THE SQUARE ONE PROJECT ROUNDTABLE ON THE FUTURE OF JUSTICE POLICY THE VALUES OF THE JUSTICE SYSTEM: IMPLICATIONS FOR JUSTICE POLICY AND PRACTICE

ROUNDTABLE SESSIONS, FINAL DAY

Zoom meeting

12:00 p.m. EDT

Friday, April 30, 2021

PARTICIPANTS:

Aisha McWeay | Executive Director, Still She Rises Tulsa

Ananya Roy | Professor of Urban Planning, Social Welfare, and Geography and the Meyer and Renee Luskin Chair in Inequality and Democracy, UCLA

Bruce Western | Co-Founder, Square One Project; Co-Director, Justice Lab; Bryce Professor of Sociology and Social Justice, Columbia University

Chas Moore | Founder and Executive Director, Austin Justice Coalition

Courtney Robinson | Founder, Excellence and Advancement Foundation

Danielle Allen | James Bryant Conant University Professor and Director, Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics, Harvard University

David Garland | Arthur T. Vanderbilt Professor of Law Professor of Sociology, New York University

Deanna Van Buren | Co-Founder, Executive Director, Design Director, Designing Justice + Designing Spaces

Dona Kim Murphey | Director of Medical Initiatives, Project Lifeline; Neurologist

Eddie Bocanegra | Senior Director, READI Chicago Heartland Alliance

Elizabeth Hinton | Associate Professor of History and African and African American Studies, Harvard University

Emily Wang | Associate Professor of Medicine, Yale School of Medicine; Director, Health Justice Lab; Co-Founder, Transitions Clinic Network

Erik Bringswhite | Co-Founder and Executive Director, I. Am. Legacy Center

Fatimah Loren Dreier | Executive Director, The Health Alliance for Violence Intervention (HAVI)

Gabriel Salguero | Founder, National Latino Evangelical Coalition

Heather Rice-Minus | Vice President of Government

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342 Affairs and Church Mobilization, Prison Fellowship

Hedwig "Hedy" Lee | Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Washington in Seattle

Imara Jones | Co-creator and Senior Advisor, Social Contract Project, National Economic and Social Rights Initiative

Jeremy Travis | Co-Founder, Square One Project; Executive Vice President of Criminal Justice, Arnold Ventures; President Emeritus, John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Jorge Renaud | Regional Director of Policy and Advocacy for the Southwest, LatinoJustice PRLDEF; Senior Policy Analyst, Prison Policy Initiative

Katharine Huffman | Executive Director, Square One Project; Founding Principal, The Raben Group, LLC

Kimá Joy Taylor | Founder and Managing Principal, Anka Consulting LLC

Kristian Caballero | Community Outreach Coordinator,
Texas Appleseed

Lynda Zeller | Senior Fellow of Behavioral Health, Michigan Endowment Fund

Marcia Rincon-Gallardo | Executive Director, NOXTIN

Vesla Weaver | Bloomberg Distinguished Associate Professor of Political Science and Sociology, Johns Hopkins University

Vivian Nixon | Executive Director, Community and College Fellowship

I N D E X

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
Session Launch	5
Justice in New York	22
Aspirations for the Values of Justice Moderator: Katharine Huffman Writer and Panelist: Danielle Sered Panelist: Vivian Nixon Panelist: Eric Cumberbatch	124
Session Wrap-Up	195
Roundtable End	200

1

PROCEEDINGS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. TRAVIS: Welcome, everybody, to this final meeting of the Square One Roundtable. It's good to see all of you on the screen. It's good to know this is being recorded so that others can watch as well.

It's a little hard to say those words. this is the final meeting of the Square One Roundtable. It's been a remarkable journey together with you and with so many others who have been with us for the past three years. And so, I thought at the beginning of this, if I can just reflect a bit with you on where we've been in the journey we've traveled together, and the ways in which we've tried to carry out the Square One mission.

So, as you know, the mission of Square One is to help reimagine justice. That's our tag line, is to bring together thoughtful people from around the country, from different disciples, from different life experiences, from different jurisdictions, from different positioning on the reform spectrum to do exactly that. And to reimagine justice in hopes that putting people of goodwill together will help generate ideas, generate a large and impactful network, and really do something that important for our communities and for our country, which is to really imagine where we can be if we were intentional and purposeful and committed to a different vision of justice.

I'm reminded, at the first meeting of the Square One Roundtable in Durham, a number of us had dinner the night before and one of our members who was there for the Roundtable the next day said to me, What's the Square One thing all about, Jeremy? We talked a little bit about what we were doing.

2.3

Then, he was talking about what he was doing under the heading of justice reform, and what I said to him -- Well, at Square One, we don't tinker. We're not interested in tinkering. We're not interested in doing small things.

We're not interested in just making things a little bit better. We're interested in really reimagining a new way of approaching issues that face our communities.

So, ever since then, we've adopted as not just our tag line, Reimagine justice, but as a somewhat cheeky tag line, We don't tinker. So, that's who we are, and that's what we've been doing for the past three years now:

Executive Session, that some of you have been part of, and the Roundtable that we're concluding today.

But speaking of the journey of the Roundtable, we have covered a lot of topics and a lot of ground, literally, in the country. We started in Durham where our topic was the history of racial and economic inequality, and the implications of that legacy and that history of

inequality for justice policy going forward. That was in October.

2.3

We then met in March of 2019 in Oakland, where the theme of that meeting was examining criminalization and punitive excess and the role of the courts, and many of you were at that session. It was a great, great session.

We then met in Detroit in October of 2019, where the theme was violence -- examining violence in the United States, both personal violence and state violence, and how that reality of violence in our history -- particularly racialized violence has affected the trajectory of the way we respond to the harm and advance justice.

And then, we didn't meet in Austin because of the pandemic, but we had a virtual meeting — the fourth meeting of the Roundtable, where the theme was aspirations for a new social contract. Going bigger and saying, Well, if we wanted to create a new vision for justice, wouldn't we have to imagine a very different social contract that would provide a firmer grounding for well-being and healing and realization of human and community potential? So, it wasn't in Austin, but it was originally planned for Austin.

And here we are at the fifth meeting of the

Roundtable, where the theme is values -- the values for the future of the justice system. So, it's been quite a journey with a lot of topics that have been covered. But we've also been productive in other ways along the way.

2.3

First of all, we've convened 150 people, either around the Roundtable or in Executive Sessions, which is part of the theory of Square One is that by creating nodes of the network -- people who are in touch with each other around the country who are willing to think together, do together, and organize together, that we will move towards justice.

We've had 30 convenings -- Roundtable convenings, Executive Session convenings, presentations at academic conferences, virtual town halls on Zoom, too.

Again, spread the word.

And we've also been very interested in helping to put some new ideas in play in writing. So, over 65 publications have come out of Square One. Some of them are now finding their way into traditional scholarly journals. Some of them, at the other end of the spectrum, are blogs as we're talking about today with Danielle and Vivian and Eric, who've written something about the issue of values. And we have promoted them widely.

The Executive Session has resulted in a number of very thought-provoking papers. Some picked up by

mainstream media. Some by other convenings. Just to get lots of ideas -- lots of new ideas into the discourse.

2.3

Along the way, we've been fortunate, and I always want to say thank you to our funders. We've been supported by Arnold Ventures, by the MacArthur Foundation, by the Joyce Foundation, by Galaxy Gives, by the Ford Foundation, by Schusterman Family Foundation. And today's meeting is supported by J.C. Flowers, a New York-based foundation. So, we've seen also that the philanthropic community has come to support this work, and for that, we're very grateful.

So, here we are at the end of that journey.

And just on a personal note, and I know that my team that I work with -- Bruce, Katharine, Anamika, Sukyi, Evie, and Madison, the steering committee of Square One -- are just very excited by the distance we've traveled, and very grateful for the opportunity to go on this journey with you.

I speak for Bruce when I say that back to the days when we were sketching this out on a whiteboard at John Jay and said, Well, wouldn't it be fun to do something like this? To look back and see that three years later -- four years later, that we've traveled this journey. And we're very -- all of us -- deeply grateful for the intellectual and collegial and friendship support

that we've gotten from all of you.

2.3

So, where are we today? Today, we are coming back to a format that the Roundtable has used for each of our meetings, which is that we're going to have our last meeting of this session of the Roundtable, and this is the last one for the Roundtable altogether. And we're embedding within this a discussion about justice in New York.

So, in Oakland, we had justice in Oakland.

Durham, justice in Durham. It was sort of justice in

Austin, even though we weren't in Austin, and justice in

Detroit was part of that Roundtable.

So, we'll talk about that after the break -that starts at 12:30 today -- and we'll hear from some
people who are doing the work on the ground here in New
York. We'll then pivot later this afternoon to a
discussion of those three discussion papers that I
referenced that will help us think about these issues of
values more fulsomely.

So, even though this is the end of the Roundtable, this is not the end of Square One. So, you'll be interested to know that Square One has a life beyond the Executive Session of the Roundtable. There is something about this idea that is catching people's interest, and is going to go to do some work at the local

level -- do some work in terms of curricular work at Columbia.

2.3

We hope to do some more national work on issues that have been raised about, here particularly, the issue of racial reckoning. We think it's central to the Square One enterprise. So, you'll hear more from us. We hope that you'll be on with us for the next step of this journey.

So, with that introduction, let me just bring us back to our task for today. So, we'll pivot in 15 minutes or so to a discussion about justice in New York, but what I wanted to do was first, since we are together here as part of the Roundtable on values, is just to remind us that we had covered a lot of ground on that question.

So, the value of values is where we started.

Why do we care about values? We've had discussions and keynote presentations and papers written all around this theme. How do we think about the values that should guide the next iteration of our work? Not our work, but the nation's work.

We recognize and we had this very poignant and sometimes difficult discussion last time that we're doing this work this week on Square One talking about -- it was at a time of just profound national reflection following

the conviction of Officer Chauvin, following the murder of George Floyd, following what seems like one after another after another of stories of unarmed Black men and some women, people of color being killed by police officers, and recognizing that this work is really difficult.

2.3

So, I just want to say that at the outset, that's part of the distance that we have traveled together as colleagues -- as friends. And it's very moving and very deep.

So, we talked about those issues last time, and the importance of -- particularly for our communities of color -- having a moment of understanding and grace to realize that that's going on in our lives, and in their lives in particular right now.

And we focused on some very high order values.

And I'm just going to tick off some of them that we've talked about over the past few weeks and invite you and anyone wants to use your little blue hand, if you would, to come into the discussion. But listen to the values we talked about.

We talked about healing, a real, pretty profound discussion about healing and the importance of healing. We talked about reckoning. Reckoning with the legacy and the reality -- the current, present-day reality of white supremacy and the impact that it's had on the way

we think about the justice system.

2.3

We talked about the importance of centering human dignity as we think about the road ahead and where we would like to be as a society. We talked about equity and that if there is an irreducible minimum to a system that results after finding just that core, at a minimum, we said to ourselves, there should be an equitable applicable of the law and sanctions and other processes.

We had a really deep discussion about forgiveness, and it was clear within the group that it was not an easy concept for everybody to adopt. But for some, it was central. For others, it was, perhaps, too distant.

Through all of this, we talked about safety.

Safety at a community level. Safety, in terms of one's personhood. Liberty and dignity sort of go together.

Autonomy is wrapped up within that, I think.

And we talked about the importance of community. The community as being a source of strength, a source of assets, a source of politic power that has been removed from community because of the power of the state to say, No. This is what the state does.

These functions -- this is not what community does. That as an aspiration, as a north star, in essence, to some of us, was very important.

So, we've covered a lot of ground. At the same

time, not flinching from recognizing -- to quote from Nneka's presentation, that the system has done catastrophic harm. And that we can't just say, let's talk about values and do that in the absence of coming to terms with that.

So, we covered a great distance, and I want to encourage anybody who wants to reflect on where we've been to offer up your reflections. Please find the way to raise your blue hand function and let me know if you want to talk, and reflect on where we are, what you've thought about since we met last, continuing some of the discussions, anything you want to underscore. The floor is open.

Yes, Gabe?

2.3

REV. SALGUERO: First, let me say thank you for all the hard work and the team that has put this together.

I think this is the appropriate time, as we're closing at least this portion. And I appreciate the work, after life, as a clergy person, in that reference.

And I saw Jon also did. So, thank you. I think there are a few things that I want to underscore.

Number one is the breadth of the thing. Right?

In every discussion, when we start talking about values
and sometimes the hierarchy of values, the breadth of the
stakeholders makes it challenging to unpack the priorities

of values and the breadth of diversity of the stakeholders.

1.3

And so, I think that we should begin -- or we have begun, and we've done a pretty good job -- to talk about the diversity of voices that are impacted by the systems we seek to transform, reform. Some have said abolish.

I mean, the verbs abound. The reason the verbs abound is because the constituencies abound. And so, I think that's an important factor for how hard this work is.

I think the second thing is, at every conversation I've been a part of, there is genuine consensus to say loudly and repeatedly that the systems are broken, that they're fundamentally unjust. That there's something here that needs immediate, urgent attention and cannot be ignored.

The third thing, I think, is talking across -and this was a major topic, maybe two or three
conversations ago -- the theory of change. That has been
a continuing conversation in my hearing -- incremental,
urgent, revolutionary, transforming.

The theory of change is where I've seen the most fecund, fertile conversation, but I've also seen the most variety of opinions. And I think that's going to be

an interesting conversation and praxis and action moving forward. And maybe there isn't a theory of change because the systems are so complex that there are theories of change, and that each of us has to go at it in a multifaceted way and be allies with those who have a different approach.

But I think that oftentimes when we have the level of this conversation -- because systems are complicated -- we try to minimize a theory of change when the system is not a flat system that -- I want to underscore that there are theories of change, and that we can affirm other people's theories of change because they're doing the good work.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes.

1.3

REV. SALGUERO: And thanks again for inviting an evangelical into this conversation.

MR. TRAVIS: That was very powerful and concise and integrative observations. I really appreciate that, Gabe.

Jon Simon?

MR. SIMON: Good morning, or good afternoon. I hesitate to raise my hand first in these conversations for a variety of reasons, but mainly because I'm running about a week behind mentally. But this seems like the right point in the conversation to come from last week.

What hit me during the week -- I teach a seminar on abolition and reform in criminal justice and got to mull some of our conversation from last week over.

And we talked about human dignity, but that's a very, very broad term.

1.3

I mean, it can be incredibly precise. Like, everybody needs a toilet. Everybody needs access to hygiene equipment, and if a jail doesn't provide that, it should just be closed. Period.

So, it can be very precise, but it's a very general concept. And what really hit me is what you said among the values that you highlighted, Jeremy -- but I would say it's defining dignity today, perhaps, is healing. I mean, there's this massive desire for healing across so many communities, and so many wounds that have gone so long unmet.

You know, like any term, it then becomes overgeneralizable. But I do think -- and it's amazing to think that only in the 1970s, we thought dignity meant retribution and holding people accountable as much as possible, right. And so, the term dignity can get filled with different meanings.

But I really took away the healing as a defining meaning of dignity right now.

MR. TRAVIS: Yep. Yeah. Thank you for making

that connection.

1.3

And for me, also, the healing theme -- I referenced this last time -- I didn't really look at the transcript, but you sort of reviewed our notes from that first session. Healing was just a strong theme that I hadn't quite expected, and that comes from somewhere. Right?

The fact that's such a strong, affirmative statement, I think we should pay attention to that.

Yes, Monica?

DR. BELL: I mean, I guess there had been a few things I've been chewing on, and one of them -- just thinking about Ellen's presentation last week and the kind of values-driven policy change model.

I guess, the broader invitation for all of us to think -- not just about our capacity to work in coalition with people who have different sort of political ideologies than we do, but also just, like, our different utility in knowing that we can't all do the whole part -- all of the policy model. But we have very particular roles to play, and to think about how to be in coalition with other people along those vectors. I just thought -- I found that to be a really valuable takeaway.

And then, I've also just been thinking about the relationship between pragmatism -- or practicality,

maybe, might be a better term to use here -- and vision. 1 2 And I think there's been an interesting dialogue and 3 tension between those two over the course of this values 4 Roundtable in particular. 5 MR. TRAVIS: Right. DR. BELL: So, anyway, I mean, those are things 6 7 I've been thinking about a lot as the Roundtable continues. 8 9 MR. TRAVIS: Thank you for that, Monica. And wasn't Danielle's presentation just so 10 11 energizing? Because it was so well structured, in terms 12 of the model that she was presenting and that she's worked 1.3 I know I came out of that just like, there's something here that I've just to wrap my mind around. 14 15 she's just a captivating thinker as well. 16 So, Dona, you're going to be our last observation before we allow Sukyi to take us into the 17 larger session. So, Dona? 18 19 DR. MURPHEY: Yeah. I just wanted to extend 20 this idea of healing as not just being something applied 21 to harms exacted in the past, but healing that happens in 22 the present moment. And also, the idea of health as

MR. TRAVIS: Yeah. The other phrase I didn't

something that really informs policy moving forward.

write down, but it's used a lot is well-being, which

23

24

25

health sounds sometimes too medicalized, but it's really 1 2 well-being. Sort of, are we healthy in all ways in the 3 world? As communities, as individuals, as families. 4 And when you ask, so what's the measure of 5 well-being? It's something about relationships within communities. The ability to thrive. The ability to find 6 7 your place and to be supported in that. 8 So, I know that Sukyi is listening. 9 that's she holding the people in the waiting room at bay, because they're eager to participate. 10 11 Sukyi, is this a time for us to allow you to 12 work the Zoom magic and make all that happen? 1.3 MS. McMAHON: Yeah. I can let folks in. also waiting on Bruce to get in, as well, because he will 14 15 be leading this session, but we know he won't be here for a few more minutes. 16 17 But I think that once we let folks in -- let me 18 just glance at the run-of-show here. He's meant to welcome them and to give them a rundown of how this is 19 20 going to work, but I think you can also just welcome them, and let them know we're going to take five for a few 21 22 minutes. 23 I'm not going to start the livestream

MR. TRAVIS: Okay. I will be happy to welcome

24

25

immediately. So --

1	them and do a little bit of an overview of where we're
2	headed. But then, shall we wait? Should we be waiting
3	for Bruce for the livestream?
4	MS. McMAHON: Yeah. I think so, since he's got
5	the opening remarks, and we're going to ask everyone who's
6	not a New Yorker to go off-camera. And then, we'll invite
7	you to come back on camera around 2:15 2:00 or 2:15
8	once we get done with the local part. And then, you'll
9	all be welcome to come back on and ask questions.
10	If you've been at a "Justice in" whichever city
11	session before, you kind of know how this works where we
12	invite you to oh. There's Bruce. We invite you to ask
13	clarifying questions, try to probe a little bit deeper.
14	Welcome, DA Gonzalez.
15	MR. TRAVIS: Yeah.
16	MS. McMAHON: So, you'll have an opportunity to
17	engage with the locals. But I'm going to let them all in.
18	MR. TRAVIS: Cool.
19	MS. McMAHON: And if you all will go off of
20	camera, that would be great.
21	MR. TRAVIS: Good. Okay.
22	MR. McMAHON: Eric, you've got this thing on
23	camera. All right. Here they go.
24	(Pause.)
25	MR. WESTERN: We're still filling up. Okay. I

1	see we've got full boat here today, and still filling up.
2	
3	Is there more to come, Sukyi? Or
4	MS. McMAHON: Let's see. I think Liz Glazer is
5	due to be here.
6	MR. WESTERN: I saw Liz for a second.
7	MS. McMAHON: Okay. I've got Rahson
8	MS. GLAZER: I'm here. I'm here. I'm just
9	brushing my hair. So, you know, putting on my lipstick
10	and primping, generally.
11	MR. WESTERN: That is a problem that is
12	completely foreign to me.
13	MS. McMAHON: This is everyone, Bruce.
14	MR. WESTERN: Wonderful. Wonderful. Well,
15	welcome, everyone, to this meeting of the fifth and final
16	Square One Roundtable. We're discussing values.
17	MS. McMAHON: Sorry, Bruce. I have not gone to
18	livestream yet. I'm going to start that now, but
19	MR. WESTERN: Okay.
20	MS. McMAHON: you'll have to start over.
21	Give me one second.
22	MR. WESTERN: Okay. Okay. Well, welcome,
23	everyone. Welcome to this fifth and final Square One
24	Roundtable. The theme of these meetings has been values
25	and the role of values in the project of building a more

substantial kind of justice in America.

1.3

And at each of our Roundtables, we've been meeting in localities and we've taken time on the program to discuss the problem of justice in each of those localities. Justice in Durham. Justice in Oakland.

Justice in Detroit.

And today, we're turning the focus of Square One on New York City. And this is a discussion of the challenge of justice in New York, and I think it's an extraordinary way to conclude the Square One convenings because in so many ways, New York City has been on the cutting edge of justice reform in the nation. But it's also presented some of the most serious challenges.

We've got an absolutely dynamite group of people around the table to discuss justice in New York.

We'll introduce them in due course as we ask them to quickly reflect on this, but that will happen shortly.

So, now, I'm going to hand it over to my good friend and colleague, Jeremy Travis, who's going to provide an overview of the issue of justice in New York City.

Jeremy?

MR. TRAVIS: Thank you very much, Bruce. And it is a true delight and pleasure to be with all of you, my fellow New Yorkers, here for this Justice in New York

segment of this fifth and last Square One Roundtable.

1.3

It's been quite a journey that we've been on with the Square One Project over the last three years.

And we've learned a tremendous amount from these sessions as we've held them in Durham and Oakland and Detroit, and virtually in Austin. And then, to come back here for this session on Justice in New York.

My purpose at the outset of this is to just tell, particularly people who are outside of New York who are watching this on livestream or on YouTube or on our platform, just a bit of the big picture, from the big strokes as to what's been going on in New York.

I do this not to assume any sort of special expertise on this, but just to succinctly say that New York is at a really interesting place in the way that we think about the criminal justice system and the way it's been operating, and the ways in which it's changed in fundamental ways over the past years. So, I'm just going to list some ways that come to mind when I think about the changes in New York.

Certainly, we have to talk about the Close
Rikers Campaign. So, the idea that there's now a
commitment by our city to close Rikers, which has
accurately been described as a sort of torture chamber on
an island off in the East River, and to build new,

smaller, local jails. That's a monumental accomplishment with much credit to the people who led the Close Rikers Campaign, but that's also made possible by the fact that there's been this stunning decline in the pre-trial detention population of New York.

1.3

If you know my history, I've been New York criminal justice for a long time, and there was a time when there were 22,000 people held in pre-trial detention in our city. Now, depending on the day that you're asking, the number is in the 4,000 - 5,000 range, and is intended to go down even further.

And as Vinny Schiraldi likes to say, we are at European rates of pre-trial detention. That, in turn, reflects a lot of activism. A lot of work by city actors. A lot of work by legislators who passed bail reform. But that is a stunning reality in our city.

I go a little bit further back in our history and raise up the Close to Home Initiative, which resulted in the significant decline in the number of our young people who are being held in secure facilities and brought as the title says, close to home. This is another part of a larger national effort to reduce juvenile prisons and detention facilities, but the New York version is also stunning. Very small numbers of young people being held that way when it used to be hundreds of thousands.

