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MS. HUFFMAN: Hi, everyone. Good afternoon. Good morning. My name is Katharine Huffman. I'm the Executive Director of the Square One Project, and it is just such a pleasure to be here with all of you all again today.

All of you who are Roundtable participants here on the Zoom screen, and all of you who are joining us virtually through our livestream, it's just wonderful to be here together. And we really appreciate everyone taking the time and effort and energy and love that it takes to have this conversation.

A huge thank you to the participants who were with us yesterday evening. You all really helped us set the space for this opening panel and discussion today about the role of values. We're here with this entire Roundtable convening with one purpose: to move forward the project of reimagining justice in America in a foundational way.

We've brought together this wide range of advocates and organizers and leaders and elected officials from all across the nation who are all fighting for that fundamental change from inside the justice system, from outside, and in a lot of other places as well. And we're just really grateful to have all of you together.

We truly believe that a big part of our work in
making change is to expose our ideas and our values to everyone on the Roundtable and vice versa, and to everyone who's part of Square One, in the hopes that will contribute to our collective growth and change. And we just really appreciate everyone who's participating in this session.

I want to take a quick moment to walk us through the agenda for today. We're going to start with a terrific panel discussion with Leah Wright Rigueur and Monica Bell on the role of values. They will get us started in our conversation.

And then, we'll be opening up for a group conversation with this entire group that will continue until 2:30 p.m. Eastern, 11:30 a.m. Pacific. Then, we'll take a quick 30 minute break, which can be lunch or snack or late breakfast, or whatever is appropriate for where you are in your time zones.

And we'll reconvene at 3:00 p.m. Eastern and at noon Pacific to come back and have a second discussion, which will start with some thoughts from Fatimah, Abbey, and Keith, who have done some writing in advance of that session as well on the values of justice. And then at that point, we'll actually break out into rooms of about eight or so participants in each one, and we'll have a facilitated discussion within each of those. And then,
come back together to share our thoughts.

Just for technological considerations with all of that, while we're in the breakout rooms and during the break, we will be ending the livestream. But the breakout sessions will be recorded as the full Roundtable is, and those breakout session conversations will be posted, as well, on our website and our YouTube channel in the coming days.

So while we aren't able to have all the breakout sessions livestreamed, they will be available for folks to able to review and hear how those conversations went. And for those who are watching from home or away, if you subscribe to our YouTube channel or registered via the Eventbrite for this Roundtable, you'll get a notification when we're live once more after each of these breaks.

One more update reminder for our participants. As everyone knows and as most of us experienced last night, during the course of our conversations, we'll be inviting open and informal conversation with everyone, and we'll ask you to use the raise-hand function so that you can raise your hand as you want to get in the queue to speak.

But as always, the option for the insistent wave is available. And if you have something that you'd
like to say that's immediately responsive to something
that someone's just said or that you feel really can't
wait in order to have the impact to interact with the
discussion, please wave physically. And I will be keeping
my eyes on the screen to invite you in, or you can shoot
me a direct chat and I'll try to be keeping an eye on that
as well to invite everyone in.

So with that, I want to take just a few
minutes -- welcome, again, to everyone. A huge welcome to
those who weren't able to join us last night, and we're
just really looking forward to this discussion.

We've been able to begin our talk and sort of
thinking about, what do we mean by values? What are the
role of values in this endeavor of trying to re-imagine
justice? And what does that mean?

Before we get started on our panel, I'll
invite -- if anyone has any thoughts from last night's
discussion, any reactions or things that have come to you
as you've been considering that overnight -- or if there's
anyone who wasn't able to participate, but has any
thoughts you'd like to offer, we'd invite that now before
we shift gears and get started in our next conversation.

Anyone have any thoughts they'd like to
share? Great. Well, in that case, I think we can go
ahead and get started in our conversation.
Leah and Monica, if you all are ready, as we start this conversation, we wanted to really begin our time together in earnest talking about the role of values. In recent years, there's been an increased recognition that our nation's reliance on mass incarceration to create safety and justice has not, in fact, achieved those goals of either safety or justice, and has actually often created harm to people, to communities, to systems.

And because of that, we -- the collective we -- have begun to seek ways to increase safety and lessen harms within the systems. We've been mostly, in doing that, focused on sort of the practical tools available, and working within the political constraints of elections every few years, and the efforts that can be made within the context of the justice system itself.

But what we're all realizing is that real conflicts and inconsistencies arise from this narrowly scoped focus. And while it's understandable on a practical or a political level, reacting to this narrowly defined problem with a narrowly drawn response doesn't get us to the core task of reckoning with the justice system and with the damage it's wrought, or bring us to the possibility of really foundational change.

So in this session, we want to really think
about, what is the potential role of values in breaking
out of these constraints? And is there the potential that
a focus on our shared values would allow us to really make
more progress, and really foundationally reimagine justice
and achieve safety and security and freedom for all?

What kind of values are necessary in the
present to have the kind of just world that we imagine?
So I want to open up this conversation with a huge thanks
to Leah and to Monica for the writing that we all have the
opportunity to read in advance, and I'll invite you all to
get us started in this conversation with this question of,
what kinds of values are needed to have the kind of just
world we imagine?

Leah? Monica? If you'd like to start.

DR. BELL: I'm happy to start, because in some
ways, my opening statement is less about naming particular
values and is more about thinking about what a
conversation about values would actually offer us in the
first place. And so, one of the things I think a
conversation about values could offer us is a type of
common terrain about which to debate about particulars.

So, I mean, of course, the questions you
started with invite -- you know -- who is the "our"?
Right? So I'm interested in who the collective is that
we're referring to in particular. But, you know, we could
Another thing, you talked about safety and justice and how we haven't achieved it. And a lot of the conversations about the criminal legal system right now -- it's like are safety and justice even values of the American criminal legal system, if we just start there.

There are many communities that have been made less safe, and certainly have not experienced anything like structural justice related to the criminal legal system. So I guess those are just kind of initial recognitions.

But I think the value of having a values conversation is to say -- it's almost like the Constitution, right? It's like regardless of what people think about the Constitution and how it should be interpreted, at the very least one can say it gives us a common vocabulary about which to have a further conversation. Even with its deep flaws, its deep racism, its deep endorsement of settler colonialism and so forth, that terrain is important.

And so, I think as an initial statement, we're not going to have, I hope, a pie-in-the-sky conversation about values that doesn't take seriously the fact that any conversation about values is built on a pre-existing structural injustice. And so really we're just having a
first-step sort of conversation, but returning to those first principles is important.

But I'll stop there, and I look forward to hearing what Leah has to say.

DR. WRIGHT-RIGUEUR: Sure, and thank you, Monica. Thank you so much. You know, in our previous conversation, we had talked a lot about defining and definitions. And I think that's really important, too, because in this conversation, values is everything. And I think establishing whose values, what values, what kind of values we're talking about is deeply important.

Now, what I want to do is two things, I think, in this kind of opening statement. The first is to, you know, go through the pie-in-the-sky thing about, what are the shared values that I think are necessary in order for us to even to get some semblance of change. I mean, of course, we can parse that apart and take it apart. But then, also, to think about how those values and others that we would inscribe as positive values conflict, perhaps, with values as they exist now for values of the nation.

So I think what's necessary are ideas of empathy, ideas of rehabilitation, ideas of racial and social egalitarianism. Right? So really it's this idea of equality in its truest sense, but in questions of race
and social issues.

A sense of freedom. I'm not going to say
liberty, because I think liberty is a loaded term. So
it's freedom in some respects, but freedom broadly
construed.

And then, of course, the last one is
collectivism. Now, the reasons why I think -- I mean,
there are a number of reasons why I think those are
important. I'm happy to talk about that later on.

But I think one of the things that we're coming
up against is that the values that I've defined and have
broadly construed are actually in conflict with our
nation's values as they exist right now. And that in
fact, our nation's values as they are practiced are almost
incompatible with ideas of restorative justice.

So what we're talking about here, particularly
as we begin to have a common understanding of definitions,
which is really important, I think part of what we're
coming up against -- and again, this is, I think, part of
a conversation Monica and I've had earlier -- was that
these ideas and these values as defined, right -- common
values as they are defined are actually not necessarily
reconcilable with ideas of restorative justice in a system
and in an institution as we see it right now.

So I would love to have a conversation about
that as well.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you both so much. Well, I invite you to dig in on that a little bit. I mean, this question of, what do you do when the values that you seek and the values that we may talk about as ones that could actually move us forward are so deeply, and it almost seems concretely, in opposition to many of the values upon which our entire society is built?

What's the opportunity -- what's the path forward in that context? Or is there one?

DR. BELL: So I think in a lot of ways this goes back to how we're defining the “our,” like, in who gets define what the meaning of the nation-state is. So you know, we don't have uncontested shared values, actually.

And maybe that's, like, a bleak way to start the conversation to some degree. But we have shared values, per se, but there's a political and social process, and a process that includes organizing, a process that includes deep dialogue and education, and just like actually in the work, the values become defined.

And so, you know, as an academic, a lot of the time, there's a tendency to start with theory. And I think in some ways, starting with values can feel like that if we're not really careful to tether values to
praxis. And so, I think in observing the work that people do and engaging in work, values become defined more explicitly.

So just to be a little more concrete. So like one could have -- you know, we write about this in our paper. One could say, Oh. I have a value of repair. And one could approach values of repair and reckoning by having dialogue in which there's apology and sort of detached from anything material.

Or one could have a conversation about repair in which there's a requirement that first, we deal with the material consequences of what has happened. So, and then, the kind of value of repair becomes more explicit and better defined, and I think that's the type of values conversation I'm interested in engaging in.

One that's like almost inductive, to use maybe a sociological way of thinking about it, where instead of, I'm saying, Okay. Well, these are our values. Now, let's figure them out. Instead, say, like, Let's be doing work, and then the values that we actually have become more apparent.

And I think what's nice about this conversation is there's so many people here -- I mean, of course, watching -- who've been engaged in tangible work who can help us better understand what the actual values are, if
that makes sense.

DR. WRIGHT-RIGUEUR: And so, I love this idea of tangible work. And I'm going to expand on it a bit to say that I also want to think about tangible moments where it becomes apparent through which values are expressed -- national values are expressed, but also mitigated values, and then, the development of shared kind of values.

And I actually think that there are very specific moments in America's history, particularly in recent history, just to kind of, I think, contextualize it and to point to areas where I feel most comfortable. But I think particularly, in recent history, where value making happens, and it can be incredibly powerful, both for negative, but also for positive.

So I think about a moment like the end of the Civil War and radical Reconstruction. That is a moment of value making. But so, too, is the end of Reconstruction and the rise of the redemption period and the nadir of African-American history and experience.

I think of other moments: 9/11, for example, where there's a nationwide connective experience, and there is an attempt for a certain kind of value building, but something else comes out of it. A different kind of value is built out of it. One that does harm.

I also think about, say, the Charleston
Massacre in 2015. And the reason why I use the Charleston Massacre is because there is something that happens in the American idea in that moment -- or the American public idea that seems radically different, but also collectively brings us together to produce something that is on the edge or the cusp of possibility -- positive possibility.

So you have Nikki Haley saying that she's going to bring down the Confederate flags from the Mississippi state house. We have Ben Carson saying, Call it what it is, racism.

And it seems like there's this moment where we can go in a particular direction to do less harm as a nation as one of our shared values. And that moment is upended, I think, with the influx of the presidential election and the rise, in part, of Donald Trump. It's the moment -- it's a lost moment.

Which brings me to, I think, my last moment of value building, which is the moment that we are in right now. The death of George Floyd -- the recent murder of George Floyd, the death of Breonna Taylor, I think, as well. But more so, as part and parcel of this kind of George Floyd moment.

But then, also, couple that with the Capitol riots and insurrection that happened on January 6, 2021. And I think when you take those things together, it
really feels like we are in a moment of possibility and
value building -- positive possibility and value building
for our shared values as a nation.

So I think to Monica's point, in terms of doing
the work, we have to couple it with these moments of
practice with, also, events, where it feels like, as a
nation, we are collectively going through these moments
and redefining what our values are and what they mean.

MS. HUFFMAN: Okay. That's a really powerful
concept, and just as a follow-up question to that for both
of you. You know, Leah, you just described some of these
value-making moments, and then described in each of those
how the potential wasn't realized, and instead there was a
turn that went certainly not sufficiently forward and
possibly even backward.

You know, we're in this moment. We all feel
that potential for forward motion or for backward
motion. Are there lessons we can learn from history? Are
there lessons we can learn from the practice of people who
are working now, all of us on the screen and otherwise,
that can help us turn this value-making moment that we're
in towards the creation of those new values and towards
the positive? As opposed to adding it to the list that in
10 years from now, we'll be saying that was another missed
moment where we didn't make a change.
DR. WRIGHT-RIGUEUR: Monica, you want to tackle this one first? No? Okay.

So I think there's a lot. There's a lot. That's a really big question. But there are a couple of things, I think, as starting points, which is that I largely focused on kind of national moments. But I think the truth is that these national moments happened through local, on-the-ground building, particularly around institutions, around individuals, around policymakers.

You know, one of the things that I've been saying for the last year, and quite loudly, is that the American people, particularly on a local and state level, have been failed by political institutions, by policymaking institutions, by policymaking bodies. And that now is the time, I think, to really think about the kind of spadework -- to use the term from Ella Baker -- that we should be doing on a local kind of organizing level.

That it's not possible to have this kind of national significant change without having these small organizations on the ground -- fully resourced, fully empowered to actually do the kind of necessary changework that is necessary.

The other thing that I think a lot about is,
what is the line between compromise, right -- and we're thinking a lot about how do we navigate an intensely polarized and partisan America. So in a lot of ways the conversation tends to revolve around, all right, how can we find interest convergence? What are the things that we can compromise on or work with people across the aisle? Or people of different ideological backgrounds?

And that's nice. But I'm starting to increasingly think that that is not the path forward, particularly since compromise has consistently failed over, really, the past several decades. That, in fact, there has to be a re-commitment to an almost radical imagination and creativity in terms of sponsorship, and a willingness to allow these small organizations to fail.

And I say that, in part, because there is a real resistance -- or there's a real emphasis in saying, I want an immediate ROI. So I want an immediate return on investment, particularly from investors, from donors, from philanthropists.

But instead, what we have to see is that these small organizations on the ground that are the doing the local work are going to fail. They're going to fail over and over and over again. And that in order to actually see something at the end -- if we're being hyperbolic, this is 400 years in the making.
You're not going to fix it in a year. You're not going to fix it in five years. You're not going to fix it in 10 years.

