progressive or liberal folks can tell themselves about why you don't engage. Myself included. Which ultimately allows us to not push that reform forward with folks we think it is not going to work with.

So I think it is critical, I think, as a core component. Hopefully, someone else can chime in.

MR. TRAVIS: Anyone else want to -- Hedy, want to add an observation?

MS. LEE: Yes. I mean, I also think the discussion of health was really compelling to me in the essay, and I think could be a way that we could have some buy-in, Aisha, potentially.

I mean, at least from a health demographer's perspective, millionaires in other countries, ones that David Garland mentioned, are way healthier than millionaires here. There is something about living here. There is something about the way that we interact and work together, or do not work together, that is hurting us all.

And I think that is the best way -- that is the only way to get at some strategizing. But I think once people recognize that no one is safe. No one is healthy in the way that things are set up, that we could have some movement, in some of those conversations. Even if it is
for selfish reasons.

MR. TRAVIS: So what does the mobilization look like. Kristian?

MS. CABALLERO: I guess, just to kind of touch on the democratic question and this ideal of how we can, you know, mobilize and change the political and social dynamic. Kind of going back to trying to change our social structure, as far as the hierarchy is concerned.

I think, well, number one, you know, we definitely need to change the campaign financing aspect and make that more equitable and more inclusive. Especially for people that don't have the resources and the means and the connections, the lucrative connections that could give them a leg up in any sort of political race.

But I think the more that we try to create a model that is horizontal, you know, where everybody is on even ground, and no one is taking advantage of their social and economic status. Because absolutely in the world of politics, especially the way our representation looks right now, that is exactly what is happening.

And so, I think we need to not be shy about re-envisioning and remodeling what leadership needs to look like. And I think the more horizontal it is, the more that we will see racial equity and racial representation.
in the picture.

MR. TRAVIS: So the Square One ambition is that the ideas that we generate at the roundtable and through the Executive Session resonate in the larger public so that there is a change in thinking, a change of language, a change of perspective. But ultimately, that things change.

And that power shifts and that the way we organize ourselves to respond when something goes wrong in society, in communities and families with individuals, that there is these -- there is a different way, a better way, a healthier way. A just way of organizing that response that will look totally different from what we have now.

So I am about to hand it over to Bruce to give us some final observations. But I first want to, just on a personal level, thank Danielle, first and foremost. I think we are all deeply, deeply indebted to you, Danielle. This paper was the perfect -- I will say it one more time, perfect -- ending to our time together. You have helped us.

We talked about the tapestry we are weaving. There it is. We can turn it around. Feel it. There are some missing pieces, of course.

MS. ALLEN: The only problem was I had to write
it at the beginning of this. I almost wish I could have
written it after I heard all the other papers.

    MR. TRAVIS: I have already said, we are giving
you a free time to now expand it into your next book. But
it has really helped us, in so many ways, to integrate
these ideas.

    The second thing I want to say is just to thank
you to all of the members of the roundtable for being so
generous with your participation, your thoughts, and your
openness. Your willingness to listen to each other and
engage in some very, very difficult, challenging, but
really, really important topics.

    So on behalf of the larger enterprise, I want
to say thank you. But to close out, I was trying to
think. What would be a perfect close before I turn it
over to Bruce.

    And you know, the Square One tagline is, the
hashtag rather is, #reimaginejustice. So that is what we
are all about, reimagining. So this is a project of
reimagination. And Danielle has taken us a big step in
that direction.

    So with your permission, Danielle, I am going
to read, as we close out, the second paragraph of your
paper. Everyone read it. But it is now, perfect.

    “Nor can one modify justice. We do not seek,”
and this is in air quotes, “healthy justice, or fair justice, or successful justice. Justice itself is simply all those things, if it is justice at all.” Boy, you have a way with words. Okay.

“That is, justice delivers well-being, supports healthy communities. It embodies and enacts principles of fairness. It successfully addresses the needs of all entangled in active wrongdoing; the victim” -- that was for you, Aswad -- “the victim, the wrongdoer, and the community.

“The word ‘justice’ itself, without modification, means all of these goals. Consequently, articulating the goals of a reform effort,” which is what we are doing, “in this domain of policy is harder” -- we know that -- “than in other substantive domains.”

“Nonetheless, such an articulation is critical to achieving alignment, an effort across the many constituencies pursuing reform. The right and fair administration of justice is the backbone of legitimacy for any state or political order.”