Another big change in our city -- again, with a tribute to community activism and legal activism around this -- is the end of the era of stop and frisk. It used to be that there were every year, 600- or 700,000 individual stops, mostly of young people of color, by the police.

1.3

That was challenged in court. Challenged by activists for many years and brought to the point where that phenomenon has dropped by 90-95 percent. So, a significant change in the daily interaction between police and the residents of this city.

Likewise, a big decline in misdemeanor arrest.

Likewise, a big decline in the use of the criminal summons, which is sort of a New York phenomenon. But we give summons with criminal penalties attached to them for very minor offenses, and that -- again, thanks to activism and city council reforms, that has changed in dramatic ways. Those are not now clogging up the criminal court system, and not now, in many cases, subject to warrants for non-appearance.

Another big change that is still in a work-inprogress status, thanks to -- we'll hear from Eric

Cumberbatch later, and Liz Glazer with -- the Mayor's

Office of Criminal Justice created a separate office
within that office to use community capacity to fund

community capacity and people doing violence-interruption work and street-organizing work as part of our response to crime and violence in the city. They've also played a major role in helping the city through the pandemic.

1.3

So, big changes in our city. Some of the people who we'll hear from today have been the architects of those changes. Gladys Carrión was the leading advocate for the Close to Home Initiative when she worked for the state, and she gets credit for making that possible.

But at the same time, we are, as Bruce Western likes to use this phrase, we are the knife's edge. This is not easy, and it's not necessarily sustainable on its own terms.

There's been a lot of resistance. There's been a lot of resistance most recently to bail reform, and we saw that from law enforcement. We saw that from editorial boards and elected officials.

There's now questioning of the Close Rikers decision by the city, as -- coming up in the mayoral campaign, where people running for office -- some say, Well, I don't that's a good way to spend money. As we've seen rates of violence go up in the city. Not all crime, but rates of violence have gone up.

And that's raising questions about some of the reforms overall. The reduction of pre-trial detention,

bail reform, and the decisions by some prosecutors not to enforce some low-level offenses. We had, at the same time, legalization of marijuana in New York, which is not without its controversy.

1.3

So, we are meeting today at a time when a lot of the reforms -- the progress made in New York is on the knife's edge. Where are we going in the future?

So, that's the purpose of Justice in New York, and hear from some of our colleagues who do this work and have been at the forefront of these reforms to see what it looks like to have a forward-looking vision for the city, recognizing that there's a lot of progress been made and a lot of work still to be done.

MR. WESTERN: That's great, Jeremy. Thanks for that introduction, and I think that tees up the conversation very well.

I think that's been a theme of this year, actually, as we look back over this past 12 months, going back to the spring of 2020 and the summer that we remember well with the murder of George Floyd and the protests that followed. Are we in a period of progress or retrenchment? Are we feeling optimistic or pessimistic about the project of justice?

And so, that's the question I want to pose to the New Yorkers at the table. So, what I'd like you to

do -- I'm going to call on people in alphabetical order, and I'd ask you to introduce yourself and share with us, just in 60 seconds, a response to this question: are you feeling optimistic about the project of justice in New York City? Or pessimistic? And why?

So, that's the brief, and I'll begin with Beverly. I'll go through in alphabetical order by first name.

Beverly?

1.3

MS. TILLERY: Hey. Good afternoon. I'm

Beverly Tillery. My pronouns are she and her, and I'm the

Executive Director of the New York City Anti-Violence

Project, where we work to address and end all forms of

violence that impact the LGBTQ and HIV-affected

communities.

You know, I'm always optimistic, because if I wasn't, I wouldn't be able to do this work. So, first, I will start there.

real, concrete reforms and changes that are happening that we have to celebrate. And so much of the time we don't celebrate the wins that we have and the successes that we have. And at the same time, I'm cautious and I'm also worried.

You know, we just ended a year in which

violence of trans and gender-nonconforming people across
the country went through the roof, and that included
homicides here in New York City, particularly of Black
trans women. As Jeremy said, we saw really a positive
effort towards bail reform in New York City thwarted last
year by really a false narrative about how people were not
going to be safe if we let people out on the street.

1.3

And I think that we have a different conversation that's happening, and there are more people engaged in the conversation, which is thrilling. But we still need to keep widening the net.

And ultimately, I think we have to get to violence prevention, and what does that look like? What does it mean? And how do we create a culture and systems in our society where people have real safety nets and support that they need, and that we're not relying on policing as a way to create safety for people?

MR. WESTERN: That's great. That's great. Danielle, good to see you.

MS. SERED: I was hoping you meant alphabetic order by last name. It's so great to see you all.

I mean, I'm deeply optimistic. I think a lot about Mariame Kaba, who is like, Do you honestly think I would work this hard if I didn't think we would win? You know?

If I didn't think we would win, I would do something very different with my life. You know? I believe very deeply in the things we're fighting for and those of us fighting for them. And so, continue a depth of optimism that is not the kind of thing that's rooted in, like, a Biden win, for example.

1.3

And I would say, I think, in terms of the real transformation of safety, the end of mass incarceration, I feel like there are two really central questions that we keep asking and answering over and over again whenever these conversations come up. And I try to pay a lot of attention to how we're answering them.

The first is whether or not we will compromise on telling the truth about the role race plays and has always played in these systems. As right and left partnerships, and bi-partisan this and that, and other kinds of things come up, very often there's a lot of consensus on some certain policy direction, so long as we can remain silent about the question of race. And it is my belief we will never achieve the transformative change that is necessary if we are all to survive without speaking the truth about the centrality of race and racism in our culture, in our criminal justice system, in our history, in our practice.

And I do feel, in this past year, very hopeful

about the portion of people who have felt that they could stop making that compromise and still win the things they needed to win. I think that the centrality of race in so many of our conversations — the boldness of those conversations testifies not just to individual people's decision—making or awakening, but rather to people's judgment that the collective can bear that honesty, and they won't lose everything as a result. And that makes me enormously hopeful because I do think it's a prerequisite for the survival of our democracy.

1.3

And then I think the other central question that always comes up in this is, do we really mean we believe that everyone can be a dignified, meaningful contributor to our society? Or do we mean almost everyone?

And I think there is a version that shows up, whether you think about it as precision policing, or targeted deterrents, or whatever those are. The strategies that talk about, accurately, that the people who cause serious violence are a small portion of the total number of people.

But how we relate to the people who cause the most serious harm in our community, in our ethics, in our values, in our practice, in our sentencing, in all of it, I think is still very much an open question. Are we

willing, whether we are at a point collectively where are
we are willing to be much bolder for everything but that?
Or whether the breadth of our vision includes people who
cause serious harm?

And the truth is, if we really want to deal
with matters of safety, it has to include everybody. The

1.3

with matters of safety, it has to include everybody. The exclusion of people who cause serious harm from a safety strategy -- and I think about a reliance on incarceration as exclusion -- I think sets us up for a permanent failure.

And I think that question is very much still unanswered, and will make or break our chances going forward.

MR. WESTERN: Great.

And next, I'll go to Donna Hylton.

MS. HYLTON: I thought it was just going to be one name. I always get the Hylton.

MR. WESTERN: Sorry, Donna.

MS. HYLTON: No worries. Hi, everyone. So, I'm Donna Hylton. I'm the Founder and President of A Little Piece of Light.

We are a women-led organization, and our primary focus are those who have been subjected to abuse, trauma, violence, and incarceration. So, our population of folks are not limited to, but absolutely include,

women, girls, trans women, LGBTQ individuals, because we are the most marginalized, right, and harmed.

1.3

So, I agree with Beverly. I wouldn't be doing this work if I wasn't optimistic. And my optimism is premised in that when I was incarcerated, I did not believe I would ever get out. But that's something that I held onto -- I kept hope, right. You keep the hope alive. You hold onto something.

And so, I hold onto it today doing this work out here, and I see that we've made many strides. We have, and I think we should acknowledge that and feel good about that. But we do have further to go.

Unfortunately, to Danielle's point, racism is the biggest monster that we have to fight. The majority of what we go through is premised in racism. The most impacted people are Black and Brown people. Our prisons and jails are filled with Black and Brown people.

All our issues are, I mean, rooted in poverty, and a poverty that is premised in racism. Harm -- racism. So, we do have to be very clear with that. So, I feel like we have a lot more to go.

But one of my greatest concerns is, in this moment and what we're all collectively going through -- this collective trauma -- that we, who are doing this work, really understand how important and necessary it is

for us to come together, put away our own differences. Because we're all facing the same common enemy, but we have the same common goal.

1.3

And so, that is my biggest -- I wouldn't say hurdle, but that's my biggest focus right now. To make sure we, as a movement, as a collective of people doing this work and understanding that there's more work to be done.

We've made some strides. Yes. But there's more work to be done -- that we understand and come together in this moment, because it's going to take the unity of us all to move us forward.

Someone told me that when I was learning this organizing work that organized people will always be organized power any day. And we see that. That's what's happening. That's what's going on.

People are showing up and they're standing up, and they're speaking out and they're saying, Enough. So we need to do that more, and we need to do it as a collective of people in this work.

We can no longer have this argument or this separation of nonviolent and violent and all these other things. To your point, Danielle -- we can no longer do that. Because at the end of the day, it doesn't matter. Because what's used against all of us who are Black or

Brown is that we're Black or Brown, no matter what the 1 2 issue may be. 3 And so, I remain optimistic and I'm hopeful. 4 And I know that we will get this done as long as we do it 5 together. 6 MR. WESTERN: That's great, Donna. Thank you. 7 8 Liz Glazer? You're muted, Liz. 9 MS. GLAZER: Okay. You would think after a year of pandemic Zooming, we would know how to unmute in a 10 11 more sprightly way. 12 So, great to see everybody. Thank you, Donna. That was amazing as always. 1.3 I actually have enormous hope. And I think in 14 15 part, it's powered not just by the pain of last summer 16 that became so evident for every single person in the country when you had people taking the streets. 17 But actually, hope that exists because of the 18 fiscal crisis that faces us, and that I think that what 19 20 that will require us to do is to scrutinize why we have 21 centered our response -- and it's really just a response. 22 It's not prevention. It's not affirmative -- but our 23 response to crime or safety in the police and the criminal 24 justice system.

And it will force us to move away from kind of

25

the flood-the-zone monopoly on safety that police and the criminal justice system have had to a different kind of goal, which is to create a thriving city that mobilizes all civic services. Police are maybe one, but just a piece. But importantly, jobs and physical infrastructure and education and all the things that safety looks like in rich and white neighborhoods, it should look like everywhere.

1.3

And I think that sort of sounds all lofty and gushy and that's one of our problems is that -- oh.

There's crime, call the police. Sounds very muscular and responsive. But what I've just said does not.

And what the fiscal crisis will do is, it will make it very present and evident. Because it will force us to pressure test every dollar to see what buys us safety at the lowest of cost. And I don't just mean dollars and cents cost.

I mean the kind of human cost that our current default to the police has inflicted for generations. And I think that this more heterogenous strategy and the way it's sort of centering what we're doing in civic society, as opposed to in a military and largely unsupervised structure, will be crucial.

And I think that the challenges to making this shift, even though so many of these pieces are in place,

particularly in New York -- the challenge of making this shift from police-centered to civic-centered is one to make to this idea feel as muscular, deployable, nimble as the police are now. The police to whom you see in so many civic functions, up to and including most recently, vaccinations.

1.3

The second thing, I think, the challenge will be is that, although we have all the pieces in place, do we have the will and the structure to organize and connect to those pieces in a way that all those resources are heading towards that common goal?

And I think the third challenge that we have is that we must address the violence issue. Because violence will reinforce that instinct to default to the police -- to default to that monopoly and safety. And we have to be able to show that, in fact, this other approach, of which police, I think, play a role. I know some of my colleagues disagree, but I do think police play a role -- but that this other approach is a more democratic, a more affirmative way to secure our safety and to kind of ignite a kind of virtuous cycle of social interaction that will iteratively shrink the justice system.

MR. WESTERN: Great. Thank you, Liz.

Next, I'll call on Eric Cumberbatch.

MR. CUMBERBATCH: Hey, peace. Good afternoon,

everyone. Great to see you all. Eric Cumberbatch, Deputy Director of Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice, and I lead the Office of Neighborhood Safety with two great partners, Renita François and Jessica Mofield.

1.3

To the question, I'm eternally optimistic and forever grateful. But my optimism isn't blind. I see, experience, and feel hurt and pain in this space, and I think, too often, we're carrying wounds that are consistently reopened.

So, that's how I exist and enter into the space at this moment. I stay optimistic and stay focused because I'm really leading efforts that empower community groups, individuals, to really define, describe, and ultimately implement what justice looks like through their lens within their communities. I really think that our approach is to lift up the brilliance, a lot of the just greatness that exists in communities that have been overlooked, that have not been elevated, and purposely designed to promote failure and to promote adverse outcomes.

So, seeing community and lifting up the organizations and individuals that I'm invested in, beyond fiscal resources -- seeing that happen in real time and being part of that movement really continues to fuel my optimism. And I see, right now, the younger generation

that is coming up as being really socially active. Just justice warriors, and really focused on creating change from within, and not the reliance of government and/or any of these other structures that have ultimately created harmful conditions that we've experienced and we've grown through.

So, that's where I am. And ultimately, I'm grateful for the opportunity to share and learn alongside everyone that's on this panel. Thank you.

MR. WESTERN: That's great, Eric. Young people is a new thread in this conversation that's been really important.

Eric Gonzalez?

1.3

MR. GONZALEZ: Good afternoon, colleagues, and nice to see many of you. I've missed you over the past year, and hope to see you all soon in person.

You know, for the first time in over 20 years in law enforcement -- and I am the Brooklyn District Attorney. Elected in 2017, but having served in the DA's office for over 20 years. It's the first time on the ground that I'm seriously hearing conversations from ordinary New Yorkers discussing structural racism in our criminal justice system, talking about inequities in policing systems.

And much of this was laid bare, I think, during

the COVID pandemic, where people saw how poverty and race were all interconnected, and who got sick and who died and who lacked services. And when violence spiked in Brooklyn, and throughout the city, which neighborhoods suffered.

1.3

And so, I think I'm optimistic that these conversations are genuine. These are things that are heartfelt during the protests that many of you referenced:

George Floyd and the protests for racial and social justice.

I saw something that I had never seen before, having lived in New York City my entire life, where I saw middle-class and upper middle-class white people marching alongside of people of color demanding social justice.

And they experienced policing and the excesses of policing differently for the first time, right, because these protests -- especially many of the protests related to George Floyd -- there was excessive policing to control crowds.

And so, for the first time ever, people may have been on the other side of some of these policing structures. So, I think these are genuine conversations about the reform that's needed in policing, and maybe thinking about how we have public safety in different ways. The conversations about transferring resources away

from the policing systems into community-based organizations and resources -- I think all of that is legitimate.

1.3

But I'm cautiously optimistic, and I agree with Liz Glazer tremendously, because we're talking about the concern about violence. To be clear, what's happening on the ground is that, for the most part, we're seeing a surge in gun violence. There's no question that gun violence is up from record lows. And in Brooklyn, it's up as much as 60 to 70 percent in terms of gun violence.

But much of the other crime in the city and in the county is really at record low levels. I mean, there are fewer arrests. There are fewer robberies. There are fewer burglaries. There are fewer violent crimes.

And so, the concern that we hear across the country about violence and this sense that the city is slipping away, in the sense that we're unsafe, actually alarms me. Because I expect that over the next year or two, as people return back to a more normal life, we're going to actually see more crime.

We're going to see increasing crime rates from these record lows of the past two years, and whether or not that memory of the pandemic and George Floyd protests and the things that have led, I think, middle-class people to support policing reforms, will that stay intact?

And I think that is why Liz is completely correct that we have to make sure we deal with gun violence. And so, this issue of how we get there and how we reduce violence in our communities without relying on police -- but this question of how we change our reliance on policing to deal with gun violence is so critical on this issue. We have to deal with gun violence very directly, because if we don't, I think we could see a slide.

1.3

And in terms of what is necessary, I think, on the ground, we need to make sure that part of what is being instilled in this community response is what we expect the relationship to be between our government, our criminal justice system, and the people we serve. And I think that is what's most inspiring and why I'm hopeful.

I do believe that people are rejecting the old version of law enforcement; the police, the prosecutor, and others should decide every aspect of how to create public safety. There is a genuine interest and a genuine belief that community-led public safety is critical to actually getting there. And as long as we all do what we need to do to continue to support that narrative, and then, get the resources to actually do that work, I think we will change forever how this city goes about providing safety.

And so, to that extent, getting the civics and all the other organizations, all the other public services in our community to deal with issues before they blow up and become more problematic is the next step for all of us. And so, again, a lot of what I said is less eloquent than what Liz said, but it's really on the same track.

1.3

There is a will to do it. We have to be ready for the uptick in crime. There will be an uptick in crime, because we're at record levels now, and if people'd level of tolerance aren't for more, we have to prepare them that there will be rising crime rates. But if we can do that and lower gun violence, I think we can hold the line. Thank you.

MR. WESTERN: Thanks a lot, Eric. Gladys Carrión?

MS. CARRIÓN: Thanks, Bruce. It's great to see so many of you. I am Gladys Carrión. I am a senior fellow at the Justice Lab with Vinny, but I was the former commissioner in New York State, and also in New York City responsible for juvenile justice reform -- administration for juvenile justice.

And what we did, with Liz as a partner in crime, was reform the system, or attempt to. And I am so pleased to see Jeremy, who's also a partner in that work with us.

You know, I am optimistic and I am hopeful.

But I am, like so many of you, also cautious. You know,

we've accomplished a lot, particularly in the juvenile

justice -- and I marvel at the numbers.

1.3

To think that in Close to Home in the City of New York, we have 62 young people in confinement today, which is amazing. When I was at the State, we had hundreds and hundreds. And even thinking at the secure, there are 22 young people from New York City in upstate facilities.

So, that number -- we probably never envisioned that number being so low. But what concerns me and what I think a lot about is that we don't become complacent with the success that we've had.

And also, you know, I've had lots of opportunity to reflect, that so much of the work that I did and did in partnership with many of you, while really important and transformative in the lives of young people, it wasn't enough, and it's not enough. And when I look back at the numbers, the system remains as many facilities as we closed -- as many programs we implemented, almost exclusively Black and Brown children, because that's who we continue to incarcerate in this country and in this city, and that really concerns me.

And so, for me, now as I look back at this work

from this vantage point, we've engaged in doing harm reduction and that's really important. I mean, it is. But for me, we should really view it as an interim step, that we need to really transform these systems, that we need to dismantle them as we know them, because they're not promoting the well-being of young people.

1.3

It's just not the solution, and when I think about -- you know, Liz alluded to this -- there is and continues to be a juvenile justice system that addresses the needs of white children. And we haven't managed to replicate that system.

Because that system is grounded in communities that are well-resourced with the health benefits, good schools in communities with clean air, with all of those factors that are so important to create and support a civil society, which is not in our communities that really populate these systems: both the juvenile justice system and the child welfare system.

So, I think we have to be bolder and we need to have a great sense of urgency in making the change and understanding why it's so necessary because we continue to capture in these systems just Black and Brown children.

And so, inherently, there is something that at the root of these systems that is wrong and that we need to change.

So, doing what we're doing -- what we continue

to do, even very well-intentioned, isn't working for our children. And so, we need to do something differently, and we need to do it at a bigger scale and be bolder and more strategic.

But what gives me hope is the fact that there's so many voices now in this space calling for this transformational change. So, I'll end there.

MR. WESTERN: Thanks, Gladys.

Jeremy Travis?

1.3

MR. TRAVIS: Thanks, Bruce. It's hard to follow all of these observations because they're so thought-provoking and so eloquent. Let me try my best to answer the question.

So like many of you, I'm a born optimist. I can't imagine being in the world any other way. And as many of you have said, we couldn't do this work unless we were optimistic and held out hope that things could be better.

But I would like to think I'm a clear-eyed optimist in the sense that I recognize the very steep hill that we still have to climb, notwithstanding the progress here in New York. And these obstacles have been with us for a long time.

Bruce and I just published an essay where we defined the era of punitive excess as being basically the

last 50 years, when incarceration rates started to go up and the politics of tough-on-crime took hold, and we started to think that we could both police and prison our way out of a crime problem. But the history, as many have alluded to, is much longer than that, and we still struggle in the shadow of the legacy and the current application of white supremacy.

1.3

I'm optimistic, in part because of reasons that other colleagues have alluded to here. One is, just the history of change in New York has to give you some reason to believe that change is possible. And just having worked in New York on these issues for a long time, I feel that just acutely and very grateful to everyone on the screen who's helped contribute to that.

But also the history of the last year, where we saw the outpouring of protest in our streets -- New York and elsewhere -- following the murder of George Floyd, and the strong recognition of the need to deal with issues of race and the intersection between racism and the criminal justice system. And that has become -- and I hope this is a sustainable -- part of our discourse as we go forward.

And I would also add to those who place a lot of hope in the next generation, I do, too, having been at John Jay for many years. There's nothing as energizing as

being in touch with young people about what their hopes are for the future, and the ways in which criminal justice has become a central mission for their energy and their activism. Along with climate change, along with working on income inequality, right up there is justice reform. So, that's very encouraging.

1.3

I do want to make a special plea here for a widening of our lens to think about mass incarceration.

It hasn't been mentioned explicitly. Danielle did a bit in talking about youths in prison. Some of you alluded to this, but I think we have still failed to focus on an agenda for what it would take in New York to significantly reduce -- maybe abolish. I can't quite go there.

But at least significantly reduce the number of people in prison. And I pay tribute, again, to Gladys

Carrión for asking some of us to come together with a plan to reduce the juvenile population of those in youth detention facilities, and the numbers are just staggering.

I always ask myself, why can't we do that with adult systems? Why can't we have a politics that when we support people for assembly or state senate, we ask them to commit to a number? Commit to 50 percent -- it used to be the cut by 50. That to me is far too modest.

And when you look at where we've come from, in terms of these prisons in our state, to where we are now,

I hold no celebration for the fact that the prison populations has gone down double digits. That's not cause for a hallelujah. We still have so many people in prison who are there for such a long time, and when we saw -- what COVID laid bare was the elderly in prison, those who are disabled in prison, those who are unhealthy in prison.

1.3

That's the tip of a big iceberg, which is, we use prison far too much. And a true next step in this movement, from my opinion, would be rallying around an explicit campaign to reduce the prison population in the near term. And we can do that.

I'm not talking about forward looking. I'm talking about people who are in prison now getting out, and there are ways the prosecutors can do that. There are ways that legislators can do that. There are ways that governors can do that.

But in order to get closer to a vision of justice, we have to do for the adults what we were able to do for the young people, and bring them close to home and keep them close to home, not use prison as our last resort.

MR. WESTERN: Great. Thanks, Jeremy.

Nadia Lopez?

DR. LOPEZ: Good afternoon, everyone, and thank you for the invitation to be a part of this conversation.