So in order to see some kind of long-term, I think, success and viability, and to see some kind of long-term change, we have to be willing to fund movements and organizations that are going to fail in the short term, if that makes sense.

DR. BELL: No. I think that makes a lot of --

MS. HUFFMAN: Monica, could you -- go ahead.

Yes.

DR. BELL: Yes. I think that makes a lot of sense, and just to some degree, it's like, Oh. Especially where you started the conversation is quite reminiscent of what my initial reaction was. It's like, Well, I think it's easy to tell a story of failure if one looks primarily at the kind of overarching nation-state.

It's a lot harder to tell that particular sort of story if one looks at local organizations, if one looks at the kind of daily organizing work that people do in dialogue with each other. But so, I'll add on -- so, Leah already said that.

So I'll add on a couple of things that amplify, I think, in part some of those points. So first -- this is related to Leah's last point. We really have to think
about what victory looks like.

So one way to think about those moments and that bifurcations that Leah talked about is through a lens of, Well, you know, we started with something bold. And then, there was some event or some kind of happening that stopped it.

And I think -- I guess I view a lot of those moments as still having some type of productivity in bringing to the fore certain types of ideological dimensions. I mean, the fact that as a routine aspect of political conversation, we hear people talk about abolition. We hear people really name anti-Blackness, white supremacy. We now have people questioning whether the police promote public safety at all, and that people is a large group of people, and not just people who are kind of in marginalized groups.

Those types of ideological changes -- rhetorical changes and innovations are important. So I think the broader question is one about what your theory of change is. So one of the things that's been really frustrating to me over the past several months since, as we have called it, the George Floyd moment, is this reaction by a lot of liberal people, people who see themselves as being even progressive that the language of defund, and the actions of protestors and movements have
been counterproductive.

They point to certain types of election results or whatever. But I think that really misunderstands what the theory of change of a movement is.

So one of the things we talk about in the paper is you have all of these cities that were initially resistant to doing these. Let's fund alternatives to policing. Let's try out things, like the CAHOOTS model, in our town. There was so much resistance to that for so long. Movements have been organizing for these types of things for so long.

And then when it became -- oh, not only that, but you also need to defund the police. It's like, Well, maybe we won't quite go all the way there, but maybe we will finally start investing in these alternatives, investing in communities, investing in community organizations and certain aspects of the welfare state.

So one could say, Oh, well, that is, you know, a weakness and a co-optation. But I guess I can't help but think that's part of -- that's a type of incremental victory that's going somewhere.

And I don't want to be telling, like, some story of grand progress, you know? Like, I'm not signed on to that. But I just do think it is too defeatist, I think, to say that because the most radical thing that I
want to happen doesn't happen right now, that there's been -- there's, like deep pessimism -- what have we been up to?

Like, I think there are a lot of people really up to stuff that's meaningful. And so, yeah -- I'll stop there, but it's such a great question.

MS. HUFFMAN: Yes. Thank you. You're reminding me, Monica, of the conversation in our most recent Roundtable, and it's come up in different ways over the course of all of our time together, about understanding and being able to even identify the difference between incrementalism and foundational change in increments, and that those are two different things. But it's often hard to know the difference and to see where that's going.

So just a couple more questions for the two of you, and then we'll start opening up for our conversation here with everyone.

So one is just to circle back to -- with everything that we just heard and you all just said, you know, so where does that land us on values and the role of values in these conversations? Are values part of the toolkit that we can use in building this type of consensus? What does that look like?

Well, I'll just stop there and invite you all
to respond to that, and then we'll start opening up to
others as well. Go ahead.

DR. WRIGHT-RIGUEUR: So I mean, I'll start off.

I'll just, I think, briefly say that certainly values are
important, but I think it's more so in the idea of value
making and shared positive value making, right.

And perhaps -- I'm really struggling to
articulate this the way that I see values. But I think
one of the things that we can talk about is how we, as a
nation, begin to see values change or shift, or attitudes
change.

And I'll use the example of, I think, empathy,
though, in terms of what I see of a value -- as a positive
value that we should be aspiring to and working towards.
Empathy is one of those things. I think in terms of
criminal justice and the carceral state, one of the things
that has been absent for so long has been this idea of
empathy.

But it was a concept that, as a country and as
a nation, is both a difficult concept for people to grasp
around the carceral state, and around criminality or what
have you, and restorative justice. But it is one that is
shifting over time, particularly through the actions of
people on the ground who are doing the scholarship, the
academics, the practice and the praxis of restorative
justice. In such that, you know, in the present, I think there is an increasingly emerging idea around empathy and rehabilitation when it comes to restorative justice and the carceral state.

So I want us to think a lot about how those things happen. And then, how those values can be useful. I also really have to say that I was really interested in this idea of both harm reduction as a concrete part of restorative justice. I've been thinking a lot about the reparations conversation, and we're seeing right now that we may actually get a commission on the study of reparations, which is huge, right. That's been a 40 year conversation -- 40 or 50 year conversation in the making.

But I'm also seeing it come out in different spaces. So, for example, in conversations around the emerging cannabis industry, a parallel conversation has been around, what does restorative justice and reducing harm, particularly retroactive harm that was done -- what does that look like?

So what are social equity policies and racial equity policies that have to be put in place into this emerging cannabis bill industry and institution in order for us to move forward? That's a conversation that's happening in the private sphere and it's a conversation
that is happening in the public sphere at the federal level, at the state level, and, of course, at the local level.

So I want us to think about what are the -- I think, the abstract values that emerge during kind of these event-making -- value-making moments. But also, what are the concrete values that we can use as we are doing this work on the ground as well?

DR. BELL: Yes. That's really great. That's really great.

So, you know, I think -- as I started, I think the primary contributions of values debate in this sort of conversation is to offer a common terrain to debate about. And so, I want to be a little bit more precise what I mean with a few examples.

So one of the things that's been really interesting and inspiring over the past several years in movement work is a kind of rejection of the word “equality” for having conversations about equity, about justice, about liberation. And I think by choosing those types of words instead of the word “equality,” one gets particular sorts of cash out.

So, of course, a conversation about equality versus equity invites us to think about the past -- invites us to think about where we started, and not just
have a presentist view. So, and that helps us to think about reparations. I actually think part of the reason that the political work of reparations has become seeming more possible in the way that we articulate it is because our way of thinking about what equality is has shifted to be more attentive to the past.

Similarly, more people are thinking about not racial inequality, but racial injustice right now because the word injustice sounds a moral debate. What type of world are we saying we want? What are our commitments? And not just, in what ways does one group disparate from another? Which is, of course, very important, but it doesn't embed within it a sense of the good.

Similarly, and this is something I've written about. And it might be a bit controversial to some degree in this space, but, you know, there has been a lot of focus over the past few couple of decades or so on notions of trust with relation to the criminal legal system.

So how do we build trust between communities that are marginalized and the various actors within the criminal legal system? And I think if one has that value, then, it drives the conversation in a -- what I would say is a sort of somewhat limited way.

Not to ask, should marginalized communities be trusting the police? What are the police? And what is
the criminal legal system doing that is not just
delegitimating, but is in fact oppressive and
exclusionary? And so, I think having these words and
debating about what the values are gives us a terrain on
which to have conversations like that.

Another one I just want to highlight quickly --
well, I guess there are a couple more, and I'll try to be
brief, though. So I mentioned earlier, liberation.
Liberation versus equality.

You know, if one is concerned about equality,
one might be very concerned about traditional residential
segregation. You know, how scattered are people of color
across neighborhoods?

But if one is concerned about liberation, you
might be less concerned about the scatteredness, and more
concerned about residential choice, freedom. Do people
get to live where they want to? And do people get to move
about where they'd like to?

And then, also, we've been talking much more, I
think, in criminal legal system conversations not about
punishment, but about accountability. People want
accountability and people want safety. But discussing in
detail what those things mean, we get to have that
conversation if we say, Okay. Well, accountability is a
value. It's not just punishment as the value.
So, and I'll stop there, but that's, I hope, somewhat granular in getting us kicked off.

MS. HUFFMAN: That is great. Thank you both so much. We just heard those examples of values as a process, and what that looks likes. Values as a meeting ground and a common ground for conversation.

Let's open it up to our group. As I said, please feel free to use your little raise-hand button, and we have a raised hand already with Gabe Salguero.

Gabe?

REV. SALGUERO: First, thank you. Both presenters were quite informative and quite insightful. So as we say in my neighborhood, Muchas gracias, hermanas. Many thanks.

I think I have several -- or just one question about values. Maybe it's two parts of that question, which is where are values formed in the national conversation in topography? From whence?

Who are the value formers, and how do these value formers share those values across cultures, across geographic regions? And so, from whence do these values -- who are they? Who are the formers? Or as Lin-Manuel Miranda -- who is in the room when those values get decided on?

The second thing I think Dr. Bell was talking
about in the last part of her presentation was Bob Putnam, the sociologist, talks about the -- and to some degree -- the kind of more conservative thinker who Vol Levin [phonetic] has talked about -- the distrust in institutions because those institutions -- one thing is, people are losing trust in institutions, is one way to say it.

I'd like to say is -- institutions are acting in ways that make us lose trust, is a better way to say it, in my readings. So if we're creating institutions, and some of them will fail, as you talked about -- the philanthropic, Dr. Wright -- the need to kind of try and fail until we are able to build capacity.

What do we do with the decline of institutional trust even as we have historically -- even in minority communities -- used institutions to form values and to share values broadly? How do we deal with that paradox?

Because trust is on -- there's a trust deficit, rightly so in so many communities. What, then, becomes the institutions or the mitigating institutions to create the trust and to share the values?

The last thing I want to say is, how do we determine the hierarchy of values when we have competing values? Saint Augustine would say, How do we determine which is the highest good? And who is the arbiter of
those things?

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Gabe, so much. I'll invite -- we're going to be opening up for a full conversation. Anyone is welcome to jump in and respond to these questions that are being posed and share your own thoughts.

So, folks, please feel free to raise your hands and while that's happening, Monica or Leah, if either of you all would like to react to the questions that Gabe posed, that would be great.

Feel free.

DR. WRIGHT-RIGUEUR: Sure. I'm happy to respond to it, but Monica, please go.

DR. BELL: Okay. You know, so, on the first question about who's in the room -- I mean, I think one of the really fundamental problems of the American nation-state is who has been in the room when policy values are being determined has been quite limited.

Of course, I mean, I guess as a Constitutional law professor, I suppose I feel some obligation to think about historically, not just about what wound up in the document that has been -- I mean, like I think if we're going to take seriously the criminal legal system, well, the criminal legal system has a legal structure. And that legal structure -- the commitments of the Constitution
have been articulated and built into certain types of precedent.

So it's hard to say, for example, that we really have a value of something like bodily autonomy, which I think should be a critical value of our criminal legal system, when you have Terry vs. Ohio and its progeny essentially saying that certain groups of people don't have bodily autonomy, and that the police can constantly violate it with really minimal justification.

So I think one of the really fundamental changes we have to make is actually having an answer to your first question that is different from the answer that we've had in the past. Like propertied, cishet, white men -- like, that's who we've acknowledged, in general, have the power to define American values and -- but of course, the action of movements over history have offered alternatives to those values, and have shifted the meaning of them.

And so, I think seeing ourselves -- and this is very much what Leah was talking about -- acknowledging -- finding movement moments allows those values to be redefined.

Just very quickly, on the institutional trust question. I mean, this is something I think about quite a lot, and the decline of -- well, I don't know that we've
had a decline of trust.

I think we've just had actually -- we have people seeing that institutions haven't behaved in a trustworthy manner, and actually acknowledging that. And I suppose this values conversation -- and maybe it ties to a conversation about the hierarchy of values.

I don't know that trust in institutions should be at the top of our hierarchy of values, given the history of the institutions. And so, if we had a hierarchy of values that were rooted differently, like liberation, justice, other sorts of values, and if we saw those as being prime to this kind of order-keeping value. Like, have we trusted institutions as a value about order, maintenance?

Then -- and so, I mean, of course, these are all debatable. What are the fundamentals, I think is a conversation that we should be having all around this nation, in terms of figuring out the hierarchy of values. And then reconstructing institutions that are attentive to those values.

DR. WRIGHT-RIGUEUR: So if I can just jump in and say that I echo everything that Monica just said. Just to the first question, though, I want to add on and say, you know, these movements, these organizations, these people on a local and state level -- even national
movements are constantly making values. The question is, how do we get them into spaces where those values become part of the national conversation, including the policymaking conversation.

What's interesting, though, is that I think there's an imbalance -- certainly an imbalance there. A power dynamic there. But we have seen moments where those values from, say, grassroots or from movement politics have influenced institutions for the better.

We've also seen moments where political grassroots movements, perhaps that we don't agree with or that we might label conservative or radical, what have you, have made it into the mainstream of these spaces in part because they're not that radically different from the people who are making the policy. But in some cases, they are radically different.

And so I actually think it is useful for us as part of this conversation around value making and how we move values into spaces that we want them to be to actually study these organizations, these movements, these people in the grassroots -- left, right, center, wherever -- who have actually successfully moved these things.

So as we're talking about, for example -- and I'll use the example of the Tea Party Movement, which is
largely an older, white, male, 55, conservative movement, but it's also largely propelled by white women in their mid-50s -- mid-30s to mid-50s. And it's funded by, you know, conservative philanthropists, but it actually has a grassroots component.

One of the things that we see is that the Tea Party Movement actually manages to translate itself into a policy movement that influences the direction of at least a third of people in this country. So while we may not agree with that, particularly the punitive measures and vision of the Tea Party Movement, we need to actually study how that happened, and study how we make this shift from one piece to another.

We can do the same, in some respects, with different aspects of the Civil Rights Movement. We can even do the same with different aspects of the Black Power Movement. And I think we can do the same with different aspects of the Movement for Black Lives that is happening right now -- that has been happening over the past five years or so.

The other thing that I want to just highlight is that we do have to reckon -- to the second question -- we have to reckon with this idea that different movement groups have, and movement organizations and movements, more generally, have with the concept of the illegitimacy
of the state. And what that concept means for the kind of ideas and values these groups produce.

Now, what's interesting is that, again, illegitimacy of the state is something that movements on the left, right, center -- all over the place -- hold, but the reasons for their definition of illegitimacy is very different.