So can I hear amen? There we are. Thank you, Danielle.

Bruce, it is off to you.

(No response.)

MS. HUFFMAN:  Bruce, you are muted.
(Pause.)

MR. TRAVIS: You are still muted, Bruce.

MR. WESTERN: Okay.

MR. TRAVIS: There you go.

MR. WESTERN: What I just said was so profound.

And it was just to me, here in my office. This has been yet another extraordinarily rich discussion. And it’s really been quite an amazing process. And I am so grateful to every single participant who has just given so much to the conversation we have had over the last month.

Do you guys all remember back to our first meeting, where, really, the question on the table -- I think Jeremy posed this question as we did our introductions. And he was asking, you know, are you feeling optimistic or pessimistic?

And Vivian definitely, I think, sort of channeled that question that was initially posed in her comments. And in this whole discussion today, I think, we are sort of grappling with that. Do we, can we feel optimistic? Or are we pessimistic?

And Danielle's paper has given us a framework for wrestling with that question. And in this whole discussion, there are three major themes that I want to pick out.

And the first is the social solidarity that we
have talked about over the past hour or so, and over the
past month. You know, this is the opposite of alienation,
right, this social connectedness. And I think we have got
to be really thoughtful and intentional about what this
is.

We have got to be really specific about what
this social solidarity is. Because we are asking a
political process, and we are asking our institutions to
create it. And so, what is it? And I think people spoke
to this, in a very specific way. What is this social
solidarity?

And then David gave us the Norwegian example;
Nils Christie said of Anders Breivik, he is one of us. So
this social solidarity, at some level, is feeling like our
neighbors are one of us.

Aisha spoke about redeemability, right. If our
neighbors are redeemable, if they do something harmful,
and yet, we can imagine their redemption, then they are
part of our community. That is a way of thinking about
them being part of our community.

The health lens that Danielle introduced as a
way of thinking about human flourishing and connection, I
think, is also a way of thinking about this social
solidarity that joins us together. It is a social
product, this human flourishing.
And Heather spoke about this, and Kimá spoke about this, and Hedy did as well. And I think, when we talk about health, what I hear is, you know, not just being in good physical health, though it includes that.

But it is also talking about our capacity for human creativity and our capacity to engage in loving relationships. These are all of the elements of health and human flourishing that are part of the connection among us.

But there are threats to solidarity. And that is what we spent a lot of time talking about, in many ways. And what are these threats to solidarity, and can they be overcome.

Number one, very deep economic inequalities. Kristian spoke to this. And of course, violence. Chas said, is anyone outside of this circle of social solidarity. What about people who have violently harmed others? That seems really difficult to surmount in politics, and in public policy.

And Courtney, I hear Courtney to be saying, well, what about you know, history. You know, a long history of racial exclusion, and injustice that is institutionalized, manifest today in our Constitution. So these are the threats to solidarity that I heard.

And they are all forms of alienation, I think,
to use Danielle's language. Economic inequality, violence, and institutionalized history of racial exclusion.

And then, Vivian put the point really pointedly, and said, well, maybe America is different. Maybe American exceptionalism is so threatening to the project of social solidarity. You know, that -- she was saying, that is the source of my pessimism, right now. So that is point number one: what does social solidarity consist of?

Point number two: how do you build it? And we spoke about that. And Danielle provided two answers off the bat. Organize [audio skip] -- there is a political process, and there is a cultural project. This shared moral imagination.

So organization, we unpacked that a little bit. What does that mean? It means protest. It means people going to the streets. Meaningful change comes from the ground up, is what Elizabeth said.

But we also heard the importance of running for office. We also heard the importance of voting. And as a tactical matter, we heard from Vivian and Courtney and Danielle the importance of shrinking this disagreeable, irresolute fraction to the smallest, the smallest number possible. That is part of the political process, too.
What about this shared moral imagination, this cultural project? It consists of many, many things. And the general thing I am trying to get across here is, that at some level, we are having a fairly abstract discussion. But we can point to real examples on the ground of concrete instances of the things that we hope can promote justice.

Sheer moral imagination, it sounds like this abstract cultural project. But I heard that, you know, it is as concrete as a federal system in which there is national data on case clearance rates. It is coordination between different levels of state, federal, and local policymaking.