I'm the Founder of Mott Hall Bridges Academy, a STEMfocused school in the Brownsville section of Brooklyn.

1.3

And so, this conversation is really important to me because I don't come from, let's say, the formalized criminal justice background, but my work in education is aligned to the work that many of you are doing. I'm cautiously optimistic.

When I opened this school, I said I opened this school to close a prison, and I was intentional about that. I understood that I had to redefine my role as a principal, and not see myself as someone who was just going to be in a school building, in an office, and complying to all of the mandates of the Department of Education.

I knew that I was serving as a community leader. I knew that I had to understand the people that I was serving within that community. And so, that meant knowing that, as Donna had spoken about, Black and Brown people have been marginalized and the impact of poverty.

What does that look like? Where does that stem from? Who's responsible for it? Who else knows about it? Why haven't we done anything differently? What needs to happen?

Because as long as I'm still here as a principal in this school, what am I doing to change the

landscape and the future for these children, who only know prison or the conversation about death as a form of being and living on this earth? And so, I had to take a holistic approach to that, and I had to understand that there are parallels to the criminal justice system that's embedded in our education system.

1.3

There are conversations that are not happening.

There's an expectation that we're supposed to live in a silo, and that's not correct.

Right now, the despair that's in Brownsville is palpable. We are one of five communities that has the vast majority of our residents who are in the New York State prison system.

And so, knowing that, you have the high crime that's happening because people feel unseen. There's trauma in the community. There's a lack of investment in saying that we should be providing skills and opportunities and access, so those who are in our community can be able to become productive citizens.

Children who came into my school were literally on a first or second grade reading level and they were in sixth grade. Six percent of my scholars actually read on grade level when they came in to sixth grade, and my question was, that means there's only two kids who can read on grade level; what happened in elementary school?

What questions are we not asking our parents?

1.3

They don't have libraries in their homes. They don't have access to books. All they have access to are the ones in the school, and most times, principals don't want children taking the books home because then they wouldn't have books in the schools for everybody else to read.

So, the only time that they get to see and touch and feel and read is when they're inside of a school, because most of their parents don't have the capacity to read or write. So you think now with COVID -- it's nearly two years -- a year and a half that children have been home.

Schools were a place of escape for them. It was a place of healing. It was a place of feeling valued.

Now they're in a household with parents who are maybe dealing with traumas themselves, mental health issues, multiple brothers and sisters. They have no form of escape. And then, when they were going outside, the police were policing them and telling them they needed to go back inside of their household, and creating more trauma.

So, those children -- when Eric spoke about the fact that there will an increase in violence, I think about those children because they're going to go into high

school not having been able to succeed. They'll go into schools where there's so much turnover right now because of the way teachers and principals have been treated throughout the whole pandemic.

1.3

So, there will be a new crop of individuals who are really there for the check, not really there for understanding the communities. Not really being able to understand that they are actual agents that can either deter children from going to prison or being the pathway for them to end up there. This is a concern.

And so I'm cautious about being optimistic, because as long as there's not a conversation about how the school system has to be in partnership with those who are doing the social justice and criminal reform, we're going to see this divide. And we're going to see many of our families -- families, generations, who are going to be destroyed by this very moment.

So, you know, everyone on this call, I'm listening. And I've been taking my notes of what everyone is saying because I know the value of what it means to show up, and I'm going to say many of my colleagues, they don't have the capacity.

They simply just don't understand their roles and responsibilities because, in the Department of Education, you have to get this data together. You've got

to make sure that you have kids on proficiency, but it's virtually impossible when you've taken away our money and you don't provide professional development.

1.3

And so, I've had to partner with individuals like Ken Montgomery and Keith White, who are my brothers from the Brooklyn Combine, who provide mentorships for my scholars since the time I opened the school. I've had relationships with Marlon Peterson from the time he was incarcerated and started a letter-writing program since 2004 when I was just a teacher, and continued that on. And when he was released from prison, he became a mentor to my scholars.

I went to school with Topeka Sam in high school. So, I know her story. I knew Topeka before her incarceration, and I know the person she is. And it was important to share with our girls that you can be incarcerated as well, but creating opportunities for our scholars to hear her story so that they can know that there's other opportunities in life for them.

And then, partnering with individuals like
Thomas Edwards of The Circles of Support, in terms of
getting the funding that was needed in order to provide
our scholars with financial literacy and entrepreneurship
so that we can disrupt generational poverty. Because the
reality is, the reason why there's so much violence is

because people feel like they have nothing.

And so, the reimagining is also, how do we redefine how we show up? How do we redefine what the expectations will be for these communities and those who are serving in the communities and getting funding? How are they actually engaging those who need to experience hope and not feel helpless and the despair?

So, thank you.

MR. WESTERN: Thanks, Nadia.

Rahson Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. Thank you for the invitation to be a part of this discussion. My name is Rahson Johnson. I'm the Program Manager of the Save Our Streets. That's SOS. It's a community-based organization that is under the Center for Court Innovation.

Our primary mission is to reduce gun violence in the community. So, we spoke about violence interrupters, outreach workers earlier. That's one of the programs I'm actually a program manager for.

To the question, I think of Viktor Frankl, his book, Man's Search for Meaning, and the thing about tragic optimism. So, yes. I am hopeful, but I do know that we are living in a time where life and death are permitted to coexist, where suffering is permitted to exist.

Working with violence interrupters and being

1.3

out there in the streets to interrupt violence, every day we see gun violence. Every day we see people hurting each other and we interrupt it as best as we can, while also trying to remain hopeful that we are changing.

1.3

The very shirts that the workers wear, Stop shooting and start living -- it says, Put the guns down. Stop shooting each other. But also, find ways in which we can live and coexist together.

Just last night, I was on a webinar about community organizing. And it was about maybe 20 minutes into the webinar, one of the workers texted me and said we had a shooting in the community. So, even while having that discussion, there's still things happening in our community.

But I think about the leadership when I think about how optimistic should I be. I think about the leadership. I think about the times that we are in.

Seeing violence at our capitol -- the U.S. Capitol. We're seeing that there is leadership there that kind of perpetuated some of the violence.

And so, when we go out there and we attempt to speak to the young people about building community, about resolving conflict, and being, basically, just loving and caring towards each other, those are examples that they point to. They question that leadership. They question

the area in which the country has gone and where it's going.

1.3

You talk about racialized violence that is perpetrated against some of our community members by the police. They point to those examples. Why should I be a person that seeks to change things when the very institutions that are here to protect us and to keep our community safe aren't doing that. They're hurting us.

So, those are realistic situations and concerns that they bring up. And we try to find ways to talk to them about those issues and try to figure out ways, how we can deal with the interpersonal situations and conflicts that we have.

So, I am certainly optimistic. A lot of people say cautiously optimistic. And truth of the matter is, I have no other choice but to be optimistic.

We spoke about closing Rikers Island. We talked about bail reform. We talked about the criminal justice system and so many people that are incarcerated in our country.

Those are all points that hit personal and hit home with me, because at the age of 16, I went to prison and served a total of 23 to 60 years. I had to no education. I didn't graduate from high school.

But while I was in there, I made choices that

allowed for me to gain my GED, get an associate's degree and a master's degree while I was inside of there. And, you know, while my degree is rooted in liberation theology, I've used that same education to talk about how we liberate the people in our community, and the lens which we look through is the lens of the oppressed, the people who are marginalized, those who are hurt.

How do we help those people? For me, it's about how do we -- I know we talk about reshaping, reforming, and reimagining. For me, it's about how do we create.

I think about our school systems and where are we going -- and we do wraparound services when we were able to go in, pre-pandemic. But I think about, where's the curriculum around gun violence inside of our schools?

We have kids that go to school and sit in the classroom, come home, and see someone laid out in their community on the street from gun violence, bloodshed. We have kids who see guns inside of their homes.

And then, there's the connection, also, that Dr. Nadia Lopez wrote up about poverty. Kids who'll go hungry, who can't eat, who don't have anything to eat, who don't have enough food to eat. So, I think about how do we create a system that is going to be really rooted in trying to help our people and help the young people and

really, really radically reform the systems in which we find ourselves currently under.

1.3

And I will continue to remain optimistic about what we can do, even while I'm out there doing violence reduction inside the community. Right after this call, I'm going to Albany Houses in Brooklyn, because there was a shooting over there -- that shooting last night -- to engage the community.

That's something that we do constantly, and certainly we need help. We need more resources and I thank definitely Eric Cumberbatch and the Office to Prevent Gun Violence and Mark Jay [phonetic] for being able to provide those resources and to assist us in doing this community work, and we will continue to do that.

MR. WESTERN: Thanks, Rahson.

Renita Francois?

MS. FRANCOIS: Hi, everybody. I'm Renita
Francois. I'm the Executive Director of the Mayor's
Action Plan for Neighborhood Safety, part of the Office of
Neighborhood Safety that Eric previously talked about at
the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice. It's like a
nesting doll -- many, many names and titles.

I work with residents of 15 public housing developments across New York City that have experienced disproportionate rates of violence and other social

stressors. Any condition that you can imagine, these residents have faced and have gone against, whether it be economic, whether it deal with disinvestment, lack of opportunities for their children.

1.3

You name it. These residents are doing everything they can to persevere through it. And through the Mayor's Action Plan for Neighborhood Safety, we're working with those residents, along with community-based partners and city agencies, to define what safety means to them, and not just to talk about it and to imagine and envision it, but to actually put our hands to work to create it.

And I think that it's really important in this moment, and I'm glad the national conversation has arrived at this point where we're really starting to talk about community investment, as opposed to enforcement. But residents in New York City have actually been laying a lot of the groundwork and foundation for that.

We see them do it every day. And I think that the challenge for us in this work is, how do we move beyond these constant conversations constantly poking and prodding communities about what they need, and actually show the bold leadership necessary and, really, the humanity and dignity necessary to fund justice?

And justice, not just when people touch the

criminal justice system, but before they ever get there.

There's so much harm that has been done that I can't even think about justice in the criminal sense because so much has happened before that.

1.3

To the question of, am I hopeful? I'm always hopeful. I mean, I am the descendant of enslaved persons who could not see freedom for themselves. They couldn't see me sitting in this seat right now, but I'm sure that they hoped and that they dreamed that somebody like me would have the opportunity to be here.

And so, I don't have the luxury of not being hopeful, but I am tired. I am very exhausted, and I am weary. And I don't have all the answers, and I think that we saw with the COVID-19 pandemic that safety is really a holistic conversation that has to do with so much more than crime.

When our physical health is compromised, when our mental health is compromised, what happens to our communities? And we're not having the conversation about trauma that we need to. We're talking about the aftermath of that trauma, which is gun violence and all of the other violence that we see.

So, I don't have all the answers, but I do know that a system built on slave-catching and creative legal disenfranchisement cannot stand, and I know that we won't

let it. And so, I'm happy to be here with all of you, who I'm sure agree with that statement, and I look forward to the conversation.

1.3

MR. WESTERN: That's great, Renita. Thank you.
Thomas? Thomas Edwards?

MR. EDWARDS: How are you doing? Thanks for having me today. My name is Thomas Edwards. I'm with the J.C. Flowers Foundation Circles of Support.

Really heavy stuff going on right now, and I guess -- you know, as someone who spent time on Rikers Island as a 17-year old, I'm pretty happy about the closing of Rikers Island because I know what it was. For someone who spent time in the juvenile facility as a 13-, 14-year old, the Close to Home thing -- all these things are great things.

But I also live in Brownsville. And I look at what's happening each and every day, and all these new reforms and these things that change -- I don't know what they mean to the people most affected. They don't seem to be changed from any of these things. And I'm sure they are, and I'm sure the numbers would validate that.

But as someone who lived in these communities -- and this is not by chance that things are the way they are. These are the values of this country that segregated and oppressed a group of people.

So, I don't know how you change that culture just by doing some reforms, because it is dire. And as far as being optimistic or pessimistic -- I'm Black. I was born Black in this country, and I say that to say, I've seen so much that I don't know if I have hope.

1.3

But to be Black in this country, you always have to have hope, because if you don't believe it can get better, then it won't get better. But at the same time, it's a cultural thing, and this country has to really dig deep and be honest, and really open up some wounds there and say, Listen. This is what we did and this is how we can start to fix it.

Because this is only the beginning. Thank you.

MR. WESTERN: That's great, Thomas. Thank you.

Vinny Schiraldi?

MR. SCHIRALDI: Thanks, Bruce. I'm Vinny
Schiraldi, Co-Director of the Lab with Bruce, and I'm very
optimistic. I've been in this -- it's my 41st year in
this field.

I started in 1980, and for the first 29, 39

years -- 29 years, the prison population rose every single

year. And you couldn't scare up a small conference room

of people that seemed to care about that. And that was

really, really hard and really depressing for a very long

period of time.

I moved back to New York in 2010. I was gone for 25 years from New York, and as probation commissioner, I started looking at the numbers and a lot of the system had disappeared. It's just a stunning amount of New York City's system has disappeared. So much so that I think New York is arguably post-mass incarceration.

1.3

So, I get Jeremy's point. If internationally unique and historically unprecedented are your two guidelines for mass incarceration, I think it's just true that New York is neither of those things anymore. Racial disparities have gone up during that time, but there's 70 percent fewer people being sentenced to state prison from New York City.

It's gone down from 22,000 people to under 6,000. There were 1,500 kids in state custody in the year 2000. There's no kids from family court and state custody, and as Gladys said, 62 kids in any form of custody. Twenty-two of them are in something that's locked.

So, I think we need to start to use New York, not as a perfect example by any stretch of the imagination. It still stuns me how many people are being technically violated on parole, for example.

I called the statisticians at Rikers five times last year, and it wasn't one single person any of those

times in for a technical probation violation, while one out of seven people were in Rikers for a technical state parole violation. So, there's still plenty of stuff to not be happy about and to be depressed about.

1.3

But I actually think -- I'm glad we're having this conversation because I think New York might be an example of what the end of mass incarceration looks like in its imperfect way. And I think that's something that other jurisdictions should kick the tires on, because all this happened with a pre-pandemic, stunning decline in crime.

I witnessed that firsthand. I mean, the year before I left New York, my apartment got burglarized twice. My car got broken into, and my landlord's son killed his girlfriend in the basement. And part of the reason I got the hell out of New York was because it just felt really unsafe, and I live right now in Williamsburg in a spot I wouldn't have walked when I was living in New York before.

So, this whole notion that I mostly grew up with that we just need more prisons to keep us safe, New York has given the lie to that. And I just think we need to sort of kick the tires on that and say, not just what can we do more -- which is absolutely true and absolutely wonderful.

But how the hell did this happen? And how was it so diametrically opposed to what there was a consensus around during the '70s, '80s, and '90s, which is that without more prisons, we would be less safe.

MR. WESTERN: Great, Vinny. Thank you very much.

1.3

And Vivian Nixon, I think, may be our last participant.

REV. NIXON: Thank you, Bruce. You know, there's not much that's been said that I don't agree with.

I just want to highlight a few things, not in any particular order.

I'm Vivian Nixon, Executive Director of College and Community Fellowship in New York City. And I think the thread that runs through the few comments I have is definitely that the underlying driver of every concern that I've heard is it still continues to be race.

Rikers closing was a huge deal. It has to happen. If there's any choice to make between pessimism and optimism, I have to say that I am -- optimism, but I don't use that word lightly, because I have a lot of doubt.

I don't see a lot of evidence that there is enough political will to push back. If there's community push back, I don't see enough political will to make sure

that we hold our promise to close Rikers without continued advocacy from the community and insistence upon closing it.

1.3

So, optimism is not the word I would use. I would use hope, and I don't see them as the same thing.

But the default to police is also rooted in race. So, when Eric Gonzalez talked about, you know, we default to police for everything -- yeah. The difference is that when we default to police, it shows up differently in other neighborhoods.

The police don't show up the same everywhere.

And so, no matter how small the policing system is,

they're going to show up differently in Brownsville than
they show up on Fifth Avenue and 74th Street.

Vinny emphasized that while we have a big reduction, there's still a racial disparity. Are we okay with that? The racial disparity points to the fact that there's still a problem. Is my pain any less because there are fewer people suffering the same pain I'm suffering?

Danielle talked about us not compromising.

Those of us who are on the side of really dismantling -doing more than shrinking -- doing more than reforming -not tinkering, I can't agree with that, either. Because
without compromise, there will be absolutely no progress.

We will be stuck.

1.3

So we've got to find ways to do the things that we know are really going to change lives. Like the level of not having food to eat, or the level of living in fear, at the level of not having a school system that has the resources it needs to make sure children get the education they need.

We've got to make those kinds of compromises. The compromises that are going to make changes that are long and lasting changes that give people real hope for real opportunity. Not pie-in-the-sky dreams about what they could be if they became rich and famous.

Incrementalism can work if it is the right kind of change. We need to all work together. Yep. We do. But we don't need to be uniformed.

Unity is not uniformity. We all can have a lane that we are really good at. We can have something that we do better than everybody else, or at least, as good as.

And if we put our hands to the plow and do that, whether it's education or employment or helping people reduce violence in their communities. Do that to the best of your ability.

And we can do that in unity, but it doesn't mean we all have to believe the same. We don't have to

have the same foundational beliefs, and we don't all have to act in unison. We have to have a unity of the goal of severely dismantling the criminal justice system.

1.3

And then, I'll just end with the reason I can't use the word "optimism." I find it interesting that a lot of people see these changes that have been made -- the things that have happened like closing Rikers and more investments in programming in communities, and reducing juvenile justice systems, and can easily say they're optimistic.

But that's because most of the people who can be optimistic without qualifying it -- and I've paid attention to those who are just straight up optimistic, and those who qualified it. Most who can qualify it, understand how much of a tightrope we are on, and all you have to do is think about January 6 to know that.

We are on such a tightrope. The level of entrenchment that is possible is, to me, beyond anything we have imagined in my lifetime, or even my mother's lifetime. Because if that element of our society is able to gain complete control, they have legal authority to do just about anything they want with us if we are duly convicted of a crime, and authority to make anything they want to be a crime a crime.

That's a serious threat, and it weighs on my

mind daily. So I think what has come to my mind very clearly over these Square One Sessions and Roundtables is, there needs to be -- we can't move forward without acknowledging just how tenuous the lives of Black and Brown bodies are still in America.

1.3

We can't move forward without an agreement to repair the harm that has already been done, and a mechanism to stop the harm from continuing, and a complete rejection of any authority that is rooted in white supremacy.

And for some people, that looks like abolition.

For some people, that looks like something else, and it has to happen at every level: on the ground, in the Mayor's office, the Governor's office, the House, the Senate, the White House, in communities, in the academy, in business. It has to happen everywhere.

So, I'm not optimistic because the evidence does not make me believe we're there. But I am hopeful, and I'm hopeful for the same reason I heard many people say they were hopeful on this call.

Because my people are not supposed to have survived the torture that they survived for hundreds of years. We should be extinct, but we are still here. And that's why I have hope.

MR. WESTERN: That is great, Vivian. That is a

fitting point at which to pause. We may be rejoined at some point by DeAnna Hoskins from JLUSA. DeAnna had to step away for a moment, but she may rejoin us.

1.3

We're going to open the floor now to the New York panel, and I want to acknowledge that this conversation is enabled with the support of the J.C. Flowers Foundation. And as I was listening, something I've been wrestling with as I've been thinking about this panel is that in many ways, we can look at a lot of numerical indicators and we heard a lot about that from you all in the last half hour.

The Rikers' numbers are astonishing. From 22,000 to -- at the height of the pandemic, the Rikers population got down to 3,800 from 22,000 in '91 or '92. And Vinny put the point very sharply that we can think of us living now in New York in a post-mass-incarceration era, which is a stunning statement, and the numbers, I think, bear it out.

And yet, from around this table, the project of racial justice seems actually just as urgent. We feel as if we've not made tremendous progress on that project. As Vivian said, the security of Black and Brown bodies does not seem greatly advanced despite the large reduction in the jail population, and white supremacy does not appear to have been defeated, despite these improvements.

And I felt, in many ways, people were saying there remains a mountainous unsolved challenge that has not been reflected in the declining crime rates or the declining jail population.

1.3

So, I just want to open the floor, and I want to push on the challenges. I think often you get a group of New Yorkers together and particularly with people from outside the city, and the victory's well and appropriately documented. I wonder if we can push on the challenges.

How do we make progress on the much more challenging problem of racial justice, and the security of Black and Brown bodies, and the defeat of white supremacy? Because shrinking crime rates and shrinking jail populations has only taken us so far, it seems.

I know this is not a reticent group. I know that from personal experience. You can raise your blue hand with the reaction button to get in the queue, and for the moment, there's the discussion among the New Yorkers and we'll open the panel shortly.

Liz Glazer?

MS. GLAZER: I am probably -- I am the wrong person to lead this off, but I think as long as we focus on reducing incarceration and the footprint of the criminal justice system as the sole way to improve lives and to right the wrongs of the past, we will continue to

miss the mark. Because the issue is less -- well, I mean, that's surely an issue, and that has to be fixed. But the issue is that -- and I'm so sorry that the principal who spoke so eloquently about the Brownsville school -- I'm sorry. I don't know your name.

Wait, Nadia Lopez?

1.3

MR. WESTERN: Nadia.

MS. GLAZER: I mean, I think that the issue of not having access to just more than basic resources of good schools and decent housing and well-maintained public spaces, and putting our shoulder to that wheel in a very sort of focused and concentrated way is the way that everyone's life becomes better and the touch of the criminal justice system recedes.

It's not to say abandon the project of reducing the touch of the criminal justice system. Absolutely, we should make it less punitive, et cetera, et cetera. But we should start way, way, way before. And right now, we only have sort of language of negation.

We talk about prevention. We talk about all these other things, but we have to sort of figure out a way to make it as powerful as it actually is to put together the pieces that give people access to the resources that have been denied for centuries.

MR. WESTERN: That's great, Liz.

Beverly?

1.3

MS. TILLERY: You know, I was hesitating because actually, I was surprised by how much the conversation and hearing people's comments was creating a really emotional response for me.

I think that is because of exactly what you said, Bruce, in that you can look at all of the statistics, but the reality is that this is still a very divided city and our realities are so different.

And there are -- for some people, they can walk more safely in the city, and for some people, they do have access to resources that they need in increasing resources. And again, we saw with COVID how that is not the case for so many. I think until we define our success in terms of the lived reality of the most marginalized, the most impacted by violence, we will always have this divided conversation about how far we've come because there will always be hoards of people that we're leaving behind and we're kind of saying that's okay, because we've made all these other strides.

And so, I think about how do we get to the point where we are no longer debating the humanity of certain people in our society? I mean, that is really the core.

We talk about radical reform, which I truly

believe that we need. But I also believe, as people have said so eloquently, until we deal with racism and racial equity in this country, we will keep recreating systems that continue to punish and harm Black and Brown people and queer people and immigrants over and over again.

And that getting to the core of that, in all of the work that we do is, I think, what is really the hardest thing, but the most important thing.

MR. WESTERN: Thanks, Beverly.