So the Movement for Black Lives views the state as illegitimate because it is killing Black people. It is unjust. The Tea Party Movement views the state as illegitimate, in part, because the state is providing resources to people across all racial groups. In part, because we had a Black president, and a Black president is illegitimate in the eyes of the Tea Party Movement.

So I think we have to understand these different moments and why these institutions view -- why these organizations view institutions as illegitimate, and from there, we can make a decision around the hierarchy of values. So if we say, right, that a third of the American people think that the state is illegitimate because Barack Obama was president, that's not somewhere that should be on our hierarchy of values. Right? Like, we shouldn't be valuing that.

We might value kind of the underlying reasons to understand better why these people are doing it, but
that's very different from saying, the state is killing Black people.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Leah. Thank you both so much for that, and Leah, for that, and Gabe for that prompting question.

So we'll move on to hands that are raised. Nicole, we'll hand over to you. And then, Marcia, you'll be next.

MS. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: I'm not sure if it's too early to have a more critical take on all of this, but right now, Chicago is top of mind. It's my hometown, but also a research site that I've, you know, interrogated for over a decade, studying prosecutors, police officers, political landscape.

And in 2020, the mayor had budgeted the city budget of $1.8 billion for the Chicago Police Department, but they also set aside $153 million that was line-itemed -- that was earmarked for police misconduct. And in some ways, granted a blank check to police officers so they could continue failing in ways that kill -- that traumatize Black and Brown communities.

And so, when we talk about these values -- I mean, there is part of us that -- we have to kind of get real. Baldwin says, I can't believe what you say because I see what you do. Reuben Miller's recent book, Halfway
Home -- there's a painful look at this false promise, this lie of re-entry.

We've got 45,000 laws and policies and administrative sanctions in the U.S. that target people with criminal records. And yet, we say they're supposed to come home and that there is such a thing as rehabilitation and re-entry. And yet, 45,000 laws tell us otherwise, where the punishment transcends the people charged and extends to entire families, communities, Black mothers, Brown mothers.

So, you know, I think this discussion right now -- and I think, maybe it's just an emotional time. We've seen -- we're right now living through the trial of George Floyd's death. We're seeing if we can get justice. But you know, one verdict is not justice.

And so, as I'm thinking about this wider landscape, I just keep saying, What are the values here? And who gets to continue to articulate their values? And people marched this summer saying enough was enough.

I mean, I kept saying, Well, how many people can we watch die on camera? How many? How many children? How many dads? How many young people? How many teenagers? And finally, George Floyd seemed to be a tipping point where people were marching the streets saying, This does not reflect our values.
But I will say right now, we have not done one thing differently to change the conditions upon which George Floyd could be so flagrantly killed in public on camera with a nation, and maybe the world, expressing their total discontent with the state of policing. And yet, they have not done anything to reform.

And so, I want to just throw that out here, which is -- you know, this is highly conceptual discussion about values. But I think there is this gap between the values that a larger portion of Americans are expressing, and then, the stronghold that institutional actors continue to engage and resist reform.

And yet -- so, I struggle with this idea of values, because it seems $153 million for legal settlements -- that, to me, is an expression of our values, which is we have an enormous -- we are willing to pay to allow Black and Brown people to die. And if that is an American value -- historically, maybe that is.

And I think we need to really be honest with that as well, right, that we're talking about these higher order values, but yet, we continue to affirm these very violent values. And, you know, I struggle. I'm struggling today as I was -- Dr. Bell was on a panel with me last summer, and I struggled then.

And I'm curious for the answers from the group.
DR. WRIGHT-RIGUEUR: I'll just jump in here, too, and say I think, in part, that's -- in my opening statement when I said that, in some ways, I think some of the positive values that we imagine ourselves to be in search of or support may, in fact, be irreconcilable with our nation's American values as expressed through our nation's actions.

And I think, largely, one of the things that struck me about the moment that we are in right now is that for scholars -- not just scholars of the carceral state or things like that, but for scholars of history -- of American history, of race -- they understand that this is not new. This is not a new question.

This is -- we know that police and the Chicago riots of 1919 participated in the racial massacre of an entire city. We are coming up on the 100th anniversary of the Tulsa racial massacre where over 300 people disappeared with the help of local police, and it was just another chapter in American history.

So in doing that, though, and I think part of what Monica and I have been trying to get to -- is that in thinking that, one, these things take -- are going to take an enormous amount of time, will power, and effort in order to change, and that they're going to be monumental failures.
I consider, for example, the entire kind of spectacle around Breonna Taylor a failure, an abject failure. But that also, too, we have to have a conversation about, what are the new kinds of values that we are wanting to make? And how do we override or disintegrate the old values?

How do we move past the moment where the Chicago Police Department is, as a matter of business, right, a line item saying, We're going to set aside over $100 million for police misconduct, police brutality, and that this is just business as usual?

And I'm sure if you talk to the mayor of Chicago, she would say, I'm not doing this because I believe in it. I'm doing it because it's just going to happen, and we know it's going to happen. So how do we move beyond that?

That's a question, I think, that is worth thinking about. How do we remove, replace, destroy, whatever you want to call it -- old value systems that are deeply ingrained in society?

But also, in part, people don't want to change because they don't want to change this. But also, that people are much happier and much more at ease doing superficial, surface-level, forward-facing things that give the appearance of change without actually having to
do the hard excavation work of change.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Leah. I'll remind everyone, definitely raise your hand. We are asking Leah and Monica to take a laboring oar here, and want everyone to jump into the conversation. Marcia, you're up next.

MS. RINCON-GALLARDO: Good morning, or good afternoon to wherever you're at. I'm going to just first here, burn a little bit of sage on behalf of Adam Toledo and all of our peoples who have been killed in years, but in particular, for this young man -- 13-year old young boy.

In today's discussion about values, it's so apropos because we're just doing a retreat with our judge and a committee that's called the Juvenile Justice Gender Responsive Task Force. And values is high up on the list as we come up with a new mission statement, and I'll get to that towards the end.

But I wanted to start off in response to what our two colleagues just presented to us -- both Dr. Monica and also -- let me see, I'm looking for it -- Dr. Leah.

And I want to say that in terms of national moments, I'm so grateful that you mentioned that, because it brings me squarely back to what I wrote about, which is what were the values at the time that white man arrived on this land and continent for the original peoples? And
that that was a national moment for this country.

What were those original values? As opposed to the Puritan values that still live embedded as we think about the youth justice and injustice system. The values that children are born with sin, and that you have to beat the sin out of them. As opposed to the values of the original people who said that our children were born sacred.

So just even think of that. And that those values are embedded in a huge system that still lives to this day around punishment -- that we have to punish children.

And so, then, how that embeds into a movement that for years was reform, up until recently -- about five years ago, where we actually started believing that we can end incarceration for youth. And that it's actually happening.

And let me tell you that as we work with young people, especially formerly system impacted young people -- and I come from a family that has been impacted by both the criminal youth justice and the immigration detention systems -- is that when they see a person talk about ending incarceration, it becomes a tool that they could carry in their pocket and actually talk about it, as opposed to not even thinking that it could happen.
So the values around being able to shift -- and I agree that compromise with people that have these older values, as opposed to these values about, No, we're going to end -- we're going to end incarceration. And whether you're with us or not with us, then, what is the radical imagination that needs to happen for you all to join us? Because this is where we're going to be, right, and this is the movement we're taking it into.

So that brought me, then, to this conversation.

And thank you to the brother who talked about values and who gets to -- who's in the room when values are made? And certainly, system-impacted people are not in the room. They're not in the room, and we're talking about all kinds of system-impacted individuals.

We rarely ever go to them. It's policymakers, scholars, and theoretic -- folks that make theory. They're sitting in the room. But rarely do we have a system-impacted individual sitting in the room because, in fact, they're the ones who lived it.

I can't talk about what it is to sit in a cell. I can talk about how I felt when my loved one sat in a cell -- in a cage, but I can't talk about what it was. And so, only those individuals who have lived that experience can actually talk about what it is that we need to change.
And it's not just to put them in the room. It's about also building their skills and their leadership that they already bring to speak this language. It's not fair enough just to bring them in the room.

We have people that are still colonized in their thinking, and they'll come and they'll say things like, Oh, probation -- this probation officer was so -- I needed to have probation. Or I needed to be detained in order to be where I'm at now. You know? And they'll talk about how great the system is, right.

And so, the decolonization piece is so critical because it doesn't allow us to really talk about that wholeness, that sacredness -- that, no, you didn't need to be incarcerated in the way that you were. And then, it brings me to, then, just some examples about values.

Okay, so, we have a young person from south of the border in front of a judge, and this young person is not looking at the judge in the eyes. And to this judge, it's a sign of guilt or not guilt if you don't look at this judge, right? This is an example that we have.

And so, this young person was named guilty because he or she was not looking at the judge in the eyes. And yet, for some young people -- indigenous young people, it's a colonized sign of respect not to look at someone in the eye. Right? So those are values there.
Another value that we just came off of in this conversation about our mission statement for this committee that we're in was that we had formerly system-impacted young girls sitting in the room. And the D.A. spoke about how our girls -- we need to have detention because our girls are just not willing to complete their programming.

And yet, the girls sitting in the room said, Well, wait a minute. If you're talking about self-determination, and that our self-determination is based on completing these programs, what about the fact that I know and I'm exerting my self-determination by telling you that I'm done with this program, that this program is just not fitting for me? Right? And that I want to get out of this detention facility?

And so these definitions of values are so important, and who are we asking? Who gets to define these values? From what perspective are they coming from?

So last we have, then, is that the history of lack of trust. And that in fact because of our colonization, there might be some resignation that these systems are just, but the decolonized part of us realizes that it's built in because of this lack of history -- I mean, or lack of trust -- historical lack of trust.

And so, you know, and it goes all the way
back. It goes all the way back to the taking of the land, to the taking of our language, to the taking of even our notions of what is just, and how do we honor sacred life? So I'll stop there.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Marcia. Thank you so much. We have quite a few hands in the queue. And so, we'll start going through those, and I'll encourage folks to -- we hope this will be an interactive conversation and you can say something, and then come back in later if you'd like to. So please feel free to raise your hands again and to please engage with one another as you feel like you'd like to do that. So up next, Jon Simon. And then we'll go -- just so you guys know you're up, Pastor Mike and DeAnna following up. Go ahead, Jon.

MR. SIMON: So I'll be brief, because my thoughts are still very inchoate, but the discussion thus far has really helped me crystallize some of my anxieties about values as a frame. I think a lot of us rebel against a model we learned in college or university. Sort of you start with philosophical principles, and then you deduce like a perfect justice system or a perfect society. And a lot of us mistrust that model for good reason. I think it's really interesting and worthy that -- and hopefully I'm not
sucking up here to the organizers -- that values come last in this conversation and not first, right.

It's like this is the last convening, and we're talking about values now because I think values -- it's a looking backward at history, at what we've come through, both the long arc of colonization and slavery, and the values that reckoning with that history and its arc gives to us. But also, where we are right now with so many deaths around us.

I mean, we're living through a moment of huge, tragic, unjust deaths. And I mean, those are moments when values come to the fore, because we're looking at lives past, lives lost. And there's a real reckoning to be had here that I think does call for a reevaluation of values.

And while we're sitting here in California, where thousands of imprisoned citizens have died because the state couldn't be bothered to like protect them from a known, rampaging epidemic, and things have to change. There really is a moment where you look back at what is happening and you say, It has to change.

Thank you.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Jon. Thank you very much. Pastor Mike? And we'll hand over to you.

REV. McBRIDE: Well, when I hear the word values, obviously as a faith leader, I go to an immediate
kind of thought about kind of moralistic agreements or
c characteristics that I think our presenters have rightly
named as, you know, how do we agree on meaning making?
Right?

But then, I also appreciate and have to, I
think, contend with, we're also talking about worth when
we use the word value. Right? It's just not about -- I
mean, they may be connected. But I think that word can
serve distinct purposes in the dialectic.

And so, I have to constantly ask myself and the
folks that we organize with, if values is going to be a
useful phrase or way of trying to engage a conversation,
we must center truth-telling as a part of our
conversation. Because I have found -- you know, and I am,
unfortunately, an American, as well, so, you know, I'm
guilty by association -- that we don't remember history
rightly in our country. Matter of fact, we seem to love
lies and hate the truth, especially when it's inconvenient
to us, and I find that to be true across our political or
racial or demographic spectrum.

You know, I was in an argument with some folks
a few weeks ago. And I said if conservatives suffer from
mendacity, progressives suffer from denial, in that we
want to believe we are much better than we are around
issues related to race or class or crime and punishment.
But the reality is, in our years of organizing, we found, you know, progressive lawmakers and elected officials to be quite uncooperative in shifting these realities without all of us having to leave a pound of flesh on the floor just to get an incremental step forward. That literally, I think -- as Dr. Nicole has rightly stated -- does not change the material conditions to keep Black and Brown people from literally being executed on camera.

And in reality, when our young people or others disrupt society, those very same elected leaders who have the ability to control their agencies, whether it's law enforcement or banking systems, et cetera, asked the aggrieved to be peaceful while they continue to literally, in real time, use tools of violence to wage more harm.

And so, I think we have to continue to ask ourselves honest questions about, who are the antagonists in a conversation around values? And who are the protagonists? Not in a way to demonize folks, but to try to have a much more clear and honest telling of where people are situated in these conversations.

There's nothing worse than -- I used to play sports when I was 100 pounds lighter and 20 years younger, and there was nothing worse than having someone on your team who you come to believe was not actually trying to
help you win. And you're doing all this work and you've
got a saboteur on your squad.

And I do think sometimes in our conversations
around justice and reimagining, we think people are our
allies and we think we're having the same conversation,
and we're even using some of the same words. And people's
actions demonstrate that they are not on the same team or
we're not moving in the same direction, even though we may
using the same language and claiming we want the same
thing.

And so, in our work -- my work as a faith
leader, as an organizer, we talk about values being a
result of formation -- moral formation and proximity to
the suffering, which must, then, I think, require us to
ask lots of questions about, what are the value-making
institutions that we need to either interrogate -- because
people do not create values, whether it is moral formation
or notions of worth in a vacuum. Right? Like, we don't
come to the table without having been formed by someone or
something.

And so, what then, are those institutions that
we, then, must interrogate along the way? And where are
the spaces we are putting these value-making institutions
or conversations in a public -- hopefully, nonviolent
debate about how we come to this conversation about
values?