And Hedy's point, which I thought was brilliant, it is collective faith. The fact that the poor health of millionaires is in somehow -- is in some way connected to the poor health of some of the most disadvantaged members in our society. As a country, we are not well. As a collective, we are not well.

So that was the second point: how do you build solidarity. And Black Lives Matter -- Danielle pointed to Black Lives Matter as operating many of these -- operating successfully at many of these levels.

The third point: the institutions themselves. What are these institutions that promote association and
overcome alienation? And we heard a bunch of concrete examples of that.

And I was reminded of David Garland's, in our very first meeting, I think it was, account of the European welfare [audio skip]. Right. That our criminal justice system is imbedded in a larger political economy. And the European welfare states struck me as an institutional representation of this social solidarity that we are striving towards.

But a bunch of concrete examples came up in our conversation. Solidaristic institutions attend to healing, right. Aswad said, these solidaristic institutions attend to the healing of victims. And that has to be core to the function of this new kind of institutional landscape that we are imagining right now.

Jorge said, they should encompass ceremonies of reintegration, right. And we don't have that. We have these degradation rituals in our criminal justice system. But we need ceremonies of reintegration, channeling Shadd Maruna. [Audio skip] Justice L.A., you know, where the goal there was to replace the jail with alternatives to incarceration, to replace the project of alienation with the project of solidarity.

So all of these three things. What does solidarity consist of? How do you build it? What do the
institutions look like? These are all elements of a virtuous circle, right.

There isn't a sequence of events where first, you organize and then -- or, first you have patterns of solidarity, and you build on those to organize. And then, you make these institutions. All of these things are interconnected.

And I think that is something that we created. That is an idea that we created in this conversation and over the course of the roundtable. This idea of a virtuous circle that involves solidarity, a political process of organization, and cultural imagination. And the creation of institutions that heal and restore and fully [audio skip], and don't cast them out, don't make outlaws of them.

Optimism, pessimism. But the question is, should we be optimistic or pessimistic about the prospects of the creation of such a virtuous circle. Is American exceptionalism, is the weight of history so heavy in this country that we can't escape the logic of exclusion and injustice that we have created for ourselves.

I would say this. There are real examples of associative institutions that came up in our discussion. There are real examples of organization that is happening right now, that is seeking to overcome this exclusionary
system of police and prisons and courts.

And just on organization, this is a quote that has been in my head, that I love it. From Ta-Nehisi Coates, and you know, a pundit asked Coates, Oh, it is fine if people protest, but will they go out and vote. And Ta-Nehisi says, Well, you know, the question for me is, like, it is fine if people vote, but will they go out and protest.

And in a way, I think that is the political question that we are working through right now. But there is real organization, and there are real examples of social solidarity. Norway is one. David Garland pointed to it. But Norway is a long way away, and it is a very small country.

So are we trapped by history? There have been moments of dramatic change in this country that have been precipitated by civil war, by depression, by massive social mobilization. And I feel like we are in a period that is potentially characterized by dramatic change.

And that is an open question. And we all have a measure of agency in our relationship to that question. And that is where I would like to leave today's discussion.

Oh, boy. I mean, if we were in person, we would retire to the hotel bar right now, and we would hash
this out for the next four hours. I feel just so grateful and connected to all of you, to be a part of this process at what I think is a historic time.

I am just very, very grateful. Very, very grateful, indeed. I want to thank the audience that is watching the live stream. People can be part of the discussion on there. They can go to the Square One website, become involved in the next roundtable.

I want to thank the whole Square One team. Sukyi, Sukyi McMahon has just been the genius organizer and leader of this whole process. So I thank Sukyi.

Katharine Huffman, the Executive Director of Square One has been extraordinary. I think I couldn't have done any of this, I wouldn't have done any of this, but for my great friendship and collegial relationship with Jeremy Travis, who I think is a national living treasure to the world of justice reform.

Anamika Dwivedi has been an extraordinary member of the team. Madison Dawkins, Evie Lopoo have all been behind the scenes making this all happen. I am so thankful to all you guys.

This isn't the end of anything. This conversation among us will certainly continue. Another Square One roundtable will be held next year. It is on the theme of values. And I hope you can join us for that
conversation. So with that, good night.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Bruce.

MR. WESTERN: That was a good one.

(whereupon, at 5:04 p.m., the meeting was concluded.)
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