Thomas?

1.3

MR. EDWARDS: Yeah, I think that a lot of this is cultural. When you look at certain things, the way they happen -- you know, we didn't get to this place by accident. And what I mean by that, when you talk about how policing is different in different communities, and as it should be because policing, as someone pointed out, it started with slave patrols.

So, if it wasn't slave patrols, it was about property protections. Black people were either property and had nothing to protect, so they could never have a good relationship with that organization. So, it evolved into what it is today, and it just has over grown over time.

And then, you look at the lack of resources.

Nadia talked about education in prison, and it's been long thought that you could tie the lack of education into going to prison at some point. If you do statistics, a vast number of people in prison don't have a high school diploma. So, it starts right there.

1.3

So, it's not by chance that certain neighborhoods like Brownsville, the South Bronx, and other neighborhoods lack resources. This was by design, and it was set up a certain way to keep this thing going. And the fact that the numbers have come down -- like I said before, I don't know how much that means to the individual people.

You know, we talk about violence in the city. Much of the violence is perpetrated against people of color and with no resources, no protection. So, these things are not just, like, perchance that they happen.

I mean, you even look at the way the city was designed by Robert Moses. All these things were designed to keep certain people down. The educational system, the way it's set up. The immigration system. I mean, certain immigrants have come over here -- they are wanted over here.

But it also depends on what color you are, where you come from if you're wanted here. And the worst thing to be in America is Black. I don't care where you

come from or who you are. If you come here, you know you are over one group of people.

1.3

You have seen it on the news. You have read about it. You have seen it on TV, that this one group of people are beneath you, no matter where you come from or what your situation was.

And so, this has continued to be perpetrated. So, it becomes a cultural thing, and I think without really going all the way back to the core of this and providing real resources — and I don't know if reparations or whatever the word you want to use are the answers, but there's some real things that need to be done and looked at.

Because I don't think any one grows up -- you know, Rahson went to prison at 16. He sat in a courtroom where everybody had a college degree, and he didn't have a high school diploma. But somehow that was fair in this society. And what we need to look at is dignity. How do we treat people?

And then, I think we have to look at this country's history. Who are people? Let's not forget that. Who are people in this country? Because there was a time in this country the law dictated that certain people wasn't people -- that they weren't human.

So, we need to look at the whole history of

this country and rebuild on what happened because we can't 1 2 act like it didn't happen. And I think that's where the 3 whole core of this thing has to start from. Thank you. 4 MR. WESTERN: Thanks, Thomas. 5 Donna? Thanks, Bruce. I just want to 6 MS. HYLTON: 7 jump in because what Beverly said, it just -- I do this 8 work intentionally, right. And the intention comes from a 9 lived experience, and that lived experience is rooted in so much trauma and so much harm and so much pain. 10 11 But in my journey and in my own healing, I have 12 to understand that the majority of that was not my fault. 1.3 I had to really understand that. So, when I went into the criminal legal system 14 15 when I was sent to prison, I met hundreds of other women, 16 young women like myself, who shared very similar 17 stories -- journeys as mine. And it was at those points 18 in incarceration that I started getting an understanding, 19 and the understanding was like, What's wrong here? 20 Why is hundreds of women -- young women like 21 myself -- in this system? Not one that said anyone 22 listened, cared enough to help, paid attention. Not one. 2.3 24 And so, what I recognize is that we really have

to hone in on the root causes of things, as I mentioned

25

earlier and some of us have been saying. Nothing that we're doing is ever going to change if we don't recognize and acknowledge the root causes. And those root causes are not just premised in racism. They're premised in harm, abuse, violence, trauma, poverty.

1.3

Nadia's talking about the kids not having what they need. Why is one school more equipped than another school? During this pandemic, it hurt us so much -- it hurt me as a mother, as a woman, as a human being -- to hear and to learn that there were children that didn't even have Wi-Fi.

They didn't have a laptop or whatever they needed to use to participate in schools, in the work.

Why? Why is -- I believe it's Brownsville -- the only area in our city that doesn't even have, I believe, a high school?

Something's wrong. We must, must recognize, acknowledge, and understand the root causes of all of this stuff. We're all guilty of it. We're all guilty of it.

It's more difficult for us, yes, those of us who are Black and Brown to correct the ills that were thrown at us, and we continue to live with daily because we're walking around Black and Brown. So we don't know if we're going to live to see tomorrow free or alive.

So, in order for any of this stuff to really

change or even get the support, the work that's necessary, we have to first acknowledge that there's some issues here, personal and societal. Why do we have kids living in abject poverty? Why do we have anyone living in abject poverty?

1.3

Why has prison become the response to substance abuse, substance issues, mental health, poverty -- all these other things -- medical issues. Why has prison and this system become that? Why?

We know why, right? Because it was created to harm us. Let's be very clear. Black and Brown people, it was created to harm us.

So, we have to first recognize those root things, those ills that are so embedded in this country and to Vivian's point, entrenched. Because it's not okay. We've become so comfortable, and those who are white allies -- counterparts, we need your help. And I really challenge you to recognize your privilege.

Recognize the privilege and recognize and understand how you can help with this because we cannot do it alone. But it must first be acknowledged that it's not just the systems -- these physical systems that we're dealing with -- but those mental, emotional, spiritual systems that have been created to harm people.

So, root causes for me is so important. Our

office is located in Bedford-Stuyvesant, but we do work across this country, especially in New York. And the common thread, the common themes are all the same. All the same.

1.3

So, no matter what position or role or title you carry, I challenge everyone to recognize their humanity. Recognize your humanity so you could recognize it in other people. And as a human being, ask yourself, why are kids going hungry? Why don't the children in a certain area have what children in my area might have?

Why are so many women or people incarcerated in this country and they have the same stories? The same journeys? What's wrong here?

So, for me, the work is premised in recognizing that, acknowledging that, and working in whatever capacity I can contribute to change it. And if that means shaming people, I will shame you because lives are on the line.

When I was a little girl, you didn't help me, but there's no anger there. There's an understanding that it's hard sometimes to face the truth. And so, I challenge everyone to look in the mirror and say what is that truth for you? How can you contribute? How can you not? What can you do?

I wouldn't even care if it's picking up the phone, signing something, whatever it may be. What is

that? But really recognize and acknowledge that harm comes in so many ways. And the vast majority of it is directed at one race of people, and something is wrong.

MR. WESTERN: Thanks, Donna. We only have a few minutes. I'll go right to Nadia in one second.

We only have a few minutes before we bring in

We only have a few minutes before we bring in the whole Roundtable, but there's a very strong continuity across Donna's comments and Thomas's and Beverly's: the importance of acknowledging root causes, getting beyond debating humanity. Beverly said, until we deal with racism, we'll continue to harm.

So, I think a question for this group is, what dose this mean concretely? This is very much picking up the challenge that Donna has presented us with. What do we do in our politics, in policy, to tackle the challenge of racism and racial injustice in New York City today?

What does that mean in terms of action today?

I really want to push us to try and speak to that in a direct way.

Nadia?

1.3

DR. LOPEZ: I guess my answer -- I couldn't have said as well because Donna was saying so much, I was like, If I put my hand up -- but honestly, I think about what's the holistic approach that we're taking?

We understand that Black and Brown people are disproportionately affected by the criminal justice system, by the education system, by healthcare, by housing, by economics, mental health -- all of the things. And when you look at the conversations that are had, they'll be a conversation about criminal justice reform. There's no one in regards to mental health on that committee. There's no one in regards to education.

There's no one in regards to economics.

1.3

Then, you have another conversation about mental health. There's no one in conversation about criminal justice. We'll all say the same things in our respective industries, but we're not actually coming to the table and having a holistic conversation about what would it mean? What does it look like?

What is the impact that's being had in our communities? Yes. Racism is at the root of it all, but what does it look like for us to design policies or provide the funding? Or to actually ask the question: why is this happening?

I learned that by literally being inside of a school. It was virtually impossible for me to lead a school not recognizing the mental health issues in our school system, and not understanding until I ended up -- and this is why I'm not the principal of the school

anymore -- with health issues as a result of the stress that occurred because of the work.

1.3

So, when we talk about COVID, and we talk about Black and Brown people having the largest number of cases, all I could hear on the media was this is related to underlying health issues. But does anybody really get to the root of the why? Why would I have all of these health issues? It's because of the stress. It's because of the lack of support.

It's because of the vicarious trauma that I walk into every single day having to deal with the effects of poverty in a community that has been so traumatized, that deals with PTSD, that deals with depression, that deals with anxiety, that deals with police brutality, that deals with abandonment, that deals with children not having fathers in their homes, mothers being abused in front of them.

That's every single day. And so, if we don't have conversations that brings everyone to the table -- all of the leaders to the table and say, What do we need to do to make this happen?

Because the reality is, when we start breaking down what do communities that does not look like ours -- in communities that are affluent, that may be predominantly white -- what do they have? We'll talk

about all of the services that they have.

1.3

All of the opportunities that they have, the access and everything. Because they get together and they say, What do we need? And we're going to create it, and we're going to provide it, and we're going to have to get the money, and we're going to do all of the things.

Our community doesn't know how to advocate for that. They don't even know what they don't have. They don't know what they need because they've never received it.

So, all we know how to do, literally, is survive. We've never been taught how to properly thrive. We've never been taught what we deserve in this life.

Our kudos is that we survived another day. Our existence is based off of trauma every single day. And then, we look to the right and look to the left and say, I'm still here.

And so, until we have a real conversation -until we're able to say, Who's at the helm of this? Who
are our leaders in positions that do make the policies?
When have they shown up in our community?

Do they truly understand us? It's not enough to throw money at organizations. Do you know what the work that the organization is doing? Do you even know who they're partnered with?

That's the real work that needs to happen in 1 2 order to do transformative work that will have greater 3 sustainability and impact for the future. 4 MR. WESTERN: That's great, Nadia. Thank you. 5 Thanks very much for that. We have been joined by DeAnna Hoskins. Good to 6 7 see you, DeAnna. 8 So, I began by asking everyone to give us a 60-9 second introduction whether or not they felt pessimistic 10 or optimistic about the current moment. And so, DeAnna, I 11 wonder if I could ask you to introduce yourself and put 12 that same question to you. 1.3 MS. HOSKINS: Thanks, Bruce. I apologize to 14 everyone for having to step away. DeAnna Hoskins, 15 President and CEO of Just Leadership USA. 16 Am I optimistic or pessimistic about the current climate? I think I straddle the fence, but I lean 17 18 more towards optimistic, because being directly impacted and being in this work for over 20 years, I've always 19 20 moved towards solution. 21 I struggle when we requrgitate a problem 22 especially when you've lived the problem over and over. 23 How do we move to solution? What is the strategy to get 24 to solution?

And what I'm seeing is progress is being made

25

and barriers do come up. And I think when you've come from a community of people that understands when you start to move forward, barriers and traps are going to be thrown in front of you, your job is to figure out strategically how to maneuver them and around them to keep going in this climate, in this culture.

1.3

I was listening to the conversation before I joined back and one of the things that I think -- we keep skirting around it. We're all talking about we know race is the problem, and it's like digging up a tree.

We're digging to the root, but then, we get to it and it's like, Ooh. That's too big. So, let's try to back off and find something else that can actually subpar that or actually try to fix it. When we talk about policies, policies are great, guys.

But if we're not looking at the policies from a cultural lens -- because policies are going to land different in Black and Brown communities than they land in white communities -- who's going to benefit from those policies? And I just think all the policies -- and right now, I'm critiquing the George Floyd on police reform policy.

The fact of saying you have to put in a policy not to chokehold a person? That's not even seeing people as human, that you have to put that into a federal law to

say don't choke somebody and kill them. And that's directly saying, Don't choke Black people and kill them when you're arresting them.

That's deliberately what they're saying. So, what they're showing me is that we know -- I heard someone say it's the devaluing of Black lives -- that we're not even considered human. We're still considered three-fourths of a human, and society continues to treat us like that.

So, I'm kind of at the point -- everyone who knows me, I just call it what it is -- if we don't have the courage to stand up and call it what it is, we're going to continue to be pushed back. We're going to continue to keep coming to these moments of these tables.

1.3

I agree with Nadia. If we are not cross-collaborating -- because the criminal justice system is just a catch-all. It's a catch-all of all the other failed systems that are not fully funded and operating to actually function and to actually provide what's needed so that we don't end up in the criminal justice system.

And to keep acting as if the criminal justice system solo is the problem -- it's not. It's the systemic of all these other systems that have been failing Black and Brown communities for years.

1 Someone made a comment to me the other day, 2 This is a very uncomfortable moment. And my response was, 3 Well, welcome to Black people's world. We've been 4 uncomfortable for 400 years. It's about time other people 5 are starting to get uncomfortable, too. 6 So, I'm hopeful, Bruce, and I'm just going to 7 stay on my lane. But until we start working in a cross collaboration manner to address what it is -- and let's 8 9 put this out there, too. It's just not this criminal 10 justice system. 11 It's even being a Black woman running a 12 national organization and being oppressed by philanthropy, 1.3 so it's showing up everywhere. Still being marginalized by the color of my skin in different aspects. 14 15 So, when I say the trauma -- I think Nadia said 16 it -- the trauma of this conversation, the trauma of what 17 happens every day in life, the trauma of the work is 18 falling real hard on Black people right now. So, and I'll 19 stop there. 20 MR. WESTERN: Thanks, DeAnna. So, Renita has 21 her hand up. Eric, did you want to come in as well? So, 22 you don't have to be --23 MR. CUMBERBATCH: It depends on what Renita

MR. WESTERN: Okay. I, myself, feel that way

24

25

says or doesn't say.

about most things. So, we'll go Renita, and then, maybe, Eric. And then, we'll open the floor to the whole Roundtable group.

Renita?

1.3

MS. FRANCOIS: I just wanted to react to what Nadia was saying. But first, I want to -- as part of the Office of Neighborhood Safety, we're doing this community-based participatory research project with an organization National Innovation Service. It's a Black-led research and policy organization, and they do great work.

And so, we commissioned them to do this project to help us understand, from the residents and folks in the community's perspective, how they think about safety.

Because right now, the statistics that we look at and we want to determine whether a community is good or bad, safe or thriving, it's just if crime went up or crime went down, and that's the full story.

And so, we really wanted to go about this undertaking of really learning what communities actually say about feeling safe. So, the people that contributed to this are residents who live in public housing, residents who live in underserved communities, our community-based partners, like ones that operate the cure violence model.

And so, I want to read a quote that was in

their findings about thriving that just struck me because residents have such -- they understand the complexity of the situation in which they find themselves. And I think that as government actors -- and especially in the enforcement realm -- you hear this language of fear around the excuse for why communities have to live under the occupation that they do.

1.3

So, I'm going to read this quote from a person who's a part of this. It's says, "We're not thriving.

We're surviving, and it's a difference. It's a very big difference. When all of my needs are met and all of my child's needs are met, then we can strive. We can thrive for something. We can reach for something.

"We can see that goal happening because I'm not worried about her eating. I'm not worried about nobody's busting down my door because I got \$5 more than them, knocking me over my head, knowing I ain't got but five more nickels than what you got."

When all of your needs are met, then you're moving forward, but if you're always moving backwards, you're not thriving. And I just think that that person's understanding of -- they were being asked questions about safety and what they need to feel safe. They went to the part about, Can I protect my child?

What's the economic condition in my community?

Is there a scarcity mindset where people feel like they have to target one another to get what they need?

1.3

There's just so much richness in the understanding of people who live in a community about what they need, and we oftentimes minimize that to, Well, we need to keep the condition like this. We need jails. We need police officers because who's going to keep the good people in the community safe? And they just have a very different understanding of what that looks like.

And to the point about having these conversations in silos, I think that -- one, in New York City, we do something called NeighborhoodStat where we do convene different agencies, community-based partners, and residents together to be in conversation explicitly about issues that arise in the communities where these residents live. And we work with them to prioritize, what do they see as important and critical and needing to be addressed now?

And what are the more systemic things that they are willing to be at the table with us to work toward?

The challenge with that is -- one, we have to build the local infrastructure. We have to be doing that everywhere.

People should be in conversation with their government at every table possible about what their needs

are. It's not just about centering the voices of people who are impacted by the criminal justice system. It's centering the voices of people who are impacted by inequity and disinvestment in every situation.

So, I agree that we do need to be convening people and figuring out how we do that at a broader scale, and how we invest in that. And the other part of it is just -- I'm losing my train of thought. So, I'm going let Eric go.

But I just wanted to lift up that that is happening in parts of our city, and just figuring out how we bring that to scale and bring in more voices is a part of the work that we have to do to figure out how to make this approach more widespread.

MR. WESTERN: Great. Thanks, Renita. Can I just say, the idea of building a local infrastructure for promoting political voice seems like a profoundly important idea to me.

Eric?

1.3

MR. CUMBERBATCH: Yeah. I just want to add to Renita's comments and really take a step away from the operations part, but how we arrived in this space and why we're in this space. First and foremost, our entire unit is comprised of young, brilliant Black and Brown people that have never seen themselves as having the

opportunities to be in these spaces.

1.3

So, what we come here with, what we reflect, what we project, what our outwards touch is, is really based a racial equity lens and steeped in leading with love in our heart and spirit from lived experiences coupled with theoretical, gained knowledge in the spaces where we are.

So, I think when we talk about holistic approaches, we're bringing holistic approaches into spaces that have traditionally been very sterile and very black and white, and did not represent our communities, and did not look like us in being in leadership positions, which is beyond key in moving us forward.

Someone mentioned earlier -- I think it
might've been Vivian -- about a collective effort. And
what we're doing is building networks across the city with
the understanding that everyone has some sense of
brilliance that they could bring as problem solvers,
researchers, and be part of the solution in their
particular role, in their particular part.

And the role and part that we're playing right now is not just to bring people to the table, but to build tables of ownership in community and resource and undo harms, challenges, barriers that exist across so many agencies, sectors, and so forth within city government.

I also want to say I'm hearing a lot of systems, systems. And, you know, I think sometimes we don't always lift up the self-resiliency, self-sufficiency that exists in our communities and within our people. And the strength and just the overall ability to be where we are today, and to really use these positions and platforms to lift up.

1.3

And that, in essence, is the core of our approaches, our work oftentimes in government space. I've worked in government for -- this is now 17, 18 years.

I'm in Brownsville often. I was just at Van Dyke Houses for a very horrific incident, and a lot of the brothers and sisters said, I haven't seen you in a while, E. And for me, the reflection was, if you haven't seen me, that's a good thing. Because when I'm here, it's about the systems that have failed so many people.

And really understanding the power that the collective has and allowing each other to network and mobilize, which has historically been disallowed in Black and Brown communities. And for us to come together and unify and really have power across community, power across agency, power across government, those are the steps that we're taking in New York City. And those are the types of things that we're doing, and we're not moving with

ideology of old school criminal justice system and so forth.

I told Ms. Glazer when she brought me to MOCJ very early on that we're not here because we believe the criminal justice system works for Black and Brown people.

We're here -- me, in particular -- to blow it up as it's always been.

MR. WESTERN: Yeah. Let me bring in the whole Roundtable group now. And so, here's everyone. And the Roundtable has been meeting over the last week or so discussing the topic of values.

Now, I want to ask the Roundtable group first, do you have questions for people on the New York panel?

And so, we'll start there with questions from the Roundtable group to the New York panel, which might be to the panel in general or to specific people.

Monica?

1.3

DR. BELL: Sure. I have a question. It's something, I guess, I'm wrestling with in this debate about pessimism, optimism and compromise or not that was a big theme that a lot of you all talked about.

I guess that maybe this is less of a factor in New York, but I also participated in an event earlier today in which it was people who kind of think that radical transformation of the criminal legal system -- to

talk about the racism and the systemic and structural racism of the system is almost like off the table for them because of their political commitments.

1.3

There's almost this sort of -- to go as radical as we've been talking about, to really get into the systemic racism aspect of things, to deal with that is impossible given the politics. And I guess, of course, compromise is necessary. I really appreciated what Reverend Nixon was saying about that.

But like, how much can we compromise on acknowledging and understanding systemic racism? How do you all think about those types of compromises that you have to make on a day-to-day basis to get work done?

MR. WESTERN: And that's for the whole panel.

DR. BELL: Maybe it's more helpful to direct that question --

MR. WESTERN: Okav.

REV. NIXON: I don't think compromising on the race issue is on the table. That's the one place we can't compromise. I think we can compromise about strategic decisions to make policy changes in certain systems.

But unless race is the core of the conversation, every policy decision is subject to reversal. So, yeah. That's the one thing I wouldn't compromise on.

So thank you for pointing that out. 1 2 MR. WESTERN: So, what's the test? Right? Ιf 3 you're compromising on race, what does that look like that 4 you're failing to acknowledge before humanity? Do we have 5 a shop definition of that? I quess that's for Vivian. How do we know when 6 7 we're compromising on race? REV. NIXON: Really, I want people who feel 8 9 optimistic, please feel optimistic. I don't want to be Debbie Downer. But I think that when we make public 10 11 statements -- when we talk to media about these issues, 12 when we make progress, we should talk about that progress. 1.3 We should say incarceration is at a lower rate than it's ever been in New York City. However -- there 14 15 should be a however there -- until we can eliminate the racial disparity, we have not finished our work. 16 17 All of this celebrating has to come with, And there's more work to do because there's still racism 18 19 entrenched in this system. 20 MR. WESTERN: That's great. Thomas? 21 22 MR. EDWARDS: I think the whole thing has to 23 start with race because in this country, that's what it

was built on. I mean, for years, you're talking in this

country, you hear things about Black-on-Black crime. You

24

25

hear all these things about like it was Black people's fault that they were in this position that they were in.

1.3

And for many years, Black people felt like that. Oh, you have to do better. You have to learn how to pull yourself up by your bootstraps. But the reality was, it was a plan to keep a certain group oppressed in a certain situation.

So, I don't think you can do it without looking at race as a core of everything that happened afterwards. I mean, not too long ago in this country and certain states, it was illegal to marry out of your race, and now all you see on commercials is mixed families. I mean, sometimes it's comical. It's almost like we forgot what it was even 30 years ago.

I mean, and then, we forget what it is today.

I mean, you'll look at the news, where a 62-year old Black woman was literally pulled on the head by her hair by white police officers. They would never do that a 62-year old white woman; if they had saw her shoot three people, they wouldn't have treated her that way.

Because it goes back to race -- how you see people, and if you don't see them as human -- as real people, then you can't change how you really treat them because you don't change how you think about them. So, I think it always has to be -- race has to be a part of this

equation when we talk about equality, justice.

1.3

It has to be race in this country because it was built on that. That's what this is.

MR. WESTERN: Monica observed that there are forums and there are conversations where it's very difficult to talk in a very direct way about race and race as the root problem that needs to be solved. I wonder how much that is true in New York, and that varies. Or is it as true here as it is in other places?

I sort of put that question out there, but I'll go to Courtney.

MS. ROBINSON: I was lowering my hand because you were actually asking the question I was going to ask. But in thinking about the differences, you know, I live in Texas.