It seems to me that the only time we really have conversations as a country is during election seasons and cycles. And usually those conversations are so -- what's the word I'm looking for? So manipulated and weaponized.

It is not like we are constructing a common value system. We are literally waging war about who gets to control the status quo, and obviously, some folks' status quo have a basement that is much deeper than many of us would like to go.

And so, in closing, I'll just invite us to keep interrogating the institutions that make value a reality for folks. You know, how does the worship, faith communities, schools and universities, neighborhoods, social media, entertainment -- all of these things, in my mind, have to be a part of how we reimagine the public safety or value-making conversation.

Because, in reality, most folks' value systems or -- whether it is worth, or whether it is in the kind of our moral meaning making descriptions, they are deeply informed by much more than the radical individuals kind of belief system. So I'll stop there, but those are some of my thoughts.

And maybe I'll even just add, as I was reading
through the papers and just thinking about the kind of use
of the language of logic of public safety and logic of
punishment, et cetera. I mean, indeed, if we don't have a
value -- a process to interrogate value -- both as worth
and as meaning making -- those logics just become
unintelligible. And not only do they become
unintelligible, then they become impossible to realize.

And then, we have conversations without action,
which lead to a really diabolic cycle of death and
destruction that continues to, as it has for hundreds of
years, position the most vulnerable among us as the fodder
for our failed attempt to be able to actually move beyond
just the rhetorical.

So I'll stop there. I feel like I'm a long-
winded Black preacher this morning.

MS. HUFFMAN: No. Not at all. Thank you,
Pastor Mike. Thank you so much.

You know, I'm hearing these themes of the ways
in which there's such a disconnect between the words we say
and the actions that we take. But then, also hearing these
moments where, like, when values are in action, when they
are the process, when they are the local experience, when
they are taking on a verb form instead of an abstract noun
form that there may be some possibility for common
understanding there, and maybe also accountability.
So inviting others to continue to raise your hand. DeAnna is up next, and Bruce will come after Deanna.

DeAnna?

MS. HOSKINS: Thank you guys. I feel like I'm sitting here and my head is just spinning, right. And it's spinning because I think, in this country, we continue to have conversations that overanalyze everything.

We have to be in a lab and we have to have the perfect formula to get the perfect solution. And when we're talking about values and how when you talk about policy values, my first question is whose values? The policymakers? Or the people writing the laws?

But I also -- I want to say this last summer, what I realized across this country -- rallies, marches, riots, unrest are the screams and cries of the unheard. And I think there was a collective value being demonstrated over the summer that we want human dignity, human respect, accountability.

I think the masses have spoken. We continue to bring it down and say what is the values of a small collective of people, when to me, the mass of the oppressed people was demonstrating in the streets this summer, our human lives need to be valued. So every
conversation, every policy has to start with that at the
top of it, but it doesn't.

   Even when I look at recidivism. Recidivism
looks at the failure of the person, and not the failure of
the system, right. So I'm always saying, So is the
recidivism rate even accurate? When we talk about reform,
that means we want to tinker with something that's broken,
instead of being bold enough to say, Let's dismantle it.

   So even if how our language of how we, as
progressive people, talk and address things -- even in
these rooms -- when the formerly incarcerated is in a
room, but the balance is always off-weighted. Right? The
most oppressed is not outweighing the scholars and other
people. We're in addition to.

   And that kind of goes to what I always say, is
how do we -- we have to start setting our own tables as
oppressed because it continues to be overanalyzed and
researched.

   I remember Erica always says, We continue to
research the research just to keep doing -- looking at the
research. Right? When are we going to actually start
moving to implementation?

   But I was getting a little uncomfortable
because, again, we have to go to the truth telling, and I
think, Dr. Leah, you said it. We keep getting these
superficial policies, or things that we think are changing
our lives, only to have it continue to keep happening.
And then we're in the streets again for 20 years, instead
of having the courage to address it.

And I'm going to use a direct example. I think it's an insult that a response to the George Floyd murder is laws that says you can't chokehold someone. Well, one, he didn't die from the chokehold. But two, you didn't go far enough to say, But if you happen to kill somebody from a chokehold, you still have qualified immunity to move on.

Instead of saying, Let's abolish qualified immunity -- that if you violate someone's civil rights, you will be held accountable. And it's just those type of things that I'm starting to even see come out of this in police departments across the country saying you can't chokehold someone on the back of a law that's even called George Floyd.

So are we really even -- again, I go back to my values -- what I said yesterday. Personally, it's being courageous enough to really dig to the root cause of white supremacy upon which the system stands on. We don't call it what it is. We just actually keep moving.

And that was just my thoughts and they're all over the place. But I think centering the values of what the masses of people have already said and what we're
continuing to see displayed. Right?

Their call for action of valuing the human lives of Black and Brown bodies, and even after George Floyd, we're still continuing to see it occur. So what is really happening? And accountability is very minimal still.

That's all I have.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, DeAnna. Thank you so much. Bruce, over to you.

MR. WESTERN: Dona says I don't know how to raise my hand. So the reaction button at the bottom of the screen.

This is a really good conversation. I really appreciate DeAnna and Pastor Mike's comments just now. And I'm thinking a lot about this in the sense that sometimes when we talk about values, we think of them as establishing a standard that, in practice, we often deviate from in the realities of day-to-day politics and policy conversations.

And our values are a sort of self-accountability mechanism, so when we're compelled to be pragmatic, we face choices to compromise, our values are a reminder of the things that we should stand for. But the fundamental reality of politics is compromise and pragmatism -- or for a large part of politics, that's just
an empirical description of what the process looks like.

That's not an endorsement, but that's what politics looks like. It's pragmatism and compromise. And so, I sort of have -- it gives to me a question to the organizers around the table and other people doing work on the ground. You know, what's your attitude as we have this values conversation?

What's your attitude to the saboteurs, as Pastor Mike called them? The people that you sometimes have to work with, but who seem to be drawing you away from your value commitments. Do you navigate around them? Do you try and change them?

I think my -- I have an assumption, which may be wrong, that everyone wants a righteous place in the world, right. Everyone wants to feel that their work is meaningful and they're trying to live up to a set of values. They may not be our values. But everyone wants to feel like they're trying to live their values -- that they're doing meaningful work.

And so, if our project is to reimagine justice and make foundational change, how do we think about the role of values in relation to those that we have to contend with and compromise with and sometimes throw down with and come into politic conflict with? Do we try and change them? How do we do that? Do we try and navigate
around them?

I'd love to sort of process that and think about the role of values in that political question.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Bruce. That's a great question. And folks, please jump in on that and your other thoughts.

So, Dona, you're up next. And then, we'll follow that with Courtney and Vivian. We all know you're in the queue there.

Dona?

DR. MURPHEY: So I just shared a link to a paper that was published in Nature earlier this month, and it talks about addition being the preference between addition and subtraction. It's like a problem-solving heuristic.

So when we think about the challenge of dismantling or taking away or subtracting from something that already is present, versus adding, which is what we tend to do in our problem solving, I think it is a challenge fundamentally because this is what we tend to do. This is how we think about solving problems is we add to what is already there, as opposed to dismantling things that are fundamentally wrong. Right?

So that is just something that I wanted to share because it's something to consider, because it's
going to be something we have to navigate if we want to fundamentally transform and dismantle something that exists already.

I wanted to say also -- to speak to what Bruce was talking about, with respect to how you deal with discord or incongruence between the values of people who are making a lot of noise and I guess, within the institutions, for instance, like, how do you deal with that?

And I feel like you cannot navigate around it. Like, you absolutely have to be in conversation and dialogue with that. And I think there has to be a bi-directional willingness to kind of hear the other, and not just hear the other. Right? But that, to me, is kind of performative in some ways.

It's like, Okay. Well, you're there to hear. Go through one ear and out the other. But really allow yourself to be open to being transformed by what the other is bringing to the table.

And that takes some courage because you might have to admit wrongdoing, you know. You might have to change something that you thought you believed in. But I do think you have to engage with it very actively. Like, I think it's wrong to not engage with it. Yeah.

So I'll just leave it there.
MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Dona. Thanks a lot.

So up next is Courtney.

Courtney, go ahead.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay. Hi, everybody. So I want to kind of just -- again, my head's spinning. There's so many thoughts.

But one of the things that Bruce said was that politics is about compromise. I don't know if that is really the case. Is it really about compromise? Or have they made us believe that it's about compromise?

And when I think about politics, it is what we've created, and how do we uncreate it? When you think about some of the people that are currently serving in Congress, they've been in there my entire life. My whole life, they've served in Congress.

So we have an average age of, like, 60 years old in Congress, when the average age in our population is 30-something. So how do we reconcile what are the values of a group of people who've lived so long that they really remember when we had Green Books -- when they were segregated?

I mean, what are we saying? We can't keep electing people and putting people in office who, their time has passed. We have to change laws. We have to have timed term limits. It's ridiculous.
We have to go back to that document that we hold so dear, our Constitution, and we have to amend it. We can't keep talking about our justice system and not undo what the Thirteenth Amendment says. Because those are the kinds of policies that hold us in place.

And so, when I think of compromise, I just get frustrated. I mean, yes. I'm a scholar and I do a lot of thinking and all that. But I'm also an organizer, and as someone who is trying to actively disrupt race in schooling and incarceration, there is no compromise. Kids should not be in cages.

So at what point do we say, No. Enough is enough. These little incremental, step by step by step -- it's not enough anymore. Yes. We've had progress. No. I don't think I'm going to go outside right now and get lynched. So, yes. There's been progress, but it hasn't been enough, and it hasn't come fast enough.

So when we talk about values, we can't wait for people who don't get it, who will not get it to come to the table. I think DeAnna said it best when she said, We've got to create our tables. We have to be the people who are making this change happen.

And so, the notion that Leah have put across about, compromise is not a path forward. I think we have to keep saying that to ourselves that reform isn't an
option, that change is the only option. That to have a path forward, we can't just think about metrics and, you know, all the things that make small organizations appear as if they're failing, when really, the metrics weren't for us anyway.

So it's like all of these many, many tools that we create -- well, not that I've created or that you guys have created, but other people have created to suggest that this is how the system should work, when really it just boils down to -- I think I said it yesterday, humanity. Black and Brown people are never seen as people. So can we start right there?

And then, can we stop compromising? That, to me, is where we've got -- you guys, I mean, I'm heated this morning. I'm not usually this riled up, but I'm just like, let's stop with the compromise. Let's just take compromise off the table.

Okay. I'm going to stop. Go ahead, Miss Vivian, because I know you're going to bring us back and have something divine to say.

MS. HUFFMAN: Well, Courtney, thank you so much. I'm going to give -- I'm sorry. Leah had an insistent wave via direct message, Vivian, if that's okay to let her jump in real quick. And then, we'll go over to you.
Leah, do you want a quick --

DR. WRIGHT-RIGUEUR: Yeah. And I'll be real quick because I would love to put Courtney, I think, and Bruce's points in conversation with one another because it's both a reality that the way that the founders -- that founding politicians envision the American two-party system is one that forces out anything but compromise, right.

So essentially saying, Compromise is good. Compromise is good. And when the system is working well, we see compromise.

But what we've seen, particularly, over the last 40 years is that one party in particular, and one subset -- a group of people in particular -- have made this argument very convincingly in Congress that, in fact, compromise is not the path forward. Right?

Like, I mean, Newt Gingrich says in 1994, like, Compromise? For what? We can hold out. We can last. I won't be the Speaker of the House. Like, I'll resign, but I'm not going to compromise, because I know, at some point, we will get this radical agenda, whatever it may be.

And so, one of the things that we see, and certainly, it's easier when you have an agenda of negativism, right -- or nihilism. But I think one of the
things I really want to stress here, too, is that what
does an agenda look like with the powers that be?

With the institutions that is both cognizant of
the fact that people want to compromise, and it is
necessary to have these relationships with policymakers,
while we're also waiting for progressive -- more
progressive younger people to become policymakers. But
also, saying that we've tried compromise for the last
century, and it hasn't exactly worked out great.

So what does a new agenda that is not rooted in
compromise mean? But one that also sees us, like, in
conversation with people who actually have the power to
change laws on a local level, a state level.

And then, the last thing that I'll say here,
too, is that we don't give enough credit to the -- and it
may sound hokey, and it may sound like Civics 101 -- but
really encouraging people to run for office. And not just
we all run to be Congressmen and -women or things like
that.

But, like, school boards. Right? Municipal
office. Your local postmaster. Your local dogcatcher.
Right? We don't think about that in terms of power
dynamics, and in terms of actually changing legislative
agendas and policy because it's not sexy. It's not
attractive. It's not really quite interesting, I think,
on a national scope. But what we know, right, is that all politics is local politics, and that much of the decision making and much of the arena in which we see power change -- unyielding and without compromise -- actually happens at this level.

So what I've started telling people to do is that one of the most effective things that you can do, aside from organizing and mobilizing and protesting and engaging in activism, is actually run for local office, particularly those offices that are unpopulated that nobody wants to run for.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Leah. Vivian, over to you.

REV. NIXON: Thank you. Well, I think, kind of synthesizing the last comments from Pastor Mike on, there's a lot of complexity here in understanding that one thing doesn't naturally, automatically translate into another. There has to be a concerted effort and an intention about moving from that space where there is a seemingly unified message coming from a movement getting to the policy change that matches that message.

There's a -- something has to happen in between those -- it's not magic. It's not like the people cry from the streets for human dignity, and human dignity appears. So what happens in between those two points is
where we need to be focusing our energy.

First of all, let's decide whether or not --
are all components of the movement really in agreement?
And if they're not, are they having conversations that
will get them in agreement? And are those conversations
depending upon letting people in their spaces, because
they also have spaces.

They have tables, they have rooms where those
consultations are happening where maybe the people who can
make the decision or pull the lever are not in those
spaces. Or if folks who do have a mind that's geared more
toward analysis and data and communicating in a different
language are not in those spaces, or if they come in,
they're pushed out one way or the other because they're
not speaking the same language, even though they may want
the exact same things.

So all those things have to be considered. And
then, how are we communicating what that message is other
than a very public outcry, which happens on occasion when
there is a moment in history where things become so
obvious that there's outcry in the streets and this is not
new? Right?

I mean, I was alive for Eleanor Bumpurs, so
this is not a new phenomenon. This is a repeated
action.
How does the message get communicated? And are we assuming that when legislation is created, that nobody is in those rooms that says they're representing the movement and we have to investigate those things? And then, if there wasn't, why?