So, to see the progress that you all have made in terms of the lower numbers of incarcerations and arrests and supervisions, and how's the coalition or the groups of people that are doing this work managing the tension between those numbers and the numbers of still the disparate treatment and the increased numbers that you're seeing in other areas?

And so, how do you sort of hold that balance?

Or work towards an all? How's that being done from you all's perspective in New York?

MR. WESTERN: Danielle, do you want to come in on this?

1.3

MS. SERED: I had put my hand up right before that question, so I'll try and sort of weave those. But I think it builds on what Vivian offered, too, where I think we conflate political compromise and narrative compromise as though one requires the other. And I think politics, legislation requires compromise.

Politics is a -- I always describe it like it's field of shit. You don't walk through it in white boots and expect to come out clean. It is a place of horse trading and compromise, and giving the most you can, and political assessment. I think, in my view, the best that you can do is do that in accountable relationship with the people whose lives depend on the outcome of the decisions that you're in a position to influence in some way.

And so, the fact that that requires

compromise -- and I believe in those compromises because

people get free. I don't believe in compromises that make

it harder to win the next thing. I don't believe in

compromises that cause harm. But there are compromises

that are just about incremental reform.

I would argue even if we were to end mass incarceration, were we not doing that reparations and addressing capitalism and climate change, we'd still be

doing incremental reform. And so, I think in the policy realm, there has to just be some acknowledgment that if we're going to use policy as a tool, it is going to be a tool that involves compromise.

1.3

I think the mistake we make -- and I think we make this about both violence and about race -- is that we think that political compromise also requires a comparable narrative compromise.

On the violence issue, it requires us throwing certain people under the bus, saying we're fighting for the good ones, not the worst of the worst. And on the race issue, it requires silence of us. Or at least a much more moderated thing than what we know to be true.

I think in New York City, certainly, policy compromise is still the reality, but I think we don't have to make those narrative compromises. And I think when we do, we create the barriers to the things we subsequently want to win.

It's the same way -- the narrative frame that we're up against in fighting for reform that applies to violence is the one we put forward in fighting for reforms for nonviolent crime. It is a barrier of our making, and I think we do comparable things when we sort of "all lives matter" the conversation.

I do think the dynamics around that become more

difficult when we're talking about state legislation. 1 2 like New York City -- you can just build enough power to 3 be able to speak pretty truthful about race and still win. 4 When you get to the state level, the dynamics 5 I used to always accidentally call are harder. Binghamton, New York Birmingham, and I stand by that. 6 Ι 7 think I was intuiting something not making a mistake. We have KKK strongholds. We have rural places 8 9 that depend on incarceration for their livelihood. have a great -- the state, itself, is very different. 10 11 And so, when we get to the state legislature, I 12 think we end up making choices that are more comparable to 1.3 the ones that you see in other jurisdictions. know if that's helpful in the questions being raised, but 14 15 it's the way I see it. That's great. 16 MR. WESTERN: No. 17 Gladys, I know you're trying to get in, too. MS. CARRIÓN: I wanted to answer that question 18 19 because I think that when I was trying to close facilities 20 in upstate New York and when I was doing that, I led very much with the issue of race. And I talked about Black and 21 22 Brown children that we were incarcerating in the State of 23 New York, and I was vilified in many places, but I thought 24 was really important.

And some people were offended about the fact

25

that I led with that, but that was the reality. That's who these systems captured, and my system that I led was almost exclusively Black and Brown. And I wanted people to understand that and to really grapple with who we were incarcerating in the state.

1.3

And I was very vocal about that, and said that I would no longer export Black and Brown children to support upstate economies. That was the truth, and I thought that I had to lead with the truth. And I think that I had to confront the legislature with that reality.

And, you know, I think it drove change. I mean, I think it changed a lot of people's minds when we pulled the veil and said, Hey. This is what you're doing.

But most leaders don't lead with that, unfortunately. My colleagues didn't. But I make no compromise there. That's what we had to do.

MR. WESTERN: Great. Nicole?

DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: Thank you for this amazing presentation. I've often focused on Chicago; it's my hometown and where my research began. And so, it's wonderful to hear about another city, kind of a sister city.

One of the interesting things that happened in Chicago during the pandemic is, they have one of the largest single-site jails, the size of 72 football fields

-- is that they saw the jail population decline and everyone started to rejoice. And what happened is the graph looks like this.

1.3

I mean, I don't which ways you guys are seeing it. It went right up, and there's jurisdictions across the nation -- people were very hopeful, and lots of people said this is the end of incarceration.

But unfortunately, the pandemic and people coming back meant they were coming back to the same practices prior to the pandemic. Arrests were going up. You know, cases were starting to be pled. And sure, the jail population was declining, but people were incarcerated in their homes.

And so, I say this not to be a pessimist, but to be a realist, which is that the system and institutions from a sociological standpoint have a tendency to snap back exactly where they were without true reform. And true reform meaning that we're changing the cultural logics and the sensibilities that rooted these practices in the first place.

One of the things that I found in my research is judges, prosecutors, public defenders, even police were using racist tropes to understand small crimes that were nonviolent and violent crimes. They called defendants either "mopes," which was almost like the N word

reconstituted for a color-blind era, and they called the violent offenders "monsters."

1.3

And people were pushing back and saying, Well, that's Chicago. Then, more and more people anecdotally were saying, No, no, no. We had words for that. It's not quite monster and mope, but it's this and this. But it was a dichotomy.

Studying a large west coast jail, a corresearcher and I found the same tropes being deployed in another jurisdiction in a jail setting -- not in a court setting -- which shows that the race and racism is essential to the system functioning, that it helps us rationalize an enormous amount of entrenched practices. And it's not happening in one jurisdiction. It's happening in many. It is larger than one space, which makes sense.

But I think -- I'm curious to what the panel thinks about that because we're starting to see life regenerate itself in a lot of wonderful ways. But we're also seeing that it could be the system goes to back "it's normal."

I think about whether George Floyd would've lived, and I imagine that he would've been charged with a low-grade felony. He would've been roughed up by the police, but survived.

Gone to that local infirmary in the jail, and he might've been a "success story", meaning we didn't detain him in the jail, but we marked him, convict him, we put him back on the street, no social service provision, no treatment, no access to mental health care, and that, statistically would've looked like a success.

1.3

But I don't call that the end of mass incarceration, and I certainly don't call that the end of police brutality. So, I throw out these challenging questions because I feel like this is the panel to really take it on. So, thank you.

MR. WESTERN: Thanks, Nicole. Vinny?

MR. SCHIRALDI: Thanks, Nicole. I was deliberately trying to be provocative. If you define mass incarceration the way Bruce and Jeremy did and the National Academy of Sciences does, I just think it's not what New York is anymore.

So, I'm going to stay with that. I'm not backing off on that, and it's not just during the pandemic. In fact, it's a wash. New York's a wash during the pandemic.

There was, like, 5,800 people in Rikers before the pandemic started. It dropped down to 30-something, and now it's back up to 5,800. This happened starting in Giuliani. We're talking like Giuliani era.

Actually, even Dinkins, the incarceration numbers started coming down since Dinkins, through Giuliani, through Bloomberg. And then, accelerated under De Blasio.

1.3

2.3

It certainly could go back up, but I just think from the standpoint of -- not ending racism, not making your justice system fair, not doing all things good, but confronting mass incarceration, that I just feel like New York needs to be discussed, debated, and studied as an example of what that looks like with all its successes and all its flaws.

I think that when I look at that, you know, I see a lot of factors. I see a lot of voice of community, voice of formerly incarcerated people, open-minded elected officials, funding of community programs -- really interesting factors that I think need to be unpacked.

And I think it's important to do that because I think we need to understand it and figure out what it's applicability is to Chicago and L.A. and Boise and all the rest of the country. Maybe parts of it don't apply.

Maybe New York was just so rich that it could afford to pay for a lot of community programs that other places can't.

And maybe those other places are going to have to figure out ways to kick-start community resourcing that

didn't happen in New York and would need to happen in a different way in Tulsa. But I think that's a worthy debate, not because I think New York solved all the problems that other people legitimately are raising in this, and not because I don't see those problems.

1.3

Donna and I are working on a campaign. I'm furious about the fact that New York state incarcerates more people for technical violations than any other state.

And 56 percent of the people being paroled to New York
City go to a homeless shelter, while we're spending over \$680 million locking people up for technicals.

So, it's not like I'm missing the fact that there's a whole bunch of terrible shit going on, and that that's landing on the backs of Black and Brown people.

And I'm maybe too much -- maybe I'm too focused on mass incarceration, but I feel like it's not a trivial thing to focus on. And if we are, we should kind of examine and kick the tires on and look at, compared to other places, how New York did this for decades -- not just during a pandemic, decades.

Even if it could turn around tomorrow, it's still decades worth of progress starting in a place that before it started, had higher than average incarceration rate, and now blows the rest of country's incarceration rate away. I just think that's not trivial.

MR. WESTERN: Great. Thanks, Vinny.

I just want to do a time check. We have seven or eight minutes to go. I've got Liz and Donna in the queue. So, we'll hear from you. And then, I will turn to Katharine Huffman for a wrap-up.

So, Liz?

1.3

MS. GLAZER: Great. Thanks. So, I just wanted to respond to -- and apologies, Nicole, I guess? And a couple of other things that people had been talking about. How did the number of people who are incarcerated get reduced? Or how do we end it all in all?

And I would just sort of flag that the way in which everybody has been talking about this is in the passive voice, as if these are sort of semi-autonomous systems that just simply keep on operating. And for sure, they do, and that's a problem.

But I think that what -- the one thing to take away, or that I take away from kind of the past seven years in New York in which there was a much, much sharper decline in incarceration than at any previous point in its history. And then, to take away from the six weeks from the beginning -- starting sort of mid-March in the pandemic, is that there can be intentionality and there should be intentionality, and it requires leadership.

It requires somebody to put people's feet to

the fire because there's so many decision makers that result in the number of people who end up in our city in jail, and that there was a very explicit effort to scrutinize who was going in and why they were going in, and that got distilled in the pandemic at a point at which the stakes were life or death.

1.3

There was an intentional effort to empty out the jails. And is it possible to take that sense of urgency, and use those structures of leadership so that there is someone who wakes up every morning with a stomachache to take these different parts of the legal system, all of whom answer to different bosses, and have them focus towards one goal?

And I think the second thing that happened over the summer is that -- what is really sort of often unspoken, although it is right in front of us, is that, as Gladys said, everybody in jail -- I mean, just the overwhelming number of people are Black and Brown, and they come from about a dozen neighborhoods in New York City that suffer from all the sort of other social issues that deprivation has imposed.

And so, I think that there has to be leadership, and the leadership has to lead with the issue of race, exactly as Gladys pointed out. That has to be at the forefront, and in some ways, last summer and those

social forces meant that there was a lot of language about race.

1.3

So the police commissioner made an apology for sort of the way in which the police department for decades, centuries had acted. But did that translate to action? Did that translate to accountability?

I think that's sort of what the challenge is -is you can have a leader like Gladys, who does what she
did. But you have to have a sustained attention every
minute of every day with a leader that has the capacity to
bring people together and to move from A to B.

MR. WESTERN: Great. Donna, you'll have the last word before I turn to Katharine.

MS. HYLTON: Thank you. Thanks, Bruce. I want to go back. I know Courtney, you had said, What was our compromise? How did we compromise? Right? That's what you -- basically, what you were saying.

How did we deal with -- you know, I'm going to say this. For me, it wasn't so much about compromising. I want to just take this last few seconds here to say that my -- and a lot of us, because I can speak for some others, right, and I have a team behind me in the back here -- what helped us stay centered and stay focused and stay determined, no matter what, throughout all this was the myriad of grassroots organizations.

The people -- the organizations in the city and the state that, no matter what, was going to stand up and support the people. So if we didn't get a win or things weren't happening the way we wanted it to happen, myself and others felt secure in that people doing this work -- fighting the system and these systems were going to continue to do that.

1.3

Like, we were going to show up and we were going to be heard, no matter what. Campaigns happen. You fought. We were rallying. We're protesting. We were all doing all kinds of stuff, and we're still doing it.

So, that compromise, for me -- and I speak for a lot because I have a team back there. They're listening and some of the stuff that I hear them saying, and I just wanted to say this, because we don't thank those on the ground, boots on the ground, people doing the work, enough.

Organizations -- Danielle represents one,

Common Justice, fighting that fight. Just Leadership -
DeAnna. Vivian, College and Community Fellowships.

Exodus Transitional Community, Fortune Society, Osborne.

I mean, so many different ones.

Now, A Little Piece of Light. We're new kids on the block, but we've still been doing this work, right.

We don't recognize what collectively that has done and

how, no matter what, wins or losses or whatever it may 1 2 have been. Whatever those compromises may have been, we 3 are secure in that we have that. 4 We have these existing things. We have these 5 We have ourselves. That those systems will not Those systems will not -- basically, silence. 6 waver. Those systems know that they have to deal with. 7 8 And so, I just wanted, as we close here, to say 9 that that, to me, means a whole lot -- as a Black impacted woman, a Black mother -- that we have us. So, I don't 10 11 care about the systems, because that's what it means. 12 It's that. I'm always looking for that. 1.3 Now, I look for it differently. But we do this work, and we're relentless in it because we know that 14 15 people's lives, again, are on the line and it means 16 something. And we want better for people as a whole, but 17 we definitely want better for Black people. 18 MR. WESTERN: That's a great and powerful note 19 to close the conversation on. 20 Katharine? 21 MS. HUFFMAN: Thanks, everyone, and thank you 22 all just so much for this conversation. I'm tempted to 23 not try to revisit some of the themes that I heard and

> ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

But I'll make a little bit of an attempt to

leave Donna's voice right there.

24

25

pull some thoughts together, acknowledging just how important what you just said was, Donna, and what we've heard from so many folks.

1.3

So, we just had a conversation about New York
City and New York, and what has been happening there, what
hasn't been happening there, what could happen there. And
the initial question that each of you was asked to answer
was this question about optimism versus pessimism. Are we
in a moment of progress or a moment of retrenchment?

It was just incredibly striking to hear how most people reflect optimism but with various qualifications. Beverly said she feels optimistic almost by sheer force of will It's a survival mechanism. It's something that we must decide to have.

Danielle quoted Mariame Kaba and said, If I didn't think we would win, I wouldn't work this hard.

This where optimism comes from. Eric Cumberbatch -- I feel optimistic, but not blind. Eric Gonzalez and several others as well -- optimistic, but cautiously optimistic, suggesting that there's much more to that than just a simple answer.

Rahson mentioned tragic optimism, which is an incredibly compelling way of thinking about what optimism can be. And Renita said that she's optimistic, but she's tired and exhausted, and I think that resonated with a lot

of folks, as well. And then Vivian brought us back to where she had taken us in our fourth Roundtable, actually, making a distinction between optimism and hope, that those are two different things, and how important is to think about that.

1.3

So, we brought all those feelings into this discussion about what the future may hold. I was listening for your visions and your thoughts about what is the future and what does it require?

Some of the reasons, I think, for the optimism with its various qualifications that you mentioned were things like there seems to be a change in political power and political sensibility. Eric Gonzalez was talking about discussions he'd heard about the importance of centering race and racism and ending white supremacy over the course of the last year. Middle-class white people joining in walking in the streets in support of the importance of that.

Donna talked about the power of people coming together and how organized people are organized power and this is such an important part of the change that we're feeling, in terms of the political power that drives real change. Vivian agreed with that and tapped off of it, but pointed out that coming together does not mean — unity is not uniformity, and that we don't all have to do the same

thing or even believe the exact same things, but we have to have the same goals.

1.3

We had some really also great conversation about compromise and the role of compromise and what that means in different contexts, the difference between narrative compromise and sort of policy compromise that Danielle raised for us. But the place where we've all agreed it seemed that we could not compromise was on this question around race and the crucial centrality of grappling with racism and white supremacy in order to move forward.

In addition to that change in political power that was giving people hope for the future was a sense that in the future, real safety is going to have to look different than just policing. And this is something that we've heard a lot about what that means over the course of the last year.

Beverly was talking about how this has to go far beyond police. A lot of folks had something to talk about with regard to that. Renita talked about how safety is so far beyond the justice system, in particular, and Nadia talked a lot about that, as well, as did others.

Liz talked about the potential in this moment of fiscal crisis that can force this change -- force us to be more thoughtful and more critical of how we spend our

dollars for safety in terms of the dollars that we've been able to and willing to put towards policing in the past without a second thought. That now is the time where a fiscal crisis is going to help contribute to a more critical look at that.

1.3

Several folks mentioned the power of young people and the energy of young people. Eric Cumberbatch talked about just the power and the brilliance of the young people that he works with on his team and that he sees in communities bringing young people into the spaces of leadership and communicating to them and with them, and also, to and with others that young people are leaders.

Young Black and Brown people who would not have previously imagined themselves as being around certain tables, that they were there and that they should be there and that they had so much to give and to lean into in leading those tables.

And then, there was a lot of discussion about the future holds this sort of actually doing it that both what we've seen recently in some of the things that are happening, and even more that aren't happening yet. That that's what's giving us hope for the future.

We heard about a lot of progress. Vinny and Gladys talked about reductions -- dramatic reductions in numbers of people in prison, of kids in detention, and

folks acknowledge that for the people who are affected by that, that's incredible, real change.

1.3

Jeremy said we can and should just get more people out of prison. Just do it, and that's not only about future impacts of policy change that should be made, but about right now, that that could be happening and should be happening.

Liz pointed out that that's a good example.

These changes don't just happen. The systems are not sort of passively evolving into these, but they change when leaders make those changes. They change when people in the public insist on those changes.

Nadia talked about the holistic approach, that this is what's needed. That we see this happening in some places -- we see the way that real investment in the fullness of life happens in wealthy, white communities already. And we need to be making those same types of investments in Black and Brown communities all over the city, all over the country, all over the world.

And Eric and Renita reminded us again about seeing the resiliency and the power of communities and within people, and that we actually do have examples of this in the works that they're doing and many others that we need to further lift up, that we need to create more support for, and that we need to really empower and make

permanent in all the different ways that we can contribute to that.

1.3

And Donna just echoed again, you know, just the power of the boots on the ground and the power that comes from the permanency of people who are not willing to give up on each other, and the ways in which in Black and Brown communities, for Black and Brown people, that there's so much important power and security that comes from knowing that others are not giving up on them.

So, just quickly in closing, I also want to note some of the dangers and the threats to the potential of the future that we heard about. One is violence. Both the reality of violence that people live and fear.

Beverly notes this very real for many people walking down the street, and as numbers really do rise, that the reality of violence will have an impact on the future.

Not only the reality the violence, but also, violence is a tool for political fearmongering. Eric Gonzalez noted this as he talked about the potential and the growing political will for foundational change and for grappling with racism. His fear that violence would overcome that political will and be dangerous.

And Rahson pointed out that in addition to that, we've also got a real threat that we saw on January 6. Literal violence perpetuated by our political leaders,

which is something that in that particular format, we haven't seen in a while. And that is something that is very damaging and very dangerous to the potential for the future.

1.3

Gladys reminded us that complacency is a danger for change in the future, a sense that either we've done enough or we're close enough or whatever version that might take.

And then, finally -- and this really where I think the core of our conversation landed -- the problem of racism and the problem of white supremacy, and that unless and until race is the core of the conversation, every policy decision is subject to reversal. That was pointed out to us by Vivian.

So, here we are as we finish out this time together and start to move into the last part of our day where we think about aspirations and what the potential is for change. I just want to kind of summarize that in this conversation, we kept coming back to the values of humanity, of recognizing the value of every person as a human being who has dignity that must be recognized, and that being able to do that is inextricable from grappling with race and white supremacy.

Thomas said this several times: we have to start with race. The promise that we made in New York --

the promise that we still need to make, that's just the beginning. Until we deal with the history of racism, the history of segregation and oppression, and the current reality of segregation and oppression, this won't change.

1.3

DeAnna said this is about culture. The reality that policies, programs, any types of investments are going to land differently in Black and Brown communities and that's because of this history of racism and the current reality. Donna and Nadia talked about investing in the wholeness of people, and that's about recognizing humanity in Black and Brown people.

And Vivian reminded us that this is not just about rooting white supremacy in the justice system. It's throughout government. It's throughout corporate America, in the private sector. It's throughout all of our systems and all of our cultures, and it's something that we have to think about in all of those levels, but also on a personal level.

So, I just want to finish with two things that I thought were really striking. Beverly reminded us that part of the reason that we feel this disconnect is because we don't define our success based on the same people. She said until we define our success based on the lived reality of the most disadvantaged, we will continue to have these disconnected realities, and we'll just

perpetuate racism in these systems.

1.3

As Danielle said, the question for us is do we really mean everybody? And are there ways in which we will be able to so deeply recognize the humanity of each person that we can stop making the distinctions that arise around race? That arise around other types of labels that we create?

Do we really mean everybody when we're talking about recognizing human dignity? So, with that, I will close, and just thank you all again for that incredible conversation and really looking forward to continuing it this afternoon and far beyond.

MR. WESTERN: That's great, Katharine. Amazing wrap-up. So, we break now, and we will resume at 3:30 Eastern, and we'll convene for our final meeting in this series of Roundtables.

So, I'll see you at 3:30.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MS. HUFFMAN: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome back to this conversation about our aspirations for the values of justice. This is our final panel and session of the Roundtable on the future of justice policy. Not only the final panel and session of this Roundtable, but the final session of our series of five Roundtable convenings over the past three years.

Over that past three years, at each Roundtable, we've always concluded our convenings with a session on aspirations, and this event is no different. This is a crucial moment for the Roundtable in which we uplift work that's happening in the field of transformative justice, and it fits into this crucial moment in our history when we really must uplift the people and the efforts that they are leading if we want to have any hope of foundationally reimagining justice in our country.

1.3

We've asked some of the many luminaries in transformative justice to join us for this closing panel discussion to get us started -- to share with us some promising practices and solutions that exist that radically changed the values and the principles of justice.

So, it's my great pleasure to introduce to you all today: Eric Cumberbatch, the Deputy Director of the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice in New York City, and the Director of the Office of Neighborhood Safety; Vivian Nixon, who is the Executive Director of College and Community Fellowship; and Danielle Sered, who's the Executive Director of Common Justice.

They've all been part of our Square One and Roundtable journey for this entire time, and it's just really wonderful to have a chance to talk with you all for

a few minutes. And then, we'll be opening up to all of our Roundtable participants for this discussion about the aspirations of justice.

1.3

So, for those of us who joined us for our earlier session today, we were able to talk and hear about a lot of the work that's been happening in New York and the excitement, the potential, the challenges, the problems from a number of New Yorkers who have been a part of that experience. Danielle and Eric and Vivian were all part of that conversation, and they've also prepared writing for us to tee up this conversation today.

You've written about individuals and their efforts that have already gained ground in the justice system and changing the justice system, and in the ways that communities create and manage safety. I'd love to hear from you -- tell us a little more about what were the driving forces behind the creation of those organizations or efforts?

Was it community leaders? Was it people who have experienced the criminal justice system? Who was it that was the driving force behind those?

And anyone can jump in, or I will start calling on folks. How do these things get started?

REV. NIXON: I don't mind starting. You know,
I have trouble picking out an organization to highlight.

And so, I really highlighted a network of organizations that I belong to that extend beyond New York City, and the reason I did that is because they're all motivated by the same thing and that is their incarceration experience.

1.3

Every organization that's a part of the national network that I wrote about, The Formerly Incarcerated and Convicted People's Family Movement, is motivated by a direct experience with the criminal legal system, and has a passion to change it from the perspective of understanding its root being cemented in structural racism.

There are two New York organizations that are part of that national steering committee. That's why I chose it.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thanks, Vivian.

Danielle, tell us a little bit about Common

Justice and the motivating work there, or the motivations

and starting points of some of the other organizations

that you write about in your paper.

MS. SERED: Okay, so I would be remiss if I didn't start by lifting up Amanda Alexander, the co-author on the paper that we circulated to all who is just a beloved friend and colleague and teacher of mine in many ways. In thinking about the conversation we had this morning and a trope that I hear a lot in the public

conversation now, we know what safety looks like. It's what exists in rich, white neighborhoods or rich, white suburban neighborhoods, or however it's framed.

1.3

I think there are two problems with that that can include the answer to this. I think the first is, it misses the way in which, even in those neighborhoods, if Black and Brown people -- particularly from outside those neighborhoods -- dare cross the perimeter, the level of violence there is even greater. That price of entry is death.

So, they are very -- they have moats around them. They have snipers at the top of the towers, right.

And we should understand them that way. They are not places free of violence for everyone.

And so, even in those neighborhoods, there is a constant, permanent presence of racialized violence, even if most of that is obtained by having made so clear the grave consequences of crossing that perimeter, that very few people do. And so, I don't want to mythologize them as a place that is somehow outside of a structure of racialized policing.

And then, the other thing is we talk about -- I think the biggest mistake people of color make about white people is people of color overestimate how good we are to each other. I do aspire for most people to have the

relationship to the state that most white people have. I think the state, in general, acts as though it has an obligation to us, including one to meet our most basic needs.

1.3

It acts as though it has an obligation to create conduits for our input, including through things like voting. And it acts as though its use of force against us should be constrained in some way, including by some entitlement we have to life and liberty.

That's a set of things I would wish for everybody, but that's different than the way white people relate to one another. And I think about the core modes of white supremacy, in my view, are controlling, punishing, exiling, and exterminating, and I didn't come to that list through a 500-year study of white people in the United States in colonial history.

I came through it through an observation of patterns in my own white family, and what we do to whom people regard as the least among us. And so, I say that because the examples that Amanda and I lift up are almost exclusively examples that are led by Black and Brown people in communities of color, where people have been and are solving their problems, mending pain by restoring peace, healing through loss and harm, and have been for centuries.

And I think all of the evidence about how cycles of violence work can explain why there are high levels of violence in neighborhoods like East New York or Brownsville in Brooklyn. None of that literature can actually explain why there isn't more. It cannot explain, given centuries and centuries of both structural, interpersonal violence and torture, why anyone does anything other than commit harm.

1.3

Like why the vast majority of people in Black and Brown neighborhoods act in ways that are loving and life-affirming, and often even joyful. It is not accounted for in the way we think about safety -- not sufficiently.

And so, one of the things we know is that the strategies that exist have to be extraordinarily powerful -- that they are the explanation for the gap between what the literature would otherwise predict and the fact of what is a comparably low level of violence given the set of historical and current conditions.

And so those -- we looked at those interventions, not as like clever, promising, grassroots, something or other. We look at those interventions as ones that have demonstrated an efficacy in the face of an ungodly amount of opposing and intervening factors, and therefore, recognize that in them, a really extraordinary

strength -- particularly if they were given the opportunity to act in the absence of those intrusions.

1.3

And so, in the argument Amanda and I make, it's not just like, Can we be safe and defund the police? We asked the question instead, Can we be safe without defunding the police?

And if we understand policing as we know it, as something that intrudes on the efficacy of community-based solutions that are in the ongoing business of producing safety, then the answer is that defunding the police is a prerequisite for the level of safety to which we aspire.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Danielle. That's just so important, the context that you've given there and the way -- connecting that the motivations and the driving forces with the differences across communities and across time, really.

Eric, tell us a little bit about the work
you've written about. How did that happen? And how has
that been able to continue? Are there things that we can
learn from the experience that you were describing in your
paper or others that you know of in your work?

MR. CUMBERBATCH: Yeah. Definitely. So, first and foremost, I want to recognize that there's great activists and advocates in New York City that have propelled me to this space, but have also lifted up a

national movement through their sense of being in New York City.

1.3

So, a lot of the approaches and models and methods that I can talk through today are really about their brilliance. Even though they may be public-health based and evidence-based approaches, a lot of these things happened organically and they were doing without the sort of nomenclature or framing from a more academic space and sense.

So, a lot of the groups -- well, two of the groups that I chose to write about were Man Up,
Incorporated, in East New York, and Brownsville Think Tank
Matters. And these groups are really special to me, both personally and professionally.

So, Man Up is an organization that formed together in East New York, Brooklyn, over a shooting death of a young boy in the area, and really just concerned individuals from the community that came together and said, We're not going to tolerate reckless and senseless killings, especially of our young people in our community.

They formed an organization called Man Up, which is led by A.T. Mitchell, who's an East New York legend -- hero for all of the right reasons. And he plays almost a role that's like an uncle to me, a really good brother.

And you know, really, his vision, his thoughts, ideas around how to transform neighborhood spaces, how to build and empower community, to be at the forefront of coproducing public safety, how to force the relationships with government, strategically resource different levels or spaces for intervention and engagement is what he's doing on the ground. So, it's really great work.

1.3

And I felt I wanted to highlight him because we share a very common false narrative that happens across our community. So, I'm from Bed-Stuy, East New York. And oftentimes, what we would receive here from media, other spaces, other agencies, really trying to diminish Black men, men of color, by labeling them gang members and/or former gang members.

Me and A.T. would have these conversations on a regular basis, and what he wanted to do was really start a campaign, and the campaign was, I am a man. First and foremost, I am a man, and my past discrepancies are my past discrepancies. You know, how we define crews and gangs in New York I already think are way out of line, in general.

I think you live in dense areas and people are your family, and that's your communal network. But in New York, if you're in East New York or Bed-Stuy, you're part of a gang, according to a lot of agencies' framing.

So, the 'I am a man' piece was really about allowing Black men to control their own narrative, that only I can tell you who I am. And no one else can put a label on me to diminish me or to remove me from a position of power and/or to really create a space where there's no empathy or no sense of belonging, contributing, or understanding. And those things happen every day when we turn on the TV, when we read newspapers, or listen to the ways that people frame those who have been harmed and/or have caused harm.

1.3

So, I really wanted focus on A.T. Mitchell and Ronald Robertson, brother powerful from Brownsville Think Tank Matters. Both of these men are formerly incarcerated individuals that have come back to their community. They operate within great organizations on the ground at a very local grassroots level.

And for me, I've worked with them probably since 2010 and '11, when these groups, these organizations probably had fiscal year operating budgets of maybe a quarter million dollars, to now lifting them to capacity upwards of over \$10 million budgets to really go back in community and do a lot of what we're at the table talking about. They're actually doing it.

So, just brilliant people that I'm grateful to be surrounded by, protected by, and serve with.

MS. HUFFMAN: Eric, thank you for that. It's just so powerful, the story you just shared and the information that's in your paper about the importance of centering humanity by claiming the space of 'I am a man,' and that's a definition that I create for myself and that can't be taken away. That's just -- it's so powerful and important.

1.3

So, talk to me for a minute -- I mean, I just would love to hear from any of you really concretely. What are the things that for any of the leaders, for any of the participants, for any of the people who are part of and who are driving the work that you're describing and the things that are happening around the country in New York -- otherwise, as well -- what would be something that would contribute to -- that would support any one of those leaders that you just described -- that each of you just described -- being able to do more?

Being able to do something to get around -
DeAnna mentioned earlier -- to get around the barriers

that are put in our way and that we have to strategically

figure out how to get around. What does that look like?

What's needed? What's missing? What could contribute to that leadership and to the continued growth and development of those organizations?

REV. NIXON: A lot of times it's the basic

premise of how we go about doing this work. So, in the work to reduce mass incarceration, to dismantle mass incarceration, to reform, reimagine, reinvent, dismantle, abolish the system, we have created many, many different types of solutions.

1.3

But the ones that are based in communities and in trying to help repair harms and move people forward, there was traditionally for years, I saw, kind of the expectation that people were there to be helped and served, and not to develop out in order to figure out how to be the drivers of the solutions in their own communities the way Eric describes. And that's exactly what I saw when I joined College and Community Fellowship.

It was an organization that did a lot of good for all of the women who were in it. We were getting our college degrees. We were getting support in doing so. We had better opportunities for our individual futures because of it.

But until I got connected to Just Leadership

USA, and then, got connected to the Formerly Incarcerated

and Convicted People's Movement, I found that there were

all these other directly-impacted people who had a bigger

vision, who had a vision of organizing and changing

systems and policies in their local areas. I did not make

that connection, and once I did, we embedded advocacy and

organizing training into the organization because it's not being done everywhere.

1.3

It's two different things, that either you're serving people's needs or you're advocating and organizing. Both can be done at the same time, and they're done most effectively at the same time.

MS. HUFFMAN: Danielle, if you -- do you want to jump in there?

MS. SERED: It just resonates so much. And I feel like one of the things that I think is available to us now is I feel like for so long, our movement has been like 90 percent destroyers and 10 percent builders, and that we have an opportunity to invert that ratio. I think Doctors Ruth Wilson Gilmore and Angela Davis for decades have been teaching us that abolition is mostly the work of creation, not of destruction.

I have a 2-year old now, so I have become somebody who needs to understand different kinds of trucks and things at construction sites. This is not a realm of knowledge that was previously important to me, and what I've observed now is that at any construction site, almost all of them have a bulldozer. It's true. And they all tend to only have one, and then they have just like a ton of other things.

They have this crane truck, and this other

crane truck, and this thing that brings stuff in, and this thing that loads stuff up. Then there's trenchers, there's plumbers, there's all of this.

1.3

It is absolutely the case there, I think, that we have to tear down. It's absolutely the case it'll take force and power to do that. That work is important. But that work of construction, I think, has been in so many ways undervalued.

So I think about the end of mass incarceration in so many ways about the work of displacing it. And that means both building the things we want and, to Vivian's point, building the collective power to secure those things as our society's central response to harm and to behavior that has previously been criminalized that may or may not include harm.

And so, I think, largely, when we see people build that power, the main things people do with it is they command resources, they command narrative power -- meaning they take up public space in a different way that shapes the discourse. They create barriers to the intrusion of other actors into the work that they are doing. That they can defend the spaces that they are protecting, that they are generating, that they are creating from the intrusion of others, including law enforcement in its various forms.

And so, entirely agree with Vivian that the organized power is the biggest difference between where we are and where we need to be.

MS. HUFFMAN: Eric, I'm going to ask you to weigh in, too. And also, go ahead and invite some of our participants to start waving your hands if you are interested in asking questions or weigh in, because we want to make sure we have plenty of time for a group discussion as well.

But Eric, I'll give the floor to you to respond to the thoughts of Danielle and Vivian, and this question about what's still missing and where are we headed and what's needed.

MR. CUMBERBATCH: Yes. I think opening spaces and platforms for small community-based organizations to really redesign, gather research, secure resources, and do actual implementation work, not only in their communities, but in the agencies, in city government, local governments, what have you, that have touched and so much impact on a very already vulnerable population.

And I think when we talk about reimagining systems or just system change as a whole, oftentimes, what's missing are the key people that are the end users of a lot of how these systems show up, how they do harm -- whether intentional or unintentional -- and how that harm

that can lessened, if not taken away completely. And I think the more spaces we open in all of these structures that are inclusive in a true capacity to build with the small grassroots organizations, and specifically, the ones that I'm naming, then we see results that are incredible.

1.3

So, there was a lot of conversation earlier today around youth in secured detention facilities, or youth in ACS Close to Home facilities, and the closure of Rikers and so forth. Part of that story -- a lot of the organizations that we resource equipment and fund are actually in those spaces as well. And they're not in those spaces because we believe any young person should be detained in a secured facility and/or be at a Close to Home facility.

They're in those spaces because they're sharing their story. And they're lifting up those young people as shepherds and mentors and being part of the process to heal those young people in those spaces without having to become bureaucrats or government actors. A lot of these young people are coming back to the community seeking these individuals out to continue those relationships and to continue that network.

So, that network actually captures a lot of people who have risk factors in their lives, allows them to fail just like any of us have failed, captures them and

lifts them right back up. And that's, you know, what I think -- those platforms and spaces being open to system change.

1.3

MS. HUFFMAN: Eric, thank you so much. That just really resonates. I'm going to be handing over the facilitation of our group discussion to Jeremy Travis, but we'll start off with Monica Bell.

I'm hearing a lot of the themes and a lot of the questions that you were talking about in the paper that you wrote for the earlier session of the Roundtable about the relationships between different types of organizations and communities.

And so, Monica, I'll hand it over to you.

DR. BELL: Yes. So, I just mostly want to thank all three of you for all of your amazing work, and also the papers that you wrote.

We started the Roundtable with this, I think, like, kind of challenging conversation. I was like, What are we even talking about, starting with values -- why would you do that? We don't have shared values. I think, if anything, we learned from what's going on in the world of the criminal legal system that there are a lot of conflicting values.

And so, we kind of started with this values conversation -- talked, I think, a lot about politics.

Because you can't have a conversation about values with really just thinking about the political space.

1.3

And the other thing we were talking a lot about was really learning from the work that is actually happening on the ground. And that's how you would get a sense of what the right values are.

And so, I guess one of the things that stood out to me, just in this conversation, and also reading the papers, is that the values that were implicitly discussed in all the work -- or explicitly discussed -- are, I think, very far away from what a lot of people who sit in spaces like this, and also, people who kind of think they're big time policy people in the current legal space are up to.

So, things like -- you know, Eric, you were talking about just now, people being able to control their own narrative and defining themselves. And you talk in the piece about Black men who have transformed and liberated themselves, and that personal transformation process.

That seems so deeply important.

MR. CUMBERBATCH: Yeah.

DR. BELL: But there's not a deep story of really centering personal transformation that builds from inside. It's not attempted to be imposed by some like

punitive force. That's not deeply a part of -- even the pretty radical transformative conversations we have. So, I want to think more about that.

1.3

Danielle, in the piece, you and Amanda

Alexander talk a lot about what the new world looks like,
exactly where you're picking up in the conversation, as
well as, you know, collective power and you way break it
down -- the piece with economic narrative and political
power. Then, of course, the way Vivian talks about selfdetermination, collective power, and accountability.

All of these values are what emerge from the work you're actually doing, but are deeply -- I mean, I think I'm so haunted by thing I just participated in earlier this morning with these federal policy people where it was like, you know, Well, the police haters -- blah, blah, blah.

And I was just like, What are you even talking about? It's really hard to be there because there were just things -- and then, the way of thinking seems really far away from the work you're doing. Yet, they're in these federal policy spaces that are quite divorced from communities.

So, I guess what I'm thinking about in this conversation about values and aspirations is how we get over that political hump. Maybe we ought to think about

that. Maybe the thing is just to focus on work that is 1 2 actually happening. 3 But if we want to take control of this moment 4 and build power that scales, how are you all thinking 5 about those sorts of questions? MR. TRAVIS: So, I think the baton has been 6 7 passed to me, and I see Nneka had raised her blue hand 8 before we switched gears and mindsets. 9 I'd like to ask her to join the conversation. And then, we'll move on. 10 11 MS. TAPIA: Well, thank you. I think maybe we 12 lost Vivian for a moment, but thanks to Vivian, Danielle, 1.3 and Eric for your conversation. I had a follow up question mainly for you, Eric 14 15 and Danielle, based off the comments that you raised. think it was DeAnna earlier who, rightfully so, said that 16 the criminal system is not the only system that causes 17 18 That's not the only system we should be focusing 19 on. 20 Danielle, you talked about abolition in terms 21 of creating and what we're building. And Eric, you talked 22 about the power of our young people, and how organizations 23 are going into these institutions to support the healing 24 of our young people.

I'm wondering, is any work being done with the

25

New York school system to teach our young kids about organizing and advocacy and thinking about creating our next generation of leaders, and hopefully, building some buffer to some of the harms that we see? And also creating communities of healing, instead of schools that harming our kids?

MR. CUMBERBATCH: Yeah. I would say work is being done, but not at the scale that it should and could be. And I do have some schools that use their, so to speak, discretionary funding to invest in these types of opportunities.

And then, you have others where it's a foreign concept, and that process doesn't occur. We're blessed to have a lot of great organizations across the city that also do a lot of youth empowerment, youth building types of activities, workshops, and just have large footprints in certain schools.

But I don't think, and this probably gets to your point -- there's not a concentrated effort around curriculum building from our Department of Education that specifically focuses on that type of really deep healing, understanding, truth-telling, youth empowerment, community engagement. So, I haven't seen that in our schools, but there are individuals and organizations who do that work.

1.3

I'm also of the mindset that I'm not 1 2 trusting -- I have a 14-year old son, Eshawn [phonetic], 3 who's texting me as I'm speaking -- but I'm not sure the 4 schools necessarily being the ones that deliver that 5 message and/or carry that torch for me -- I don't trust the institution. And it's almost to the part of getting 6 7 back to what I was raising earlier that, you know, these 8 systems continue to cause harm. 9 I'm not going to entrust that level of 10 spiritual building within that institution for my son. 11 So, just wanted to also share that. Thank you. 12 MR. TRAVIS: Thanks, Eric. Danielle, would you like to respond also to Nneka's question? 1.3 14 MS. SERED: Sure, and I'm happy to sort of loop 15 it back to the question Monica offered into the space, too. I agree with Eric. I think the New York state 16 17 school system is a likely target of organizing and most of 18 us don't dream of people who will take us down or displace 19 us. 20 So, but I think a lot about a mentor and friend of mine, Lorenzo Jones -- talks about a mentor friend of 21 22 his who taught him: we don't win because we're right. 23 win because we're strong. 24 I think we make a lot of arguments about --

evidence-based this and even moral arguments. The thing

25

that will carry the day is going to be organized power. When I think about your question, Monica, I think I actually feel very optimistic about building a substantial enough national consensus around the failings of mass incarceration to be able to bring it to its knees.

1.3

That's in part because I think of the FWD.us study that found one in two people in America have a loved one who has been incarcerated. And so mass incarceration's very expansion has in it, I believe, the seeds of its demise, because there are so many people who have direct experience and information about its failings.

The one thing that typically overcomes a steady onslaught of propaganda is our own lived experience. And so, the range of people -- including plenty of white people. Not a lot of rich people, but plenty of white people have an understanding of the ways in which that system fails. I think there is a huge opportunity in that.

We see, in our work, a really profound consensus among crime survivors that incarceration is not the thing that will protect them or heal them. It is increasingly clear that the survivors' voices who have been held central are a really non-representative set of outliers, which means that the problem we're facing in that case is not a hearts-and-minds problem, but a

narrative one. It means we have to make the vast majority of people who know it fails visible to one another so that they can experience themselves as a majority and do what majorities then do, which is to win.

1.3

And so, I think for those reasons, I'm extremely optimistic about our ability to dramatically reduce mass incarceration. I think it becomes complicated when we get to the question of whether we can reach to serious violence or not. But even that, because of what I know about crime survivors, I think is within reach.

I do not feel the same kind of optimism about white supremacy and racism in this country, and I think that's partly because I do not think there is the same majority-level consensus. If we're talking about when you think about federal policy and we're talking about running the numbers and building power, which is partly about numbers -- and I don't think there is way through that that is as incremental as we would like it to be.

I think it will require of us a national reckoning. I think we have gotten as far as we can get without telling the truth about what we have done and what it, therefore, requires. And I think absent that level of truth-telling and reckoning, we'll continue to sort of trim around the edges and watch the tree continue to thrive and grow, because that's what happens to trees

whose roots are left intact and whose edges get trimmed.

1.3

And so, I think the demand to confront the white supremacy and the legacy of racism in this country requires a level of directness, a level of difficulty that is going to happen. The reckoning is upon us. I believe it.

But that, I don't see us choosing as willfully as I do see a path to choosing an end to mass incarceration.

MR. TRAVIS: Thanks, Danielle and Eric. Let me just help all of us understand where we are in our time together.

This is the end of the end of the Roundtable.

And in many ways, we're going to spend the next hour or so trying to pull together many threads of a very rich conversation into some sort of tapestry that we can take a look at and say, Well, we've put something together that has some strength and some durability through these ideas.

I'm going to recognize Bruce in a second, who had his hand up. And then, after hearing from Bruce, we'll come back. And I have just a prompt that will help us sort of organize this last hour plus together around the theme of values and goals and obstacles and aspirations and hopes.

So, let me throw that in after we hear from

Bruce. And then, we'll try to wrap up our conversation.
Bruce?

1.3

MR. WESTERN: This is a really interesting conversation, and it's pulling together a lot of different threads that we've been talking about over the years, I think.

I was struck by Danielle's observation that movement has been mostly about destruction, not creation. Sort of 90/10, and we've got to flip the ratio. That strikes me as right in a lot of ways.

You think about sort of the wins that have been registered, and the kinds of goals that people have been mobilized around, and it's things like -- look how drug policy has changed over the last 10 or 15 years. That's mostly about shrinking, right. That's shorter sentences, defelonization -- that sort of thing. Bail reform -- mostly about shrinking. Sentencing reform, in general, is mostly about shrinking.

So what does this positive model look like? What does this sort of more creative alternative look like?

I heard two things from the three of you. One is that it replaces the current punitive logic with some alternative kind of logic -- some means of accountability, perhaps, that does not have punishment at its center. So,

that's one.

1.3

And then the other is that some creative alternative that's beyond shrinking is organizing, is mobilizing, is promoting of social solidarity, and capacity for collective action. We don't have so much of that. It's hard to point to models of sort of active policy changes that are on the table -- if adopted, would be empowering of communities to act collectively on their own behalf.

And then, the theme of reckoning was brought in again, and this started way back in Durham. That in order to get to that model of more foundational change -- flipping the ratio, going from 90/10 to 10/90 -- we need a truth-telling process or a reckoning process.

I feel we're missing a step. I want to understand better. So say we do this reckoning process or begin a journey on a process of reckoning, how do we get from that -- acknowledging history, acknowledging past harm, bringing system actors to the table to do that, providing communities with an opportunity to describe the harms that they've experienced.

Say we embark on a process like that. How does that yield this new kind of policy or this new kind of politics that is not just about shrinking, but is positively constructing, perhaps, alternative modes of

accountability, and is mobilizing for communities?

1.3

I feel I'm missing a step, and maybe I'm just missing it and it's there. Or maybe we need to spell something out. There's something else in this process in which reckoning is getting us to a type of vision of alternatives so it's community-empowering.