So if the ground level movement knew legislation was being considered to address this -- yes. They absolutely should've been in those rooms, and where were the leaders to put them in the room? We have to tie those pieces together and figure out how to not let those pieces of legislation be drafted without those voices in the room.

Human dignity was definitely, absolutely the cry, but do we trust the electeds to decide what human dignity means to us? Because I don't. They need to hear from me what human dignity means. I need to be able to define it for them in a way that they can interpret it and turn it into legislation, and that requires dialogue.

That requires that I don't just do it publicly, but that I take control of that message, put it into a form that they can understand, have a conversation, and say, And by the way, here's our version of the bill. Or here's our plan. Here's what we think you should do.

And that requires us to not push people out who can help us do that. And it requires us to believe that a
collective approach where people who are ultimately trying
to get to the same goal, but may have different
approaches, can work together.

And then, finally, if, indeed, we believe that
politics is about compromise in a democratic system that
we've created with the two-party system, then perhaps the
answer is to vote in a body of electeds that believes what
we believe and will do what we want them to do.

And that, too, requires collective action,
understanding of message, and not only understanding --
the commitment that this is a long-term process. And
we've got to get our people to understand that voting
people in office is where you end up getting power.

Because they are ultimately going to make the
decisions no matter what our outcry is, and really, no
matter what the research says, until we convince them that
they cannot get into office without our votes.

DR. WRIGHT-RIGUEUR: Katharine, you're muted.

MS. HUFFMAN: I'm so sorry. I'm here
chattering away while I'm muted.

Vivian, thank you so much for that -- for all
of that. So we'll turn next to Monica. And then, after
Monica, Kris has his hand raised, and Gabe as well.

DR. BELL: Yes. I want to be quick, just given
that has helped a lot. There are a lot of things I'm
thinking about here. So one thing that's really important, I think, to me is that we're kind of having a conversation about power, and that's a really important discussion to be having.

I mean, so, first of all, words and values aren't the same thing. So like, we have a better sense of what people's actual values are based on what they do in the world, and I think this very much connects to what Vivian was just saying, which is like, there are people who might use different words who actually share values in a really fundamental way.

And, no, they shouldn't be pushed out of progressive and radical spaces. But at the same time, there are a lot of people using the same words and saying they have the same values that need to be called out and confronted about that.

But I guess one of the things I was thinking about with relation to power is, you know, there are people who benefit directly from the oppression of Black and Brown people -- many of whom sit in these spaces, and many of whom might even call themselves progressives. And so, there are questions about what people are actually willing to give up in order to achieve the things that they say are their values.

And I think we have to be real with ourselves,
and many of the people who we might need -- or need or be expected to compromise with sometimes, are at the end of the day, going to be more interested in the protection of their own kind of life. So the protection of their interests.

They are invested in exploitation and oppression. They need to be on top. They want to be in power. They're not going to give that up.

And so, I think if we take that seriously, that means that sometimes, actually, we cannot have a conversation about shared values with them. I mean, we can have a conversation, but like, we shouldn't expect them to ultimately come around and for us to be at the same table.

Sometimes, those people actually have to be defeated. And I think that is -- I mean, maybe that's part of what the electoral conversation is partly about. It's like, well, we need to change the policy-makers, because some people are just going to arrive at a point where we share the same values and they'll vote the way I want them to.

I mean, so, I guess -- yeah. It's really important to have a conversation about values in relation to one about power and I'm glad that we've reached that point.
MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Monica. Thank you very much, and that is coming up in some of those comments that some of you all are direct messaging me about, the additional layer that has to do with fear, and maybe that's fear of losing power, but it may be other types of fear, too, that would be interesting to explore.

So, Kris, over to you, and then Gabe. And then Jeremy.

MR. STEELE: Great. Thank you so much. Courtney, I just want to go back to what you said. Full disclosure -- I am a recovering politician. So I had the opportunity to serve 12 years at the state level. And I will just say that having left that environment and kind of moving into a role of advocacy, I have taken the position that Courtney has articulated, to the point that I probably have become hostile and very impatient with those who hold office and are trapped in this culture of self-preservation, insecurity, egotism, and fear, and just have been very confrontational and trying to call that out and expose that for what it is to a point that even my own colleagues are saying, Hey. You're making yourself ineffective.

You know, if you're really trying to bring about change, you're going about it the wrong way. And you have to get back to the point where you're willing to
compromise and willing to, you know, take smaller steps. In fact, one our key partners just recently told me, You know, Kris, I would rather take a small win than a huge loss any day in the work that we're trying to do together.

And then, I will just also offer that I also had a colleague recently ask me how I escaped my own -- how did he phrase it? He said, Kris, how did escape your entrapment?

And I thought we were in this conversation of talking about individuals with lived experience, and I said, I don't have direct lived experience. And he said, Yeah. But you were in this prison that you now are fighting against.

And he said, The harm and the violence that people who hold power often inflict on others is the worst kind of violence. And he said, How did you escape out of this setting that you lived and probably promoted?

And it's really kind of left me wondering, you know, how did I escape that? And why am I so adverse to that? And what is the real effective approach to try to bring others along and try to understand what common ground we have, or what shared values we have?

I would just also say to Dr. Bell -- we talked about last night the value of grace, and how do we extend grace to everyone. And just in some personal
conversations I have, I've had some friends kind of confront me and say, You know, Kris, you are really graceful and gracious when it comes to defending and advocating and communicating with people who may have lived experiences.

And then, you have zero grace for those who hold the keys to create change. In fact, you don't extend grace at all to those who aren't willing to sort of see the truth and move forward in a positive direction. And he said, If you're going to hold grace as a value, it needs to be consistent, and you need to hold it to all people.

And so, I am wrestling -- I don't have answers or responses. I really probably only have more questions, but I do think that as we, you know, kind of hold this tension and consider what is an effective approach to bring about change and to help people truly see and understand, you know, move towards some level of consistency in what we say are the values that we share, versus the policies and systems that we create that are exactly the opposite.

I think that we have to go about that in the way that allows us to have that conversation, and in a way that ultimately allows us to be consistent in the values that we personally hold as we try to help create community.
values or shared values.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Kris. Thank you very much. You've got some shout outs in the chat there, as well, and some additional questions. Folks should also feel free to continue to put comments in the chat.

So we'll turn it over to Gabe, and then hear from Jeremy. And then Susan will be up next after that.

So, Reverend Gabe?

REV. SALGUERO: Yeah. Thanks again. Very helpful. I'm thinking throughout this conversation about values on theories of change. What are theories of change?

I think this is the third or fourth time on one of these conversations that we talked about kind of incremental change versus -- and I've heard different language, revolutionary change, radical change, urgent change. I don't have the exact -- different people articulate it different ways.

You know, and I've been thinking just like history -- how does change come historically, right? Some have come through revolution -- the American Revolution, the French Revolution, the Haitian Revolution, the Civil War -- so, that produced -- things have changed.

Some violent revolutions. Some peaceful revolutions -- Gandhi and Mandela and so many others. And
so, I see the tension and I often think, when we talk in
groups like this, do we -- we're talking about trying to
bring consensus or not. What is our theory of change?

This is my fourth time hearing the incremental
kind of radical conversation, and what I hear is that
there's a multiplicity of voices along that spectrum as,
of course, one would expect with a group this large.

And so, I just want to -- I'm not giving you my
time of change. I'm just underscoring that that's what
I hear.

The second thing is, who are the
stakeholders? I started with the conversation of -- you
know, Lin Manuel Miranda -- in the room where it happens,
right? From Hamilton, which is a very problematic
narrative. Right? Hamilton is very problematic
narrative. Not the musical -- the person, although maybe
the musical, too.

Who do we see as the actors, players,
stakeholders? Who are they?

So I'm a pastor of a church, and I run a
coalition of Christian pastors and clergy, and it's a
fascinating thing on how they should change. Right? It's
a fascinating thing on how they're persuaded to
participate in change. Or, conversely, how they're
persuaded to resist change. Right? Because persuasion
happens in multiple ways.

And sometimes, I've been kind of very active on a whole spectrum of things, thinking I'm persuading people to join me; I've subtracted them from me. They are persuadable, but I lost them.

I think it's what Kris, I think, was trying to point to in some ways, and it's the tension between -- what did you say, small wins and huge losses? And so, there has to be an analysis of who are the stakeholders, and by stakeholders, who's being victimized? Who's being impacted? As Monica and others have said. And who's making the decisions?

And the third thing is about language. Language creates culture in many ways, and culture creates language, as Noam Chomsky would tell us. The reality is how is the language of change -- how is the language of change that we use actually contributing to change or not?

Is the language helpful to transformation? Or a hindrance to transformation? I think, Katharine, you said earlier something about words and verbs, right?

Now I'm going to borrow from Pastor Mike. I'm going to use scripture, because that's the language of my tradition, right. In the beginning was the word. Actually, in Spanish, it's in the beginning was the verb -- the action word that became incarnation.
So how does our language of movement translate into recruiting people into the movement we believe are champions for justice? Or conversely, how does our language of movement hinder people from joining a movement from which in many times is in their self-interest?

So how is our role of language and advocacy -- it comes from language, right? Vocas. Voice. Words. How does our language help or hinder the change that we want to see? And how do -- does our falling along the spectrum help that theory of change or hinder?

Those are the questions I sincerely wrestle with. And so, especially given history of change because change is not linear, right. I do not fall into the kind of modernist, Western, epistemological belief that we are progressing in history.

You know, some people came on the Mayflower. Other people came underneath the ship, and other people were here and were eliminated. And so, change is not incrementally good. Change can go up and down, as we've seen with Civil Rights laws -- as we've seen with a whole host of things.

So how does our theory of change reflect language that is both helpful or hurtful? How does it reflect our theory of who the actors, stakeholders -- both impacted and impacting? And how does our perspective on
incremental versus radical, revolutionary, transformative
and that tension contribute to those theories of change
that we are so passionately clamoring for?

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you. Thank you very
much. So I'll hand it over to Jeremy. We have a few
folks in the queue. After Jeremy, we'll have Susan and
Pastor Mike and Dona.

Jeremy, over to you.

MR. TRAVIS: Yes. Yes. Thanks, Katharine, and
just wonderful to be with this group today. Sorry I
couldn't join last night, but nice to catch up with you
today.

Like so many other people have said, my head is
just spinning with lots of thoughts and ideas. Sometimes
in conflict with each other, which hopefully will produce
some new thinking. But I'm just grateful to all of you
for stimulating those thoughts and this larger discussion.

I want to just try to specify some of the
observations that were made in the last half hour or so.
I'll go back, really, to the beginning. I appreciated
that Monica talked about how some space has been opened by
some of the language that seems problematic -- defund,
abolition, transform as opposed to reform.

The space has been opened in the landscape for
ideas. She'd mentioned in particular money being spent in
a different way. But I think, in my sense of the moment, I think that's absolutely true.

The space been opened -- the protests in the streets last summer opened space. The number of people that came off the polling data about the support for Black Lives Matter. So space has been opened. And so, that's a good thing, if that's true, and I think it's true, but it's not forever.

So the question is how do we take advantage of this moment? And I identify very much with what Leah was saying, and Vivian, so eloquently, about the importance of electoral politics. Now, somebody in the chat said -- I forget who it was that said, Thank God for democracy.

Well, democracy can cut two ways. You know, democracy is a majoritarian institution that allows people who have 50 percent plus one of a vote to decide what happens to others. And there are protections in our democracy. We have Constitutional protections, but they're pretty weak in many respects.

So democracy can cut both ways. Bruce and I published this essay a couple days ago where we use the phrase “democracy deficit.” It's just a democracy deficit in the way we think about a justice system and the operations of the system we've created. And we should recognize that in our history -- now we're going back 50
years, not the 400-year history.

But in our history, what's brought us to this moment is our democracy. So the reality of mass incarceration, with its underpinnings that we should acknowledge of white supremacy and sustaining in power those who are in power -- but the realities of mass incarceration are the result of choices that we made.

Not on this screen, we didn't make them. But our democracy made these choices to enact the laws that have then been implemented by prosecutors who are also elected. So we have elected officials and state legislatures and Congress enacting these laws, implemented by prosecutors also elected, by police executives. And then, the people who work for them, responding to mayors whom we elected, and, in some case, sheriffs we elected. In some cases, there are a few of them, but even public defenders we elected.

So we have a democratized vision in this country of how the justice system should operate. It's very different from -- I'll just mention European examples. And that is both the bane of our existence and the question for me in the moment is whether that's also the opportunity for a reform movement that will undo what has been created over the past half century.

So like others, I alternate pendulum-like
between despair and pessimism and hopefulness and optimism. Remembering, Vivian, what you taught me, the difference between hope and optimism.

But when I'm on the despair side, I say, My God. Who is going to give up what's been created? Flip the question -- what's it going to take to reverse and undo what's been created?

So if a space is opened up and we're encouraging people to run for office and we have in our mind a model of change -- to use Gabe's question, a theory of change, that this can be undone, what is the, let's get crass -- political agenda that people could run on? The platform they can run on that's going to undo what has been created over the past 50 years, particularly, as it applies to the use of prison.

So wonderful to have an abolition vision out there. Wonderful to say reform is not enough. I'm surely down with that. But what is the legislative agenda that will allow people to run for office successfully so that they can undo that?

So I don't have an answer for that. But I think it's a question of the moment is whether the movement that we're talking about, the coalition we're talking about, can move in that direction to undo this harmful machinery that's been created and that many
people, particularly Jon Simon and Bruce Western have written about.

So I think, to me, it's a learning process, and this is where we need help from political scientists and historians. What are the other movements that have been successful against a majoritarian status quo where the majority is being unseated?

The Civil Rights Movement is a good example, of course. I am fascinated by the Marriage Equality Movement, where, you know, there was a short period of time, given the historical arc, a significant change in public opinion that resulted in legislative change.

I'm also always, as somebody who once thought of myself as a lawyer, interested in what are the litigation options here. How do we put energy into the Eighth Amendment that says that certain practices of this system are cruel and unusual? And this is what Jon Simon's written about.

How do we think about activating unlikely or unfamiliar allies? This is why I'm fascinated by the Evangelical Movement, which is an unlikely, but really powerful ally in saying that this country's gone off course.

I'd also add to that that I'm really interested in what -- I think it was Leah who said about the
Legalization movement. I hadn't thought of it as a movement, but it's actually having this impact, and has a reparations piece to it.