I don't know if that's clear, but that's what I was sort of wrestling with listening to the conversation.

MR. TRAVIS: Professor, that's a great question. And as you noted, it's been a theme for the Square One Roundtables since Durham, and actually, from our first Executive Session, and we hope to have some writing on this topic coming out fairly soon.

Let me just ask folks, who would like to take up Bruce's challenge to -- you called it a missing step. But if reckoning is a pre-condition -- if confronting the legacy of white supremacy and the racism in the system, and acknowledging the harms caused by the system over the years -- if that's a pre-condition to moving forward, what's the next step?

Let's just assume that it is, because we've said it is important in a pre-condition. It may not be sequential, but it is necessary. Has anybody got some thoughts on that question before we move ahead? Huge question.

Last time, you'll remember, we were together, 1 2 we talked about the truth and reconciliation idea. And 3 then, it was mostly framed as a matter of accountability 4 for harm, as a way of sort of naming the harm, talking 5 about how we got here, who -- what systems, what agencies, what institutions had been responsible for that harm. 6 7 it came under that accountability heading. 8 Now, but Bruce is asking a different 9 question -- not that that's not an important one. 10 also important. 11 But how does that lead to -- and what might the 12 next step be, leading to a different sort of vision for 1.3 justice and safety and well-being and healing? Bruce, it looks like it's a big question. 14 15 looks like a big question. 16 MS. SERED: I'm happy to say something briefly 17 about it, and then stop talking. 18 MR. TRAVIS: No, Danielle --19 MS. SERED: -- with this question --20 MR. TRAVIS: We love hearing from you. Please. 21 MS. SERED: -- which is, like, TBD. I think 22 that's the thing about reckoning, is we don't -- it's not 23 a plea bargain, right. It's not we get to know what the 24 thing is and once we know it, we acknowledge our guilt.

I think -- I've told a story about my godson

25

when he was five, and there were a bunch of kids around, and there's a party. And they broke this glass thing that I think was once a vase, and I sat them all down. I was like, Who did it?

1.3

And they're like -- and I was like, I can wait you out. You're five. And finally, my Godson raised his hand and said, What will the person who did it have to do? I said, You know, they'll have to pay a dollar and write an apology if they can write, or say it if they can't, and make something beautiful to replace it.

Then, he said, You know, I did it. And then, this other kid was like, And I helped. Because they wanted -- and I think as white folks in America, we're like, What will we have to do if we admit it? We want to know in advance.

Because I think in the ethos of white supremacy, the only possible cost for what we are on the verge of admitting would be centuries of torture and death. It would be an eye-for-eye reaching forever -- to our children's children's children. And so, we're like, I wasn't here when that happened.

We're still there. And so, I think that's one of the things about a reckoning, is that it is a fulcrum in these processes. They are a fulcrum between the past and the future, and they are necessary because the future

isn't knowable without that truth-telling.

If it were, we would go straight to it. But it is the missing piece in the alchemy of that generative process of developing things, other than the things that already exist where we just get the eff out of their way and let them thrive. I mean, there's a ton of that to do right now that doesn't have to involve this level of transformation.

But for that level, I do think it comes sequentially. And I think that's part of what makes it so hard for us to choose it, is that we want to be told in advance what it will cost us, and that is not possible.

And I think what we know from people who participate in restorative and transformative justice processes is that the things that are possible on the other side of telling the truth are not knowable on this side of it, and it is part of what makes them so extraordinary, and part of what makes so few people want to choose them.

MR. TRAVIS: Thank you, Danielle. You've given a lot of thought to this topic, we know from the title of your book. And you're welcome to make contributions on the theme of reckoning at any time. That's very, very helpful.

Jon Simon is up next.

1.3

MR. SIMON: Mainly, I just really wanted to thank this panel, both for the work that they've done individually and the essays that they have written in conjunction with this. I actually think it's a perfect kind of conversation to end on, or to continue in terms of the national or the public outfacing conversation. I think it brings together the themes of anti-violence and human dignity that I've been thinking about during this values process, and it grounds it very concretely in the realities of where violence comes from.

1.3

I just wanted to respond briefly to the thought about the mechanisms -- to Bruce's question. One that -- and obviously, a lot of people are talking about this, but I'm curious what others think. I meant reparations.

One of the interesting things about the carceral state is it's sort of like the Germans. They've kept meticulous records of all the crimes that they committed, essentially, against people. Who has been arrested? Whose wealth was forfeited?

There's records of all this. Who has spent unnecessary years in prison based on a flawed theory of incapacitation that was supposed to create public safety? All those people should be considered for some kind of compensation that would actually invest in their communities through them.

So, that's one sort of level. It seems to me we could reach an awful lot of people that way. The other is sort of going back to one of my old hobby horses, which is human rights.

It seems to me, you know, if you have a country like Argentina, where the military runs amok for a while, you need to then create an institution that permanently marks a new deal in terms of that institution. So, you have a human rights court, or you create some kind of committee for the prevention of torture that has tremendous authority to intervene in all kinds of other state agencies.

I think in the U.S., we have developed so few modern human rights institutions, at least on a global standard. We don't even accept the Nelson Mandela rules for prisons. It's always struck me that in California, where we did in some ways a much worse version of mass incarceration than, perhaps, even New York, that we ought to close the Department of Corrections and not just add names like rehabilitation to it, and have something like a committee for the prevention of torture that basically has authority over any detention facilities that we're going to continue to have at the local level or at the state level.

Thinking out loud.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. Terrific thoughts. Jon, just to mention to others, if they didn't notice it, that in the chat through the last session where there was discussion about mass incarceration in New York State and New York City, you very helpfully, I think, added a discussion about policing in New York and in other parts of the country.

1.3

So, just if you would expand upon that -- get that into the conversation as well, because I think that's also another point of possible intervention in terms of a reckoning in terms of harms caused.

MR. SIMON: I think there's an important point here that's sort of raised by Vinny Schiraldi's very provocative, important question, When will we know that mass incarceration has ended? Has it ended in New York?

I always -- looking from California, at sort of around the end of the first decade of the century, I thought the story was New York had replaced mass imprisonment with a kind of mass aggressive policing, where a good deal of the population was being essentially imprisoned in a functional way by stop-and-frisk, by aggressive use of what Issa Kohler-Hausmann writes about in Misdemeanorland -- the marking and having lots of people in orbit around the carceral state and various forms of not quite freedom.

So, I thought that was the story, which didn't look all that attractive to me. Like are you going to trade mass incarceration for that? It's certainly not worse, but is it really better enough?

But if I'm hearing correctly, something

1.3

happened in the last seven years. Stop-and-frisk stopped, at least went down very dramatically.

It leaves me just with an empirical question,

Are Black bodies being less messed with after eight years

of this than they were in the later Bloomberg years? What

is the NYPD doing with all this time on their hands?

If they're not arresting people or stopping and frisking them, what exactly are they doing? Is it contributing anything to public safety? Or should we shrink them rapidly and use that money to do something more productive?

MR. TRAVIS: Right. So, we've landed on this really important place. And appropriately at the end of our time together and thank everybody for helping us to get here, which is to have our last discussion be on the importance of accounting for harm over decades, generations as a pre-condition to some form of reckoning.

It's a way of accounting for harm, and there are lots of ways to think about how that might be done.

Jon just said we know the names of the people who have

been in prison, right? We can presume we do the same for people who have been arrested. We know the children who -- the research that Danielle cited.

1.3

In essence, we know the extent -- the reach of the carceral state over the last, we could say, 50 years or so. So, we actually can identify, at an individual level, individual harms, some more extreme than others.

And I think we have some sense of communal harms and harms to our democracy, and harms to labor market participation and the like.

So, certainly if you believe that one of the pre-conditions to arriving to a new vision of justice, and maybe -- again, I never think it's sequential. I think they're actually simultaneous processes. Is a form of reckoning a process of reckoning?

It would be really helpful if we could just add into the mix here and make believe this is a chat on the screen. What do we want to account for in this truth process that might lead to reconciliation? At least it's a truth process that recognizes harms. Anyone want to add to the list that we've constructed here already?

Abbey, you had something in the chat that was also very constructive. Additional thought that you might want to articulate? Let's just sort of think about this for a second.

What might this look like? 1 2 MS. STAMP: I hear you calling on me, Jeremy. 3 MR. TRAVIS: I did. I did. 4 MS. STAMP: It's okay. No. I was just 5 thinking back to -- a few of us went to South Dakota, in Pennington County, which is Rapid City, and then drove to 6 7 the Pine Ridge Reservation. 8 And, you know, those of us who came 9 representing systems and academia just really, I think, 10 stopped talking and just leaned into listening for a 11 Native community who was so -- I mean, bad, and how -- we 12 would have these visits and get back to the van and just 1.3 kind of be like, How do you even deal with that? 14 And just -- we acknowledge that. Who gets to 15 decide what a reckoning or accounting for harm should look like, or should be? And I think that, you know, depending 16 17 on -- you could even get down to the neighborhood level. 18 It's just going to be different. 19 And that if systems want to shut up and listen 20 and figure out about what process would be meaningful, 21 then I think folks should really define that. And I think 22 when we listened -- I think Katharine was there -- when we 23 listened to folks who lived there about their experiences, 24 it was all across the board.

So, we couldn't, you know, even put all the

25

people who live on the Pine Ridge Reservation in the same kind of category. And how individualized it was, that was really the a-ha I had during that visit. And I just shared it in the chat because it felt like really was a pertinent experience for myself as it pertains to this conversation today.

1.3

out of it?

MR. TRAVIS: Thanks, Abbey. Katharine?

MS. HUFFMAN: Yeah. No, Abbey. I'm glad you brought that up, and thinking along those lines, I'm thinking this is a little bit responsive to the question that you've just raised, Jeremy. But also was sort of thinking, if we're trying to grapple with what does it actual mean to reckon? What is that process? What comes

You know, then the way Danielle framed it -- what's the bargain we're making to go into that? Or whatever that might be.

What strikes me is that we can think about, we have the receipts, as Amanda Alexander has said before, as Jon was just alluding to. We actually have records.

There's some very concrete things we can potentially do.

I think, in this room, we also have consensus that that would barely scratch the surface in terms of the reckoning that needs to take place in this country. And I guess I'm just trying to think, like, okay. What if we

just start on some of these things?

1.3

I heard a fascinating story the other day that was talking about efforts in the decades following the end of slavery -- the end of explicit slavery -- to set up pensions for former slaves and the leadership of a particular Black woman who was a former slave herself to work to try to create this idea that individual people who had previously been enslaved would be compensated on a yearly basis.

And I just was listening to that and thinking, you know, that would've been dramatically insufficient had it happened. But what would be different now if 140 years ago, that had actually happened and there had actually been, in this case, financial reparations, or at least a contribution to reparations in a financial sense for huge numbers of formerly enslaved people? I think it would've been really different.

So, I'm trying to think, to your point, what can we add to the list of the many things that we could start to think about and put on the table? Perhaps direct financial or other types of compensation for people who have a receipt, and their families, and others.

But then, also, these -- as Abbey was saying -- also thinking about this at a community level. Let's just start on some of these things and see where we can move.

And then, you know, that's going to lead us to new answers and lead us to pieces of this that we can't all see right now, moving that forward.

1.3

MR. TRAVIS: In addition to that, there's this interesting first step, which is finding as big a descriptive basket as you can for describing the harms. You talked about the people in prison, the children of incarcerated parents, but merely counting is not enough, right.

So, that's not a very satisfying answer, and I'm reminded of the work that Heather Ann Thompson is carrying out in Michigan. I may have mentioned this to some of you before. She, as an historian, is working in that state to find as much documentation as she can about the era of mass incarceration.

Letters home, receipts for the trips for family members for visitation -- all the ways in which the burden and the experience has been documented by those on the receiving end, as part of an organizing effort because people on this screen had an easier time talking about harms than the general public does. So, what does that look like as a matter of pricking the national conscience to get to that point?

Other observations about the truth-telling part of truth and reconciliation, and whether that's something

that can be imagined? Susan Glisson, please.

1.3

DR. GLISSON: I want to just lift up the brilliance of Sherrilyn Ifill, who wrote On the Courthouse Lawn a few years ago. She said that we start to have these conversations and we start to, you know, pull all of the last 400 years of history into the conversation, and it's overwhelming. It's hard to get a hold of it.

She said the best and most effective conversations about these topics are the ones that are the most local. So, getting as close as possible to neighborhoods, to communities --

MR. TRAVIS: Yeah.

DR. GLISSON: You know? In New Orleans, we worked in cities where death rates were highest from gun violence, but what was working in Central City didn't necessarily work in Treme, or work in Marigny. You get that local. You get that close to folks.

It reminds me of Reverend Peter Storey -- one of the architects of the TRC in South Africa -- said when folks talk about the failure of the TRC, he flips it. He said the TRC didn't fail South Africa, South Africa failed the TRC because it did not continue the work of the TRC in regular local communities.

I think that's where we've got to go.

MR. TRAVIS: Excellent. Thank you for that

very much.

1.3

I saw another hand. It was up momentarily, but it's down. Yes, Courtney? Down? Okay.

That's okay.

MS. ROBINSON: Yeah.

MR. TRAVIS: It's up to you, of course. So, let me just push us a little bit. So, let's just, in our mind, imagine that there's some sort of reckoning underway, and that we feel that it's as fulsome as it should be given the extent of the harm and the many ways in which this has been carried out and realized throughout our society.

What I'd like you to do in our last half hour together is to really flip this around a little bit and just help us imagine a way forward. You can be very explicit about this, just sort of as a prompt to get some discussion underway.

Now I'm going to ask you to answer the following question: Imagine we're sitting here 10 years from now, and something very important has changed in the world that we described to each other over the course of this Roundtable. Something is significantly better. And maybe the pessimists among us who are not as hopeful would say, Well, that's just not going to happen. But please see if you can imagine that something is significantly

better in -- I'm not talking about the system, necessarily. That could be your answer.

1.3

Or it could be what's happening at a community level on these issues. It could be what's happening in a sector. Something in the world that you know -- maybe not your world, but the world that you know -- something is significantly better about how our society responds to harm.

The second part of the question is, If you can imagine that, what would be the necessary pre-condition to getting there? We take reckoning as something that's already underway as a given in this mind exercise. So, I'm not saying that we're going to go to the promised land and imagine that everything's better.

I'm not saying let's wait for a century and hope that lots has happened. Just, is there something within sight that you in your work could imagine would be significantly better -- significantly different? Maybe the work sector that you work in. Maybe not. The sector you write about, or maybe not -- or where you can see that there might be some significant changes.

If you want to put that out there, what's it going to take to get there? Be as ambitious as you want to be. So, this is a constrained visioning exercise, constrained by time, ten years -- constrained by only your

imagination, really.

1.3

2.3

And don't let the second question be the constraint. I don't want to know from you only those things that are possible. But what do you think is out there that could actually change so that we can end our time together with some sense of possible movement in the world.

So, take a moment. Think about it. I'll ask you to raise your hand when you're ready to jump in, and we'll see where we go. I'm not going to ask everybody to answer, but I'm really interested in what you think is possible 10 years from now if we sit here together.

Courtney, I note your hand was up from before. Are you also raising your hand on this question?

Mm-hm.

MR. TRAVIS: Okay. So, in that case, because you had your hand up earlier, you get to go first. And

then, Monica, Nneka, then Keith, then Danielle, great.

MS. ROBINSON:

Courtney, take us 10 years out.

MS. ROBINSON: So, I'm glad you gave us a moment, because sometimes the first thing that pops in my head isn't always the most brilliant thing. So, I had a few moments to kind of tie some things together.

So, in terms of the 10 years, I'm thinking that significant community investment in those communities that

1	have been most impacted by incarceration. We know the zip
2	codes. We know what those communities are.
3	So, instead of
4	MR. TRAVIS: Yep.
5	MR. ROBINSON: getting gentrified, that they
6	are actually invested in. And for me
7	MR. TRAVIS: Great.
8	MR. ROBINSON: when I think of something I
9	can set my sights on in the work that I do, it's
10	education. In the next 10 years, if we can school
11	differently if we can school children differently, at
12	least in my state, we cut down 40 percent of the children
13	who end up in our criminal justice system. And
14	MR. TRAVIS: Fabulous.
15	MS. ROBINSON: it may even be bigger than
16	that, because that number is about referrals. School is
17	so connected to what they're doing in the community, how
18	they spend their time, you know, what they're focused on.
19	
20	And so, we could truly, I think, break the
21	link disrupt the link
22	MR. TRAVIS: Great.
23	MS. ROBINSON: between education and justice
24	if we focus on education.
25	MR. TRAVIS: Great. Fabulous. Great. You

have modeled, not the precise answer, but you modeled a way to think about this question. So, thanks for that, Courtney.

1.3

Then Monica's next. And then, after Monica, Keith.

DR. BELL: I'll be really quick. So,

Courtney's intervention is really quite germane to mine,

because I was actually thinking about myself and my space

as a legal educator and law school and the complicity of

lawyers in doing this -- actually carrying out the system,

enabling the system as a way in which legal education is

just so focused on punitiveness, individual

accountability -- all of these tropes that are part of a

lot of toxicity.

So, on the horizon, I see -- largely because of the activism of many people, but including law students -- a reorientation of curriculum. So, Jon Simon mentioned earlier teaching an abolition seminar, but we can go so much deeper than that.

Like incorporating abolition, incorporating focuses on white supremacy, and healing centered ideas into every place in the law school curriculum. I actually see that as being possible because individual law professors control what their [audio skip] is.

And also, there's been some movement building

within the legal academy, so I'm excited about that.

1.3

MR. TRAVIS: As somebody who went through that system unhappily, came out the other end okay, I will volunteer my time as a tutor to one of your classes. That is so important.

You know, lawyers, unfortunately, control so much power, particularly in that system. So, thanks, Monica. I love that idea.

Keith, you're up next.

MR. WATTLEY: Thanks. My comments are very much in line, I think, with what Courtney shared, and that's just getting the police out of schools and replacing them, really, with counselors, therapists who are not connected in any way to law enforcement or probation or any of that.

I think the way we get there is by -- I think we have to stop pretending we don't know what we mean when we say defund the police. We can just tell the truth about what we're trying to say and actually make it happen and support the services that, especially, our kids really need.

MR. TRAVIS: Yeah. Great. Again, doable -- 10 years and as you said, Keith, enormous implications for a narrative of what reform really looks like. Thank you, Keith.

Next is Nneka.

1.3

MS. TAPIA: I'm going to go with a two-fold answer about what we're deconstructing and what we're building. So, I think we're in the midst of figuring out what transformation can and should look like because we have increased transparency into policing — thanks to cell phones — and it's forcing a conversation about what a world with a different type of policing or without policing can look like.

MR. TRAVIS: Mm-hm.

MS. TAPIA: I believe we're on the horizon of increased transparency into all other parts of the criminal justice system, which will force us, hopefully much earlier than 10 years from now, into conversation about what transformation in those parts of the system can look like as well.

And then, I do believe that -- and this is building on what Monica, Courtney, and Keith have all said -- I do believe that we are also in a very good position to build up healing communities within schools. We have a lot of healing curriculums and healing frameworks for schools.

I think it's getting the political will to get school systems to pick this up so that we can build up our young people in healing communities, and not just think

about what we're destroying in hopes that they don't have 1 2 to experience it as kids or adults. 3 MR. TRAVIS: Nneka, if you would just go one 4 level deeper on the accountability and transparency points 5 that you made about cell phones and policing. So, what's it going to take to get transparency and accountability? 6 7 You mentioned policing and what's visible with 8 a cell phone, but more broadly, we've talked a lot about 9 the roles of other system actors, and the agencies that 10 run the system. Ten years from now, what is transparency, 11 accountability for their actions look like? 12 MS. TAPIA: We're starting to see it. So, I 1.3 think it was the New York Times recently released a report about uses of force in New York corrections --14 15 MR. TRAVIS: Yep. MS. TAPIA: -- and talked about how that we're 16 17 lying on reports. I think the more that we have an 18 insider's view into what's happening into these systems, 19 thanks to advocacy groups, thanks to human rights 20 groups --21 MR. TRAVIS: Mm-hm. 22 MS. TAPIA: -- thanks to journalists, then I 23 think that those windows will open up more. 24 And we, as community members, can kind of 25 encourage the political will of these elected officials

who are running these systems to say, We want to know more 1 2 about what's happening within them. I think we haven't 3 learned more because we haven't asked for more, partly. 4 MR. TRAVIS: Yeah. 5 MS. TAPIA: We're starting to ask those questions now. 6 7 MR. TRAVIS: Yep. And just one New Yorker's observation -- that New York Times article was made 8 9 possible only because the disciplinary records of corrections officers had to be made public only because 10 11 the statute that otherwise barred them from being made 12 public, known as 50-a, had to be overturned by the 1.3 legislature and the governor. And they did that only because of the insistence after the uprising after George 14 15 Floyd of those who were leading the movement. That was a target of organizing. 16 17 So, it's a clear case of organizing to 18 transparency to accountability. Now, we'll see if 19 anything changes in Rikers. So, thanks for those. 20 We have -- up next is Emily. And then, Susan 21 after Emily. 22 DR. WANG: Great. So, I, too, appreciate this 23 question with a 10-year time horizon. And much of what 24 Danielle is saying really resonates with me, which is

really thinking about the part of abolition that's tied to

25

building. You know, we haven't just spent enough energy there. And also, the TBD.

1.3

And to me, it's in the TBD, but really, it's the processes. I've just been trying to spend more time thinking about the processes that need to be in place to get us to where we want to go, that are critical.

Thinking about what Renita and also Nadia shared today really kind of centered around the perspective of a person that was living in Brownsville. What they could name was that it wasn't important to be in a community with lower crime rates or violence, but what it feels like to live in a community that thrives.

And so, you know, this might be a technocratic solution, but I've really been thinking about how it is -- and this is happening in the health systems now -- where we redefine, reclaim the narrative of success. What does a successful health system look like?

What does a successful educational system -even as we dismantle criminal justice system, what does
success look -- and I can imagine that, led by people that
have been disproportionately impacted by mass
incarceration, we have new measures of success that define
what thriving communities look like, where people have
access to food, access to medications they need, feel safe
in their community.

These systems and organizations are equal, shared, and decide kind of with those that are most impacted on these measures that are across communities. And so, in doing so, the systems are now forced to work together. They're forced to think about kind of their success in different terms.

1.3

And the data, if transparent, then, have these systems accountable to us -- accountable to the people that live in these communities. To me, that's the most transformative part. Also, with a high lens towards how they are disproportionately oppressing communities of color, I think, are key.

We can see some of this in the health system right now. There's anchor institutions that are happening now where the metrics of how health systems operate are actually being defined by the kind of thriving nature of communities around them.

And so, especially funding is tied to them, and that's what happening within health system. This feels like a lens that can move it forward.

MR. TRAVIS: Thanks, Emily. As so often happens when you join the conversation, we realize that we have so much to learn, and you'll be quick to say the health system is not perfect, but we have so much to learn from you and your colleagues who work in the health

systems.