First, I just think we need to educate ourselves as to what our movement -- because we get so caught up in our own success and rhetoric and belief that we're on the right side of history. But we've got a long way to go to undo what's been created.

And we need to learn in a very humble way from other who have been there before, and think about this as an organizing opportunity that will take this exhortation to go run for office, and put behind it -- run for office to do X. And it's not -- you know, defund is fine. But we have to find a way to undo, I think, at the state level, the machinery of oppression that we call our prison system, and it's going to take a long time.

It took us 50 years to get here. Fifty years is ahead of us, but we need to start.

MS. HUFFMAN: Jeremy, thank you so much. Thank you very much, and thanks to the reactions and chats that are going on, too.

So just to quickly kind of give folks a map of where we are -- we have a few more hands up. Susan, Pastor Mike, and Dona.

If anyone would like to get in that queue, do
so right away, please. Because after the last comments,
we're going to turn back to Monica and Leah, and give you
all a few minutes each to react to what you've heard and
to highlight anything or add anything that you think you'd
like to.

And then, we'll finish up this session with --
Bruce will do a quick recap of some of the things that
he's heard to help us as we transition into our break, and
then into our afternoon session together.

So do raise your hand if you have something
else you'd like to add before we finish up. And
otherwise, we'll move through that path.

So with that, Susan, I'll hand it over to you.

MS. GLISSON: Thanks so much, Katharine.

Really, really appreciating the conversation. I have lots
of thoughts. I wish I could show you my scattered little
Post-its all over my desk. So I'm going to try to make
sense; forgive me if I don't.

I'm going back to Leah's really beautiful
comment. Thank you for quoting Ella Baker and
spadework. The idea of the hard excavation work of change
and what that takes, and coupling that with Bruce's
question about, do you go around -- do you navigate around
saboteurs? Or do you try to change them?

And I'm echoing a lot of what you all are
saying. And then, I want to get granular. I think we need multiple mass movements.

There need to be a mass movement that's a politics of opposition, right? It was just taking to the streets, which is lifting up messages that challenge the status quo, and that has a particular set of tools and examples that we can use.

There needs to a politics of invitation, which is that reaching out to people that we disagree with, but whose attitudes can potentially be changed. There needs to be a movement that's table creation. That's organizing, like Pastor Mike has talked about, and he knows all the amazing tools that that takes.

There needs to be the politics of power wielding and collective action that Reverend Nixon talks about so beautifully. And there are others. The legal one, right -- that Jeremy just spoke about -- the public policy one.

There've got to be multiple, simultaneous, organized movements in each of these areas, and they've got to be interconnected where they can be. Coalesce where they can be. I'm most interested in the one that's about the politics of invitation, and if I may, just to get granular.

Systems, of course, are made up of people. So
how do you change people? You have to do that inside out. You have to do the inner work. You have to help people develop emotional agility.

We have to reclaim conversation. People are not used to talking with each other one-on-one anymore. We have cell phones and texts instead, Snapchat and WhatsApp.

So just for example, how do we develop the value of empathy? How does that work on a psychological level with insights from neuroscience? First, you have to create the new conditions for having dialogue. Right?

Literally, how we talk about things is just as important as what we say, meaning sitting in a circle instead of sitting in a board room with someone at the head of the table or in a classroom with an expert being at the head of the room. You sit in a circle. You have to create a container -- an environment of psychological safety so that people feel like they can admit -- they can engage in learning behaviors like admitting they were wrong, which they won't do if they feel like they're going to humiliated.

So that's a particular kind of environment that you have to create. Once you're able to do that, then you engage in storytelling. Our brains are not moved by facts. Our brains are moved by narrative, and not just
any narrative, but narratives that are well told, that are in the right emotional environmental, and that are offered by a credible speaker, a credible messenger.

So then, you're able to -- through that process, you're able to begin to individuate, to see another person before you as a person. You're able to begin to understand their perspective and start to shift to their perspective -- to see yourself in their shoes, which is a way to get to empathy.

That's just one process to get to one value, to operationalize one value. And we have to do that every value that we want, and we have to do it at every local level and every state level, and we have to do it over and over again every place, every community, every business, every church, everywhere we can do that.

Now, I'm particularly [indiscernible] in white folks. We know now from the Marley hypothesis that white folks don't recognize racism, deny racism because they don't know their history. Jim Loewen said it best, Lies My Teacher Told Me -- history has taught us propaganda; it's not taught accurately.

When we put white folks in spaces where they can hear authentically stories in the right emotional environment, they do shift their attitudes, and they do change. I see it happen in our work all the time.
So I just want to close with a Taj James quote. We worry about outcomes. We worry about tangible things that we can accomplish, and Taj talks about quit thing-ifying. Human-ify instead. Changing our way of being is our tangible outcome.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Susan. Thank you so much.

It was a very helpful layout of all the different pieces that go into this work. Pastor Mike, I’ll hand it over to you.

REV. McBRIDE: Yeah. I was struck by the conversations about politics and electoral politics in particular. I think we have to contend with the reality, as well, that as the browning of America continues, white elites are losing their numerical grasp on the public sector. And so, they’re retreating to the private and corporate sector. And then inviting or seducing non-whites or people of color, if you will, to become the new public face and stewards of the institutions that maintain the status quo of white supremacy.

You know, it is, I think, a dilemma we have that may go back to some of our most earliest comments or conversations around values. Like, you know, how do we understand who really shares our values? Not shares our language, but our values.
And I do think that I am not very optimistic about the majority coming along at the kind of rate that we need them to. I think there's so much at risk right now with the country just continuing to implode, and I think we're seeing that around us quite obviously.

And so, I do want to just continue to raise this idea that the political and electoral process has always been about exclusion, and is continuing to remake itself to be more exclusive. And our "political champions" on the democratic side, have not yet demonstrate their willingness to eschew compromising strategies in order to save the democracy, if you will, and just the concrete example to me of that is just with the voting bills. Right?

Like, you know, all these bills being put up at the state level can only be neutralized by the federal legislatures eschewing the filibuster. But it appears to me that, you know, the commitment to the politics of compromise still has our federal lawmakers not willing to do what it takes in order to neutralize some of these states' rights arguments that are just another expression of should we integrate public schools or not? Right?

Now, eventually, that did happen. But it happened at great cost to Black people and those few whites who joined. Right? So the question is, are we
resigning the oppressed among us to have to spill our
blood continuously because the white majority can't
recognize the imminent danger?

And I think that, for me, is the rock in my
shoe as we do organizing work. You know? Because I'll
speak for Black folks. Black folks should not have to
risk our life for our whole lives in order to experience a
good life.

It appears to me that there are way too many
among us who are being invited into the status quo to help
steward it and keep it going and just leaving the
revolutionary work to those who can't afford to integrate
into whiteness as a social status. So I'll stop.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Pastor Mike. Thank
you very much. So we're going to hear from Dona.

And then, Leah and Monica, I'll come back to
each of you and give each of you enough to make any
closing comments or any other thoughts you'd like. And
then, we'll go over to Bruce.

So, Dona, over to you.

DR. MURPHEY: Thanks, Katharine. So, yeah. I
just wanted to share that I think everything that
everybody has said is, like, super relevant. I think our
theory of change should be holistic. It should be
organismic. Right?
So like we are an organism. All of us, each have the ways in which we contribute to this change, whether you're a public official, whether you're somebody who votes, whether you're a journalist, an activist, an organizer, an academic, an influencer. All of these people have a part to play in the change that is possible.

And I think that each of us needs to just figure out where we fit, and that can be dynamic, too. Right? Depending on where we're at in our lives. And I think that's fine. That's okay. But we should all be doing something towards making the change that we want to see.

So, also, the other thing that I think is maybe more of something we can operationalize, in terms of what this organism looks like is there is this paper -- again, I don't know I have it here. Let me see.

It's another Nature paper. This is from 1998, and this paper is about small world networks, which I don't know if I shared this paper with you all in here before. But it's a really compelling paper about self-organizing networks that you see as a motif in nature, as well as in human networks. So in social networks.

So they talk about -- it's something akin to, like, Six Degrees of Separation from Kevin Bacon. It wasn't exactly that, but it's something like that. So
that being one of these types of networks. Or the nervous system of the C. Elegans, which is a kind of worm, or the Western power grid -- all of these are different kinds of networks, and what they find is, the most efficient networks.

So if we want to talk about urgency and the urgency of this change, the most efficient networks are networks that are small world networks. They actually are not, like, one node connected to the next connected to the next. That's like, supremely inefficient.

One node connected to every other node, and every other node connected to every other node. That's also not as efficient as you can be.

The most efficient kind of network, actually, has hyperconnected nodes that are connected to many, many people, right. Institutions, organizations, people, but they're also connected to one another -- these hyperconnected nodes.

So this kind of thing -- that what happens here with people who are presumably connected in our domains, where we are, then, connected to one another, actually -- that creates this very, very efficient network. And so, I think that should be part of our model of change, our theory of change -- is how do we create, sustain, cultivate, leverage small world networks?
And then, I think some of the other folks here talked about the importance of the who and the how, as well as the what. And I think that is also a really critical point, and we see this having happened in the pandemic, right.

So, like, some of the trouble that we've had, I think, in all of the health disparities that we saw during the pandemic -- that could have been in large part resolved if we're thinking about the who and the how as much as the what. That message of all of the public health things that you need to be doing to keep yourselves and your community safe. Who is delivering that message? And how is being delivered?

Not just what is the message? That is super important, and I think that because of all of the valid reasons for distrust between people, we saw a lot of people suffer, ultimately, right.

So that, unfortunately, I think is a message that we kind of learned a little bit too late. This is now 600,000 people that we've lost in this country as a result of this pandemic, and it's disproportionately been people who are Black and Brown -- particularly, people who are Black in this country.

So anyway, those are some of things I wanted to share. I do think that, at the end of the day, the
electoral politics really are important, because that's what codifies the change we're trying to make, but it has to come from both the grassroots and the glass tops.

And then, the last thing I'll say is -- the very last thing, is something that I don't hear a lot of here, or really, in general, is, like, talking about the foundational change that occurs with changes in equity and public education, and also, civics.

And not just boring civics, but a really integrative, relevant civics. So I can envision a world in which we can do K through 12 public education -- every subject that you learn -- everything that you're learning in that subject is contextualized, right. So for instance, in math, your problems in your word problems are problems that reflect the actual problems in your community, and you've turned those into word problems.

In science, you talk about the history of science and exploitation -- science as a human enterprise, intrinsically a human enterprise subject to some of the same vulnerabilities and corruptions as any human enterprise. And you talk about some of those ugly things that have happened in the history of science.

These things we could learn in a way that is much more interesting, that is much more empowering, and that will actually be the roots of change that we -- that
will be sustainable, a sustainable change. Because we're working on a lot of things now way downstream, and we could also, at least, be in parallel working on that kind of really transformative change in education that will just, I think, be incredible.

So anyway -- yeah. Thank you.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Dona. Thank you so much, and just huge thanks to everybody. We're nearing the end of our time.

I'll turn it back over to Leah and Monica. I ask you to each take just a couple of minutes to respond and give any wrap-up thoughts you'd like to give.

And then, same thing -- just a couple of minutes for Bruce, and we will finish on time so we have a chance for a break before we continue our conversation.

So, Leah, do you want to go first?

DR. WRIGHT-RIGUEUR: Sure. There's so much. This has been really a rich and engaging discussion, and perhaps I speak for Monica as well -- Monica will speak for herself. But I have to say that even though we started off as panelists, it felt more like a conversation and a roundtable -- a full-bodied roundtable with everyone bringing really important analysis and commentary to the conversation.

Actually, I think is the way to go. This is
the way to actually -- as we're thinking about theories of
change, and as we're thinking about models for moving
change forward, this kind of roundtable conversation is
the way to go where practitioners and scholars are coming
to the table.

So I want to go back to a couple of different
points, but I want to root them all in something, I think,
DeAnna said maybe about a half an hour ago or so -- a
little bit before that -- which is that we're in a moment
where we've seen these people -- people in the streets
before. Right? We've seen this again and again and it
couldn't be clearer about what their message is.

So even as we debate things about who are the
stakeholders? Who are -- you know, what are the values
that people are saying? What are things that they're --
we know what the underlying value is, which is human
dignity. Treat us as humans.

And so, I want to think about that,
particularly around this idea of compromise within
change. And I actually want to think about this idea of
compromise as a value, and as a value that has been
propagated and put forth within these various institutions
and structures and systems.

Now, over the course, I think, of the coming
years, we will see incremental change when it comes to
restorative justice. We just will. We're already there, in terms of seeing change.

But the question is will we see more than incremental change? And how long will that change take? And I think that at the moment that we're in right now, I can't confidently say that we will see more than incremental change because, in fact, part of what compromise ensures is a watering down of a particular agenda.

And so, it's expressed because that is what compromise is about. That is what compromise, particularly within the electoral system was designed to do from intention. So it's not about introducing a radically restorative justice agenda, but instead, finding ways to water that down, to dilute it across a broad political spectrum.

And then, of course, to think about how do we quell insurrection and rebellion as a way of getting the people to accept this watered-down compromise version. And we see this historically, and not just say, the 1957 Civil Rights Act that everyone hates.

I mean, everyone hates this. It's just a watered down version of what eventually will be the 1964 Civil Rights Act. But we also see this in the failure of the federal government to pass most of the resolutions and
solutions proposed by the Kerner Commission.

We see it in kind of the build-up for the 1968 Civil Rights Bill. We see it with the neutering of the Voting Rights Act in 2013. Right? So all of these moments that are designed to be about compromise ultimately end up undermining this radical goal of restorative justice across multiple fields and areas.

So I think in the same way that we have been deliberate and calculated, as a nation -- particularly, the power brokers and the stakeholders in our nation have been deliberate and calculated about watering down very specific agendas. Then we have to be very deliberate and calculated about taking risky and huge moves that are the antithesis of compromise in order to move this agenda further.

We also have to be very clear that any movement of this agenda, right -- any opening of this space, I think, to use Monica's language -- is going to be a long-term project. And that, again, we didn't really talk about this, but I would love to really re-introduce the idea of being comfortable with this metric of failure in the immediate, because we also understand that failure in the immediate does lead -- can lead to success in the long term, particularly as we are talking about a rejection of compromise, even as we are meeting these stakeholders.
where we need to meet them.

So I want to think about that, and I want to think about it being calculated and deliberate risk taking, and really emphasize this idea of risk taking, even though it may not seem like risk taking to us. Now is that time to do that.

And then, the final point that I want to think about, that we didn't really talk about, but that is necessary to think about, is that it's not just the George Floyd moment that opens up this moment for a possibility around shared value building and world building and consensus building. It's also the pandemic. And it is the moment of the pandemic -- people watched George Floyd die, that nine minutes and 26 seconds, or if you saw another version, eight minutes and 46 seconds -- because they are stuck at home. \

They can't turn away. They can't move away. And so, there's a moment where they've -- because of technological changes and because of a global pandemic, they're forced to focus their attention on injustice, and they can finally hear and see what human dignity, right, what the antithesis of human dignity -- but what human dignity would entail.

So I want us think about what that means in this moment. What is the impetus and the opportunity that
the pandemic provides us, particularly since we are also on the cusp of the pandemic -- of moving beyond the pandemic?

And so, that -- again, this is a window of opportunity for us to do the work of shared value construction and construction building, and to take big deliberate, calculated risks in terms of moving an agenda forward that is not rooted in compromise, but that is actually rooted in some kind of measurable change for long-term goals.

MS HUFFMAN: Thank you, Leah. Thank you so much. Monica, I'll turn over to you for just a couple minutes, and we'll go just a couple minutes over here, folks, if that's okay. But then, we will wrap up quickly and have a full break time.

DR. BELL: Well, that's wonderful. I'm mostly just going to defer to Leah. That was great. There is one thing I do want to say, which is I really appreciated what Susan was saying about the different styles of politics that are really essential to our theories of change. I think that's really important.

I also do think we need to be careful in spaces like this where we talk about those different styles of politics, to be aware that all through history, certain types of politics have been blessed, and certain types of
politics have been maligned and rejected. I'm thinking in particular about politics of confrontation.

The politics of truth telling has been placed on the backs of marginalized people, as Pastor Mike was inviting us to think about. That is stressful. That is hard. It is also so necessary.

And so I think in spaces like this, we have a lot of different types of people. And we're all the types who want to talk to people who, like, are different from us in some way because we're all different from each other.

But we have to be willing to take up some of that labor from the people who are constantly doing it. And so, I think that is also a critical value -- is recognizing the power differentials in the styles of politics and the deep necessity of all of them for building the type of world we want.

Thank you.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Monica. Thank you both so much.

Bruce, I'll let you take us out here. And then we'll quickly share the logistics for the break and reconnecting.

Bruce, go ahead.

MR. WESTERN: I'll be as quick as I can. Two
big parts to this conversation, I think, which I felt was incredibly rich and productive -- so, the two parts, the two big parts was beginning with a discussion of values, and we're really focused on that. And then, the second part was talking about how values connect to politics and power.

Values, I took three things away. One is what are values? Values are principled statements of the good, and Monica said this directly. We don't talk about equality. We talk about equity because equity embodies within it a statement of the good.

A bunch of ideas about candidates for preeminent values in our work included rehabilitation, empathy, and human dignity, for example, and Leah mentioned some of those. So values are a statement of the good.

They're rooted in position -- whose values? Different people have different values. Whose values are we talking about? And who is at the table to articulate our values? So values are rooted in position.

Third thing about values -- values are not simply words. They're embodied in action, in social movement, in mobilization -- as DeAnna was saying, in institutions, the way institutions are structured, and in budgets, as Nicole was saying.
Values have a symbolic component. Pastor Mike spoke to this. So places like the media, places like the university are seats where the symbolic work of the articulation of values happens. That's my very condensed read on the values conversation.

Politics and power -- and then, we really pivoted, I think, with Pastor Mike's contribution. So what is politics? Vivian described it -- this is how I heard it -- as the thread that connects our values to some outcome in policy or legislation. For example, the outcry of the movement at one end and the statute at the other.

What lies between is politics. Jeremy asked very pointedly, So what's our agenda? Electoral politics is crucial in this process connecting values to statute. What agenda can we run on to eliminate mass incarceration and build an alternative?

We can look to a history of wins, like Civil Rights. I would also -- Dona made me think of the Progressive Movement of the early Twentieth Century that created the common school and mass public education, and I think that's often overlooked, actually, in how we think of big progressive change.

But a number of people -- Courtney, Pastor Mike, Kris, Gabriel -- raised the question, Is our political process capable of producing the change that we
want? That's how I heard their comments. I think that's a really fundamental question.

We talked about the how of politics, which I thought was really valuable. Susan and Dona both spoke about the how -- how do we do the how of politics? This translation from the values to the statute.

I think their contributions, for me -- Susan and Dona talking about the how -- empathy, storytelling, individuating, making heterogenous in opposition that appears to us as homogenous, self-organizing networks, small world networks.

One question this raises for me is if we think about the how, can there be greater change potential in our political process than maybe we've seen so far? Can we think more ambitiously about our political process? Is it capable of more change than we might be giving it credit for?

Very interesting idea that we, at this table, are enacting a political process itself. We're modeling a political process. Are there lessons that we can take from this? Leah spoke to this. Kris spoke to this, and Monica spoke to this.

Just incredibly fertile discussion, I think, and it's a great platform for this afternoon. So I know I'm standing in the way of our bathroom break, so I'll
stop.

MS. HUFFMAN: Bruce, thank you so, so much. Huge thanks again, Leah and Monica, for your writing and your thinking and for starting us off in this conversation today, and to the whole group for where we've taken this.

We are going to be taking a break. We're going to -- it's now 2:38 here on the East Coast. We'll give folks an extra few minutes. Let's try to come back at five after the hour, just so everyone gets close to the full half hour to regroup.

You know, we'll be continuing this conversation in another context this afternoon with introductory thoughts from Keith and Fatimah and Abbey, and then breaking out into groups. And one of the things we found we kind of lost in our last virtual roundtable was the continuity and the ways that the sessions could build on each other as they come in closer proximity. So that's why we're trying this longer day today.

We want to really be able to continue the discussion that started in this past session as we move into the next one because there's just much richness and so much more to discuss there. So with that in the back of your minds, please, everyone, take a few minutes break.

If you don't mind, if you could just stay connected, if that's possible. If technically, you're
not able to do that, that's fine. But if you just --
we're going to mute and video turn off everyone. And
then, that way we'll all able just to jump right back on
at five after the hour.

So we will look to see everyone then, and we'll
get started with our next part of this discussion. Thanks
again, and thanks to all of our observers, and we'll be
back soon.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MS. HUFFMAN: Welcome back, everyone. Thanks
again to all of you for that great conversation earlier
today -- this morning, or this early afternoon depending
on where you are right now, and glad to be back together
here and moving into the next part of our conversation.

So we're going to open up -- just to quickly go
over the logistics here. We're going to be opening up
hearing from three of our colleagues around the Zoom
screen here, starting with Keith Wattley. And then going
to Abbey Stamp, and then going to Fatimah Loren Dreier.

Each of them can take seven, eight, nine
minutes to talk about the paper that you prepared for
this, and just also your thoughts based on the earlier
collaboration, and the way that connects as we move into
this discussion about the values of justice.

We'll then go into breakout rooms. You will
automatically be routed into a breakout room. And so, you don't have to do anything at all, other than -- through the magic of Zoom -- arrive in a breakout room where we'll be talking in smaller groups for a little while. So we have more of a chance to dig in on some of the things that we will hear from our colleagues, and that we talked about already.

And then, we'll all come back together for the final part of our day together to share thoughts and compare notes of it. And then, wrap up for the day.

So with that, I will hand things over first to Keith, who is going to kick us off. Keith, who's the founder and executive director of Uncommon Law out in California.

Keith, I'll hand it over to you.

MR. WATTLEY: Thank you. Thank you, Katharine. Great to be with you all again. I don't think that the ideas I shared in my piece are especially novel, but I think that the perspective that I bring is a little different, hopefully helpful.

I'm reminded each time we get together that -- I think every time that I've showed up at one of these roundtables, I've made the comment that I'm always going to take you to prison. And that's because it's really from people inside that I've learned most of what I think
know about how the world operates.

In my piece, I recounted a little bit of the lives of a handful of people I've worked with over the years. There's so much more I could write about each one, but it'd, of course, be so much better for you to hear from them directly.

These are their stories, not mine. And while I do have permission to share them, I certainly don't own them. I also like the fact that I didn't come across these stories as individual stories starting from like a research or theoretical standpoint.

You know, I started with one client -- one person at a time, really, about 21 years ago by doing this work. And most of the work has been about helping an individual client connect all the dots between all the historical milestones in their lives leading up to and including murder, in most cases.

And we got there through many, many hours sitting together in prison visiting rooms and prison cells. And in my writing, I talk about adverse childhood experiences -- ACES, people refer to them as -- even though, the study of these experiences is not without controversy, I realize.

For example, some people have expressed concern that ACES testing among kids might actually lead to
excessive and inappropriate referrals to Child Protective Services. Fortunately, most studies have not borne that out, but it's definitely a concern.

Another one is that ACES data might be used to make predictions or decisions on an individual level, rather than focusing on institutional and structural deficiencies that really impact entire populations. I think that's what further stigmatized kids and pathologized their responses to their traumatic conditions. And the last thing we want to do is make kids feel broken or that they're somehow destined to negative life experiences in adulthood.

But in our work, when we think about ACES, we think about it as a tool to really raise awareness about the various impacts of stressful life conditions and how they disproportionately affect Black and Brown folks. Specifically, I think about it as providing useful lessons about what healthy conditions might look like.

So the four stories that I shared in my piece are really intended to help us recognize the need to be proactive about protecting kids from violence and helping them understand that their own victimization is not their fault. It's not a reflection of their worth.

I offered some ideas about what safer conditions might look like, which would also include ways
to be more responsive to the harm that's already been caused. One person in my piece, José, who had an abusive stepfather -- for him, safety doesn't just look like locking his stepfather up in jail or prison. It looks like getting the stepfather treatment for his alcohol addiction and for his own trauma history, while also helping José heal from the harm that he experienced.

For two women in my piece, Sheila and Peggy, who both survived lifelong abuse and ended up with life sentences, it looks like believing in supporting women and girls when they report sexual violence. And it also looks like teaching men and boys not to objectify and seek control over women and girls.

And some cases might also look like a restorative process to help these families heal, but none of those things happen in prison. For Donald -- also in my piece -- it would look like a living wage for his mother. It would look like responsive schools and real mental health care for him. Even his experience in prison might look different.

You know, when I met Donald, he'd been in prison for 30 years already. And he had seemed to have given up on ever getting out of prison, in fact. He hadn't even attended his previous parole hearing, and he was sort of shocked.
What happened was I was looking for some new clients to assign to some students who were working with me, and I got Donald's name from a list of people who had parole hearings coming up. And so I wrote to him, and he said when we met, he was shocked to get this letter from me out of the blue offering to help him.

And in our meeting, he just couldn't quite wrap his mind around the fact that we were there for him, to offer help to him at no cost, and what he explained was that no one had ever done that before. And this is someone -- if you read the piece -- he's been basically locked up since he was 7. From the ages to 7 to 15, he was locked in various institutions, was out briefly from age 15 to 19. And then, landed in prison on a life sentence.

In both cases, he was held responsible for someone's death even though he didn't kill anybody. It's a whole other story about that. But his experience was that there's no one who's coming to help him. And so, we showed up and we ended up working with him for about five years to really help him understand that the things that had happened to him weren't his fault, and that he wasn't just destined to die in prison -- that there was more to offer in life -- that life had to offer than that experience for him.
Something I didn't include in my piece about Donald was that when we finally got to the point where he was found suitable for parole -- granted parole after five years of working with him -- three different parole hearings in that period of time, we came out of his last parole hearing where he'd just been granted parole. He looks over at me and through tears, he thanked me for saving his life.

And I said, Well, you know, I appreciate you trusting me with your story and trusting the students with all that we asked you to do. And he said, No. You don't get it. Really, you saved my life. See? Because when I got your letter offering to help me, I was about to commit suicide. And I figured, Well, if out of the blue these people want to help me change my life and get out of prison, I might as well participate. I might as well work with them and see what happens.

He never told me that until the end of our time together while he was still in prison. He's now out. He got out. He's been out a couple of years. He's doing really well.

But it's just a reminder for me that safety also looks like real pathways home for people in prison, even after acts of violence -- even after murder, potentially. And that's tough for a lot of people to deal
with, frankly.

I think what's often missing in the lives of people I work with is a clear and compassionate understanding of the events of their childhood and adolescence, and an opportunity to heal from those experiences. When there's no one around to help a kid understand that parent's divorce or death or incarceration or substance use or violence -- it didn't happen because that kid is unlovable.

If there's no one to remind them of that, to point that out, then they're at greater risk of believing they are unlovable, unwanted, unacceptable, and at greater risk of really acting accordingly in all the ways we can anticipate that might look. So the absence of that communication -- young people really interpret those dangerous conditions they may live in as a negative reflection of who they are and what they're worth.

And so the theme I noticed -- the theme from my piece that ties directly into most of the other readings for the session is that nearly all of them highlight this value of healing -- healing opportunities. I mean, if we looked at all the carceral responses that we offer and punitive responses that we offer when really, not just kids, but everyone -- when we react to negative experiences, we get labeled, and we punish them. If we
offered instead of a punitive response, a healing response, we'd get very different outcomes.

I sense that in the readings that there was this value of healing that showed up at both an individual level and a community level, and I think healing really starts with telling the truth about our trauma. It starts with being accountable to one another. I really appreciate this group for the truth-tellers and the getters of stuff done who show up here.

But here's the thing about that, because I come out of these sessions mad. You know, mad that I haven't done more. Mad that I'm not moving aggressively enough.

So I both thank and blame this group for that, and I do focus on these real-life, individual stories because they're what I see. They're what drive us to do what we do at UnCommon Law. These individual stories really -- they drive me much more than the theoretical concepts that we sometimes get involved in discussing when we have these conversations.

And I feel like this Square One Project really takes, I think, a thorough and thoughtful approach to identifying the problems. But at the same time, sadly, I would say most of us can't name or count all the people who died as a result of jail, prison, and police violence since this project started.
I think offering different perspectives on the problems is an important and inclusive process. But as I've heard in several comments already today, it's well past time that we start to implement some real solutions on a large scale.

And I know that's happening in different pockets. I look forward to learning from and working with this group to really move those solutions forward. Particularly as it involves those large scale changes that really start at the local level. I'm reminded of that by several people who presented today.