1.3

Because the crosswalk is not that big, and you embody it, but I think we have a lot that we can learn. I have a hope that someday we can have a conversation about crime policy and never use the word recidivism. It is, to me, just -- that should never a part of our discussion. It's so toxic.

So, we have up next is Susan. And then, Dona.

DR. GLISSON: Just quickly, to Keith's really great point in the chat and to Nneka's point about political will, if over the next 10 years community organizing was invested in, in a way that it was in the last 10 years in Georgia, in all the 11 states of the former Confederacy, you would transform the South.

Reverend Barber said that we're not red here; we're underorganized. That would change everything.

MR. TRAVIS: Yeah. May that happen. Thanks, Susan, and I think we know what it takes. Just look at Georgia, and other states we can add to that list. Virginia's my other favorite state to talk about these days.

So, we have -- up next is Dona. Then, Danielle.

DR. MURPHEY: So, I will say, also, that education, to me, is really foundational. I had mentioned

in the chat earlier that we had youth-led organizing in our community. And they are organizing, actually, to change our educational system, and the people who are currently making decisions in that system.

1.3

I have a specific call to action, which people can make take as a more general commentary on what might be important and the change we'd like to see here, ultimately, that impacts the criminal justice system.

That is we need locally for our local government to be representative in terms of single-member districts, as opposed to at-large positions, particularly in communities that are showing a lot of demographic change.

In our community, in particular, we do not have representative government because they have decided to keep entrenched a system that will perpetuate the least amount of change for the longest period of time, and that is all at-large seats, which is totally not representative, right. The kids are trying to push for this.

We do need legal partners in making that argument legally. So, those who are in the legal system who are trying to support the activism that is happening there, we definitely need help with that because that's a lot of pro-bono work that legal groups could be doing with us.

Anyway, if we had representation, then I think we'd have changes. For instance, in hiring practices in our district, we have a gross, disproportionately small number of Black educators versus our Black students in our district. That would look a lot different if we had representative government here.

1.3

They would understand the importance of having racial concordance in our schools. And that would do a lot of things, from making sure we identify all of the academically-gifted students -- even if they are from communities of color, which is happening not so much right now. We would have less of a school-to-prison pipeline -- hopefully, no school-to-prison pipeline happening anymore.

But those things really are at the root of the systems that sustain, I think, the problems that we see in the criminal justice system.

MR. TRAVIS: Great. Thank you so much.

And then, next we have Danielle. And then,
Katharine.

MS. SERED: That was so powerful. Thank you.

I'm going to go big and say by my best estimate, on the day I was born, there were 443,850 locked up in the U.S., and I would ask Bruce and Jeremy and any other data types on the call to not calculate my age to the month, as Todd Clevelands [phonetic] did when he heard

that.

1.3

thing, Danielle.

And so, when I say -- and I believe we can get to that number in 10 years, and I don't believe that's inevitable. It might not even be likely. But I do believe it's possible, and I think it's really important that we acknowledge it as possible as we think about how we shape our work over that kind of time-frame.

I'll say quickly why. I think the first is that to get to that number -- we keep talking about reimagining justice, like we have to imagine some magical world from scratch, when, in fact, we need the capacity to recall the late '70s. And while I know that capacity's not one everyone possesses, it is a capacity some people possess. And there are records, even from that ancient time, that we could turn to for guidance. And so --

MS. SERED: I'm sorry. Look, I work with adolescents all the time. I'm like, I remember when computers were invented and -- just to horrify them.

And so, I think it's important that we not let the scope of imagination that we're called to do put us in a mindset that we think that we have to be capable of that kind of vision to just get to a number that most of us have seen. And so -- and I think also, I said a bit

earlier that I think that sheer number of people who have now have direct information about mass incarceration has in it the seeds of its demise, and I think we cannot lose the opportunity that is present in that. Like, the sheer scale of how many people in America know.

1.3

But there are two things I'll say about why I think that's possible in the timeline we're talking about, not just broadly. And one is, I think about this book I read many, many years ago called *The World Without Us*, that talks about what would happen to New York City if human beings just suddenly disappeared. It's like, How long until the bridges collapse? How long until certain plants came back? Until forests came back? Until bears came back?

And the lesson was, this shit requires very constant maintenance -- very constant maintenance because it's unnatural. The system we have in place is extraordinarily unnatural in any way we understand that word. And it requires constant maintenance -- constant surveillance, constant arrests, constant sentencing, constant denial of parole, constant reinforcement through sentencing law and everything else.

And so, in working, when we understand it as a thing that is not just, it's the status quo and we have to change it. But rather it's a thing that requires the

continual reinstatement and reimposition, and reaffirmation, and resourcing to do that -- because all of those things are also very expensive, the possibility of cutting off the sort of gasoline to that tank, I think, becomes much more imaginable to us in a way that's really important.

1.3

And it doesn't mean we don't have to make things retroactive and release people. Of course we do. But even the resistance to that requires that same maintenance.

And then, the last thing I'll say about why I think it's possible is, I think that once in a while, there are periods in history where a change happens at an accelerated pace. We see that. The Highlander Folk School was doing great stuff in the '40s and '50s, but wasn't nearly as busy as in the '60s. We see that happening, and I think we are living in one of those times.

I think things that were unimaginable a year ago have become normalized now. And I think younger organizers know that, and I think we are called on morally and in every other way to listen to them and recalibrate our expectations and our ambitions and the way we work, the associated labor to their far more ambitious vision.

Because I think that they may be right.

MR. TRAVIS: Great. So, Danielle, I'm with you on the ambition. I'm with you on excusability. I am increasingly with you on this might be the time to really push hard so that not only do we change sentencing — that's why I raised it in the New York session. Where's the organizing around that goal?

And I think the time -- in my most optimistic moments, the time might actually be right, and requires a discussion about retroactivity. I think that might actually be possible. So, in my most optimistic moments. A lot of variance there.

So, Katharine, you're next.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thanks, Jeremy. Danielle, thanks for that, and I'm going to take a page from your optimism there a little bit, as well. When you posed this question, Jeremy, the thing that first popped into my mind was, you see these sort of surveys that are of young people who don't believe that they're going to live past age 18 or 21.

For Black and Brown young people, they don't believe that they have a future in that very literal sense -- high percentages. Not all, but high percentages. And I was thinking 10 years from now, if Black and Brown young people universally believed that they had a future of their choosing, of their empowerment, of their

[indiscernible].

1.3

And then I was getting stuck on the second part of the question, What is it? What would that take? My list was really long.

And listening to all of you all, what I'm struck by is that, like, everyone has named a goal, and everyone has named a mechanism to get there. And you could practically interchange every single one of those with every other one and still be moving forward to the same place, which I think is really exciting and inspiring.

If we get back down to disco and the '70s, like Danielle and Jon are suggesting, in terms of our rates of incarceration, that would have an enormous impact on what I just mentioned. That would have an enormous impact on the sense of thriving in communities that Emily was talking about. It would have an enormous impact on all of these different things that folks have brought up.

And so, I just take that as a push to choose any and all of these and start moving forward in them, because that's the interconnectness I was thinking about, bringing all of these things together in terms of what we're building, as Keith was saying. And not just only focusing on what we're tearing down.

MR. TRAVIS: Well, this is just a great list of

achievable dreams -- let's call them that -- and a very clear-eyed sense of what it will take to get there. Bruce has been listening carefully and has volunteered to offer some observations about what you all just produced, and maybe some clear-eyed, realistic assessment of the hurdles.

1.3

And then, I'll come back after Bruce for one more prompt. And then, we'll move to closing it out.

MR. WESTERN: This was a challenging prompt for me. I was chatting with Jeremy on the side. I'm saying, I'm not sure I can fully do this. I'm thinking about stuff that seems very difficult.

One thing I think is really possible -- it goes to Danielle's last number of comments on the political process. We look at concrete processes of policy change in our own localities -- changes in drug policy, bail reform, things like that -- and think about the resistance to them, the hardline DAs and the sheriffs, and just a reservoir of punitive sentiment in public opinion, and that's shifting.

So, one really positive thing, I think, is I wonder if this resistance shrinks in a very nonlinear way. We get to some tipping point, and the whole political environment changes, and very significant change becomes possible.

We're not there yet, but we're on this path where political resistance to reform is gradually shrinking, and I wonder if this is nonlinear. You get to a tipping point. And then, really, really big things become possible quickly. So, that's a positive proposal.

1.3

Here are two things I'm just so deeply worried about -- they're not related to the criminal justice system at all, but I think they're just fundamental to the context we're in. One is economic inequality.

And you think about the trend in income inequality and wealth inequality, particularly in this country over the last 40 or 50 years now, and it has just steadily increased year after year. We now have a tiny, tiny, little class of people in this country who are unimaginably wealthy and command unimaginable amounts of power in American society.

And so, it's new. We used to be able to point to the Roaring 20s and the robber barons, and so on. But we've even surpassed that now, and the concentration of economic power and wealth is so extreme in this country right now. And I think that presents an enormous challenge to democratic politics.

The other thing is climate change, and it seems inexorable, right. We've past the point of no return now, and the only viable alternative for us as a global

community is sequestration of carbon -- pulling carbon out of the atmosphere.

1.3

Because it's not 10 years off or five -- it was always in the future. That point has changed. And the costs of climate change are going to fall massively on the most disadvantaged and disempowered people.

So, I just can't fully get my head around those challenges, and in our patch, there is such incredibly positive stuff happening. But then, I kind of zoom out and I think about those things.

MR. TRAVIS: Thanks, Bruce. With your permission, I'm going to ask our group to zoom back in a little bit, recognizing that climate change is huge, income equality is huge enough to drive us to inaction.

I want to just take your first comments about tipping point. Is it possible? And just ask this group to answer another question. And then, we'll turn it back to Bruce to wrap up this entire Roundtable.

We talked a lot about power. We talked a lot about power sharing. We talked a lot about the reluctance of those in positions of power to give up the power that's required to make the changes that we would like to see.

At the same time, we've talked about -- on the side of that -- coalition building, organizing, the ways in which the last -- at least, since the George Floyd

murder, but I'll go back to Ferguson -- that the dynamics about justice reform have changed with the Movement for Black Lives. There's an insistence for reform.

So that, we put under the heading of reasons to be optimistic. We did that this morning. So many of you mentioned that as something that was a presence in our modern life. So, here we have entrenched power, a movement that we see as having potential in terms of its power.

So the next thing I'd like anybody to offer observation about is to get from here -- I'm still in the 10 years thinking -- to get from here to being able to wrest power from a system that is likely to want to hold on to it, and make some of the changes that we think are possible in 10 years, not necessarily the ones you nominated before. What's the organizing pre-condition in order for that to happen?

And I know that's a very broad question, and it's not my particular area of expertise or firsthand experience. So, I'd love to hear from people: what's it going to take terms of a coalition building? Organizing?

1.3

Is it at the ballot box? Remember in our session in Detroit where our first paper was on violence as a tool for political change, or resistance as a tool

for political change? And that's prompted a really pretty
deep discussion. So, just help us think about what's the
organizing activity that you think might be necessary?

So, be the historian looking back on 10 years.

Say, We got to a much better place because that happened.
What do you hope for in terms of that coalition building,
organizing, activism? Not in an individual level, not any

Is that a vision that you want to articulate for us? As to looking back 10 years from now, you say, Oh. That's what helped us get to this point.

institution level, but in terms of broad coalition --

people demanding that things be done differently.

1.3

So, take a moment to think about that. I'd be grateful for anybody who has thought about that. And then, we'll share those thoughts for 10-15 minutes or so.

And then, turn it back to Bruce. Again, please use your blue hand.

Thank you, Nneka, for being first up, and we'd love to hear your thoughts on this question of how is power going to -- we think of it as a pre-condition that there has to be a shift in power, and how is that going to happen?

MS. TAPIA: I reflect on the conversation that we had with Marlon and Daryl. And I think about how there was a conflict there in whether or not people who are

organizing in community can coalesce with people who are working within the system to uproot the system.

I believe that progress is happening as it is right now, with us working in separate lanes for the most part. But I believe more progress will happen when people who are organizing in community can partner with people who are working within these systems and understand how toxic they are and want to see them dismantled, working in community to dismantle these systems and reduce these harms.

MR. TRAVIS: That was a wonderful contribution.

Thank you, and good to be reminded of that part of their discussion, which was so rich and really personal for them. They were really eloquent on that point.

Who else wants to contribute to this discussion about -- it's a version of Bruce's optimistic prognosis that maybe we're at a tipping point, but what's going to tip the balance here? And frankly, I don't see a lot of tipping happening already, but I think that's necessary.

Monica?

1.3

DR. BELL: I guess I'll say one thing, which is I think we reached a tipping point, in part, by pointing out the relationship between a lot of the conversation we're having here. Like, education, housing -- all of this broader network of the change we're trying to build.

I think leaning into the fundamental 1 2 interdisciplinarity of transformation can help build 3 enough political capital, because it's not just about 4 people who tend to work on --5 MR. TRAVIS: Yeah. DR. BELL: -- [audio skip] in the criminal 6 7 system. 8 MR. WESTERN: Did Jeremy freeze? Okay. I had 9 a two finger. I'm going to totally abuse Jeremy's internet failure to --10 11 MR. TRAVIS: I'm sure there were pearls of 12 wisdom that I missed. Sorry about that. 1.3 MR. WESTERN: I hadn't started yet. 14 MR. TRAVIS: Okay. 15 MR. WESTERN: It took me a second to realize you were frozen, Jeremy. But I had a two finger on 16 17 Monica's, and mine wasn't as substantive as that, but I 18 thought was right on. I think what could be very 19 generative politically is the creation of virtuous cycles 20 where policy change commands more support, commands more 21 change. 22 You see, the model I think of is in social 23 policy, right, where social security gets established in 24 the 1930s, becomes very, very difficult to dismantle, and

then, expands in the Great Society to eliminate poverty

25

among the elderly. It's an incredibly popular program, and it's politically -- you can't retrench it.

1.3

We don't quite have virtuous circles of policy change commanding support, creating more change. But I think this more expansive idea that involves housing and education in tandem with changing how we think of and do justice -- I think that's the basis for a virtuous circle in our sphere.

And we don't quite have models for that yet.

MR. TRAVIS: So, same question for Monica and Bruce, just as follow-up. Are you saying to us that it's important for people in those other sectors -- who work in those sectors or work on those issues -- to be advocates for justice reform? Or that their effective advocacy around housing, for example, will help support justice reform?

Have you seen that difference?

DR. BELL: I'll jump in and say, I mean the former more so than the latter, actually. I think that's also true for work on the criminal legal system transformation, which is to say we have to understand how intersections happen and not --

MR. TRAVIS: Right.

DR. BELL: -- and just not be sort of so limited in our scope of understanding how you're actually

going to build.

1.3

As Danielle was talking about -- how do we actually create stuff. I think we create a new world by not just folks staying on like internal to one -- MR. TRAVIS: Yeah. I'm reminded of the contributions from our school's principal from New York, whose name -- I'm sorry. I've forgotten. But when she was saying, I'm an educator, but I really care about what guys do because it effects my students and my ability to function well.

So, any final thoughts on this organizing idea -- sort of power-shifting idea before we move on?

MS. HUFFMAN: I'll echo again what we were all

mentioning before. The organizing that happened in Georgia, and the very direct linkage of political power to change.

I mean, that's -- when we're writing the history, that's going to be in there, and hopefully, because it was then expanded to all of the former states of the Confederacy -- as Susan said -- and beyond.

MR. TRAVIS: Yep. I would add to that very explicitly organizing around voting rights for people with felony records. And there is various calculations as to how that would've changed the outcomes of various elections. Our colleague -- Daryl Atkinson's very much involved in that, as are others.

We see this as difficult. Only look at Florida 1 2 to see how difficult that is, but what a change that would 3 make if that was across the board -- statutory reform. Susan? 4 5 DR. GLISSON: Yeah. Just to put an exclamation on that, in 2016 or 2017, the Women's March, there were 6 7 eight major women's marches in Mississippi, my state. The 8 largest marches that had happened since the '60s. 9 Last summer there were 32 Black Lives Matter 10 marches across Mississippi. Thirty-two. Most of them 11 were planned by young people. It's a tipping point. MR. TRAVIS: There you go. 12 1.3 MS. GLISSON: It's a tipping point. 14 MR. TRAVIS: Yeah. Great. So, unless there's 15 a final contribution to our thinking on organizing, we will start to bring this to a close. Not seeing any hands 16 17 raised, blue or otherwise. Great. 18 So, I'm going to turn it over to Bruce for some 19 final observations about this Roundtable, but let me 20 just -- if you would, as a matter of sort of a personal 21 privilege here, just to thank all of you for your 22 contributions to not only this Roundtable, but to the 23 other Executive Sessions and Roundtables that you've

It's been just a remarkable journey of a

24

25

participated on.

lifetime, frankly, for me. And you made it possible and I know that I speak on behalf of others who are not here who've been some of our participants over this three-year journey.

1.3

My only hope is for you -- and now, I'll make this a 10-year hope, is that you take some of the ideas that have been generated here and just make them happen. Whatever it takes.

Because the ideas that have been generated are really, really powerful. And I know that there's a capacity with members of the Roundtable and the larger Square One family to really change the world. And we will be running alongside you, watching you, supporting you where we can, learning from you as we've done over the last three years.

Thank you for making all this possible. So, our final thoughts are from Bruce.

MR. WESTERN: Yeah. I feel we're getting pretty talked out. I had some summary notes. I don't want to go through them all because I don't think I can do justice to the conversation that we had.

I will say -- this is just sort of my concluding observation -- the conversation we wound up having, which is characteristic of the Roundtable. We draw it up on the whiteboard one way, and then the

collective genius of the group takes it in a completely different way.

1.3

And I thought we were going to be plumbing the depths of philosophy and thinking about the deep principles that will govern the future of a radical justice project, but we spent a lot of time talking about politics, actually. The theme of values surfaced for the group an urgency about action, which, I mean, I learned so much from the Roundtable process in this way.

In retrospect, of course that's what a conversation about values would be. It would be, How do we act on our values?

One of the really interesting things for me in this whole conversation over the last week or so -- the forces that divert us from our values. What keeps us from honoring our values? An interesting thread in that conversation was professionalization and the professional pathways of career advancement and even, I suppose, personal development, and so on -- can distract us from the principle and sense of mission that we most esteem.

We had a very honest conversation, I think, about system actors. Nneka spoke to this just now. I think it's a super interesting and critical question, and I think sort of figuring out how coalitions can be built, broad coalitions that remain very, very honest to our

missions and can overcome all of the personal diversions of professionalization.

1.3

That happens on the movement side, as we well know, as well. I think that was an important thing for me that came out of the conversation. So, professionalization can divert us from our values.

What can help us honor our values? The thing I took away from that was democracy. It is in democracy that we need to affirm the connections of social solidarity. It's in democracy that we see our wishes, our problems in the lived reality of other people, and we come together to solve those problems.

And of course, democracy is under deep threat right now. I mean, we've just seen that in our political process in the last six months. So, that's all I want to say. I wish I had something more elegant and deeper, but that was a lot for me, and unexpected.

I wanted -- so this is our last meeting, and we've been doing this for three years. We've been doing it in the Roundtable format, and we've been doing it in the Executive Session. I've got to thank the incredible people who work on Square One every day.

I mean, they just walk the walk every single day, and it's Sukyi, who, I think, has just provided such astonishing leadership. It's Anamika, who has played a

parallel role with the Executive Session. Madison and Evie, who you've all had contact with -- just utterly extraordinary people.

1.3

I'm in complete awe of how Katharine stewards this whole crew. And on a staff call last week, Jeremy and I were reflecting the best decision we've ever made in the last three years was bringing Katharine, Sukyi, Anamika, Madison, and Evie on board, who are extraordinary.

I want to close these thanks by just acknowledging Jeremy's role in Square One over the last three years. I mean, if it wasn't clear in the Justice in New York session, Jeremy has been fighting for a fairer, more equal and just, humane, and compassionate New York City for decades now.

It's a life's work that's truly extraordinary. Listening to the conversation, I could see Jeremy's influence through many of the panelists at the table, and it has just been utterly brilliant. It's been a gift to be able to work with him for the last three years. I'm very grateful for that.

Final thing: This is not the end. We're going to do more. This is the end of this chapter, although there's still more work we want to do with this particular chapter, because there are papers that we have plans for.

1	And so, that work will continue.
2	But the friendships and the relationships that
3	have been built around Square One, I think, are so
4	powerful. For us, I believe, we've made some contribution
5	to the larger national conversation. This work will
6	continue. We'll fill you all in on that as our own plans
7	develop.
8	But there's definitely more work to do, and we
9	hope that you'll continue to join us. It's been amazing.
10	I think you're all extraordinary. It's just been a
11	privilege to work with all of you.
12	So, thanks very much.
13	MS. HUFFMAN: Yay.
14	MR. WESTERN: What's next, Sukyi?
15	MS. McMAHON: The recording is off. Yay.
16	MR. WESTERN: Yay.
17	MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Sukyi.
18	MR. TRAVIS: Now, we can relax.
19	MS. HUFFMAN: Here she is.
20	MS. McMAHON: That was awesome.
21	MS. HUFFMAN: Sukyi, congratulations and thank
22	you so much.
23	MR. TRAVIS: Yay, Sukyi.
24	MS. McMAHON: I'm happy. I'm just so proud of
25	everyone, you know? I want to thank you all for taking

the time, and for just really putting yourselves into this 1 2 whole journey, whether it's the last three weeks or just 3 throughout the course of this. 4 So, it means a lot. As Jeremy said, life-5 Certainly, for me, as well. What happens in Square One happens here locally and gets transferred into 6 7 the work that we're doing here, and I think Courtney might be able to vouch for that. 8 9 You know, I feel like the values that we embody 10 are trickling right down to the community level, and I think that's probably happening wherever you all are. 11 12 thank you for being validators and carrying this work on. 1.3 So I'm just going to be bothering you all next 14 15 week or so to get a debrief, and I'd just like to have one 16 last discussion about this particular Roundtable. Katharine says and Bruce says, the work continues. 17 18 we'll all be reaching out and trying to get more because 19 that's all there is, is just more.

We're going to be continuing the work until it's over. So, thank you all.

20

21

22

23

(Whereupon, at 5:15 p.m., the Roundtable was concluded.)

 $\hbox{\tt C} \ \hbox{\tt E} \ \hbox{\tt R} \ \hbox{\tt T} \ \hbox{\tt I} \ \hbox{\tt F} \ \hbox{\tt I} \ \hbox{\tt C} \ \hbox{\tt A} \ \hbox{\tt T} \ \hbox{\tt E}$ 1 2 3 MEETING OF: The Square One Project via Zoom 4 LOCATION: 5 DATE: April 30, 2021 I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, 6 7 numbers 1 through 201, inclusive, are the true, accurate, and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording 8 made by electronic recording by Latrice Porter. 9 DATE: May 10, 2021 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 /s/ Anna Marie Reyes 17 (Transcriber) 18 19 On the Record Reporting 20 7703 N. Lamar Blvd., #515 21 Austin, Texas 78752