So thanks for letting me share some of my observations with you. I look forward to continuing this conversation.

MS. HUFFMAN: Keith, thank you so, so much. And thank you to your clients for letting you bring their stories to us in your writing and in your words today.

And I share your sense of coming out of all these sessions both inspired and daunted and angry at myself and others, and really, really appreciate the willingness of this group to engage in all of that and to think about the different ways that all these pieces can fit together, or should, we hope.

We're going to turn to -- if it's okay, Abbey, Fatimah has requested that she might be able to go next.
It's just in our lineup, so that is no problem at all.

Absolutely.

So with that, we'll turn to Fatimah.

MS. LOREN DREIER: Thank you, and thank you, Abbey, for allowing me to kind of jump the line a little bit. I will kind of just start off and say how grateful I am to be with all of you.

I shared last night my heart is heavy. Just the ongoing trauma of this time, and I feel like this is a group where I don't have to pretend and operate on top of it. I can just really be real with all of you and be with you.

I share the sentiment with Keith that I leave these calls full in my heart -- angry, excited, grateful that you exist. It is so astounding to be a part of a group that opens my heart, that kind of opens me up and says things in right relationship.

We get to name and be truth-tellers in here and beyond. That you exist and are out there doing the work you're doing is so powerful, and I'm just immensely grateful for that.

So I want to say a few remarks. And I'm going to kind of just share in kind of what we're working on now, because I think it's all related to values. I'm going to just start with what I shared last night,
about -- many, many people have said this, the power of human dignity as a value. And in particular, in the context of our bodies -- the humanity of our bodies, and that, for the lion's share of the time in this country, Black and Brown bodies have been seen as inhuman and as chattel, as disposable.

And so, the actual psychological shift for a body politic to actually see our humanity is a pretty significant shift in values, and it creates a context for a whole host of other things. It requires reckoning. It requires so much, and it's so simple, but incredibly profound. I think that's why it's echoed so much in our dialogue and our discussion.

So I wanted to kind of start there and say that I share in a deep skepticism about structures and institutions reforming or reimagining. I think that racism and violence within this country is, in many ways, a gravitational force. I think that leveraging the use the physics is really useful here.

It is a gravitational force. And so, in the same way that, you know, when I throw a ball or flick something, it kind of behaves based on these kind of core mechanisms of gravity. So too, I think that the way which our country was founded and constructed around racism and violence makes the project of reimagining a single
institution really challenging.

However, I do believe in rockets, and I do believe in rocket fuel, and I do believe in the capacity for other forces. We can actually leverage and operationalize a force that actually defies or can move us past the gravitational force. And I believe in that, and I think that is what we are talking about.

What are the mechanisms by which we can actually leave our atmosphere? And, you know, how much force is required? And what are all the ways in which we can leverage that force?

And we've talked about electoral politics. I've very much appreciated in previous sessions the discussion about force, and I'm thinking back to our discussion in Detroit -- a really provocative piece about force. So I've been thinking ever since about force and how it operates, and I think this physics analogy has been incredibly useful.

Of course, my contribution as a trauma therapist is thinking about the role of trauma. And I believe that given the prevailing history of our country, the numbness we walk around with in the trauma of structural violence and structural racism has been incredibly heavy. And that healing is not only a practice of human dignity -- the ability to witness love and
transform no matter the conditions -- whether violent or nonviolent. No matter the conditions -- the technology of transformation and healing should be available and given with tremendous abundance to anyone.

That healing is also a political act. That healing, itself, creates new people who, then, can articulate truth -- tell truth, and operate this rocket that gets us out. Right? I fundamentally believe that healing and political acts are connected and situated within one another and how critical that is.

So that kind of leads me to the work we're doing now. I've been working very closely with Pastor Mike and Eddie Bocanegra and many, many others in a broad coalition.

We have -- I've been working very closely with the White House. And I have gotten the commitment of the President to invest $5 billion through the American Jobs Plan to essentially bring an infrastructure of healing and transformation to communities that are disproportionately impacted by the very trauma that keeps us numb, the community violence.

And in doing so, we have an opportunity to -- I think it's a historic, unprecedented opportunity to bring to bear new stewards of transformation. New kind of witnesses and bearers of truth to our movement who -- I
think as it's so rightly been said by so many others -- have not had sufficient opportunities to talk with us and be with us in these discussions.

And that we have to -- instead of bringing their voices there, just here with us. That this unlocks, in our prayer, that it can unlock new generations -- several generations of people who are paid to do the work, the labor of healing in places that have been forgotten.

So what a task to imagine. Now, $5 billion is not the whole system. And in many systems, it's a drop in the bucket.

I'm acknowledging that, and I'm saying that we are tasked with thinking about how to design -- how to actually design an infrastructure that leverages those resources in ways that effectively operationalize these values, and put them directly in the hands of those who want to create, heal, transform on the ground. That's the work.

That is the work we're doing, and it is powerful. It is challenging, but I think it undergirds the meaning of self-determination, that we can leverage this for self-determination and power through the act of healing.

And so, I just want to share that if we do this right, I believe that we will have just this really
profound opportunity to bring new people -- and I was
talking to Pastor Mike. We talk all the time about this,
that we have to kind of see these resources as a way of
thinking of this as an opportunity to resource those who
have tremendous innovation to make valuable the wounds.
Right?

The very thing that has created the trauma is
that lived experience; the proximity to pain itself is a
value in this transformative work. And to actually create
a mechanism for resources to go to those who have the
closest proximity to pain, how powerful and profound is
that as an activity?

And I'll stop there, but happy to talk more to
any and all of you who are interested in ways of
contributing to this thinking, because it will take all of
us, I think, to do this work effectively. So thank you.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Fatimah. Thank you so
much, and thanks for the incredible work that you and
Pastor Mike and the rest of the Fund Peace leadership have
done to get us to where we are now with this possibility
before us in that way. It's really moving.

So, Abbey, I'll hand it over to you. And then,
we'll break out into our discussion groups.

MS. STAMP: Great. Thank you. Thank you,
Keith, and thank you, Fatimah, for helping -- reminding
folks like me who haven't worked with clients for a really long time, just grounding the importance of our work and the pain that the system has really enforced onto people and how -- well, I'll talk about a little bit more, but it's really important, I think, for the folks who pull the levers of power to understand and be able to learn how to acknowledge publicly.

So Kris talked about -- I think he said being an elected official in recovery or something. I'm a clinician in recovery. So my background is as a licensed clinical social worker. I spent most of my career working on the juvenile side here in Multnomah County, Oregon, doing trauma work with young people and their families.

And so my work now, on the policy level, is really grounded in that space and just experiencing the extreme trauma and poverty and xenophobia that my clients really brought to me in those spaces. And what happened is I acknowledge that I am not built to carry that and I got out of direct service because it was just too much.

So for folks who continue to work with folks who are in pain, I just thank you and I honor that a great deal because I couldn't. And so, instead, what I'll do is I'll talk about the policy work that we're doing in Multnomah County.

And I had some thoughts about what I would say,
but based on our first session this morning, I want to pivot a little bit. So in that first conversation that we had today, I heard a lot of curiosity about really how to become more tangible and practical and on the ground, so I thought I should briefly share the practical side of what I wrote about in the blog piece, and how I've decided to tackle our local system from my social work values that does include self-determination and really honoring process and individuals, as well.

And just for a brief piece of context -- so, Portland, Multnomah County, the Willamette Valley -- and shout out to CAHOOTS -- thank you, Dr. Bell -- is a deeply blue part of the state of Oregon. But the rest of the state is also incredibly conservative, at least in comparison to the Willamette Valley.

And so, our focus, then, in Portland and Multnomah County is very, very much at the local level -- very, very localized. And so, what we've been trying to do is to lean into that change and figure out what the local control is that we have over our system, no matter who's in the White House.

So my job as Executive Director of this collaborative council of all of the actors in the criminal legal system is really as a facilitator. I'm not a policymaker myself, but I have the privilege of using my
position to mediate and agitate -- to create a path forward that I believe is the right path to move forward. I would not be facilitating meetings and projects if I didn't believe in them.

So in terms of a values discussion, among the executives and elected officials and the work that I facilitate, it has been really important to talk about values for us as a tool to create buy-in across the board. Because I believe as a facilitator, my job is to keep people at the table and to keep them engaged.

The worst thing for me is if someone -- if I piss someone off and they pick up their toys and they leave the table. Because then they're gone, and they can't participate and be willing to take some risks and engage in change and process. That's particularly true with those folks who have the authority and the power to pull the levers that can change policy, that can change laws in Oregon, and can change and fund budgets at the city, state, and county level.

So I have been working really hard to find those values that create common terrain -- Dr. Bell, I'm going to take that from you, as well. Make sure to say thank you for that -- new language for me. I think that has been the way that I've been able to agitate and create some meaningful change.
So in the blog piece, I wrote about healing, and I want to talk about why I think that works for me and works for us at the local level. So I think talking about healing basically just kind of jibes with everybody, and we can acknowledge that we have a system of oppression that has caused harm, particularly for BIPOC communities.

Acknowledging harm, and then moving into healing by shrinking that system is that even the most fervent support of law enforcement can kind of start to understand that and get with it. And that people in our community are suffering with behavioral health conditions.

People are sick. So let's help heal and don't prosecute folks, and harsh incarceration does harm. So let's stop incarcerating people.

Victims don't get what they need or what they deserve from the criminal legal system. So let's do restorative practices instead, and acknowledge that when people heal, everybody thrives.

So just talking about healing feels, right now, like everybody's been able to belly up to the bar and participate in a way that I haven't experienced before. So in order to help judges figure out what focusing on healing looks like, I have to remain curious.

So when discussions about values result in statements like, I value reducing recidivism. That's when
my job, I think, is to lean in and ask why. Right? The five why's -- to keep inquiring about what does that mean? What does recidivism mean to you? And then some depth emerges.

And so, we're looking at, oh, if we decrease recidivism, then what we're really saying is that people find recovery. Less harm is caused to others. There's less exposure to a harmful system. And then, selfishly, it costs less.

So very quick snapshot of the journey we're experiencing here in Portland, Oregon. My participation on the Executive Session of the Square One Project has really helped me and challenged me to think about this blue-sky thinking, like, abolition and what's square one, and try to bring it to the ground to create change in two, five, and 10 years here in Oregon.

We had a conference over a year ago. Dr. Western came, and then Anamika came, as well. And what we did there is I brought together all of the policymakers, the budget-makers, and the lawmakers, and the behavioral health authority -- and all of those folks who are the influencers and the policymakers, and we just got together and talked about, we don't have a vision.

We don't have a vision. We're all in chaos all the time. People silo up. We need to come together and
say, What's a north star? And is there a possibility to
be willing to come together and work towards that?

So, really, it was a family meeting. Okay, all
of you executives, are you willing to come together so we
can engage with folks who we are harming to talk about
doing business differently? So we got some buy-in.

We focused on healing. We taught the
harmfulness of the dichotomy of victim versus offender,
how that's a terrible way to label and box people. We
acknowledged that the criminal system is harmful. It's
expensive and the outcomes are awful, so what the heck are
we doing?

We need to lean in and make sure that we're
intentionable about changing responses to folks in crisis,
changing responses to violence. To undo the 400 years of
harm to BIPOC communities the current system has done. To
decarcerate communities that have been most negatively
impacted. And acknowledge that there's not enough
capacity in the housing systems, treatment system, and
community-organizing spaces to really do what the criminal
legal system has asserted itself to do instead.

So change the paradigms. So if at first, do no
harm, what should we be doing to actually heal people and
heal the system? So we engage in this process that we
were now calling transforming justice. Turns out, lots of
people are calling their projects transforming lots of different things. But that's our name for now.

We did a very, very competitive RFP process. And we procured a consultancy to lead in and help us see the forest for the trees and be our shepherds and help us move forward. We are creating a vision across all disciplines that shrinks the criminal legal system and prioritizes diversion, deflection, decarceration for BIPOC communities, grows the health, housing, and treatment systems, and prioritizes restorative justice, healing, and harm reduction.

We are having sessions -- facilitated sessions that are public and posted to the web and transparent, with people with lived experience, people who are certified peer mentors, people who have been victimized -- whether they identify as victim or not -- providers with natural or community leaders, with advocates, with organizers, and also all of the executives who have their hands on the levers of change to help create a vision for the future of justice policy locally -- really have a just criminal legal system.

And what we hope is that this process will also have an implementation plan. Because as an executive director of an agency, I walk in and there's three strategic plans over the past 20 years, beautifully
written, nicely bound, but sitting on the shelf and that's not okay.

So what I want to be able to do is to create a plan that actually creates change, that outlasts elections, and outlasts turnovers. So in two, five, and 10 years, we'll actually be able to have some tangible changes.

And I have two very quick examples, just to make this -- I'm going to use the word tangible one last time. One is the deputy chief of police is on this committee with us to try to figure out what the hell should we be doing and what should this look like moving forward.

And the Portland Police Bureau was under consent decree from the Department of Justice for killing Black men and people with mental illness. It's been about a decade.

So part of that work was they created a behavioral health unit, which is a law enforcement officer and a crisis clinician together. They work in the community. That's, like, a great model, right? Everybody wants co-responder models.

But I pushed a little bit. I said, Wouldn't it be great if you didn't even have to do that? If we had really good grassroots, community-based solutions to folks
in crisis, and a mental health system, and a substance use
disorder system that wasn't totally broken and oppressive
in itself?

Why do we keep asking police to do more better,
instead of asking them and demanding they do less?
Particularly around folks who are really having struggles
with behavioral health. He was like, Yeah. I think that
actually makes some sense.

The last piece I want to share is, we need to
engage in some budget alchemy. Half of Multnomah County's
general fund go towards the public safety system, and that
doesn't even include policing. A quarter of that goes to
our local county jail. A quarter of the county's money
goes to jail because that's how expensive the systems are,
right?

So we have a newly elected DA -- good
friend. Seventy-seven percent of the vote -- like, super
landslide -- way progressive, and his job is damn hard to
help make change, even though he wants to do it.

So we had a meeting earlier this week and I
just said, Dream with me, Mike. 15,000 cases are
prosecuted in Multnomah County annually. 13,000 of those
are misdemeanors. Yes, that includes domestic violence.
Those include driving under the influence, and some scary,
scary things.
But what if we stopped prosecuting, like, disorderly conduct and theft III and tiny little -- like, why do we do this? What if we stop? How much money could the system save?

And could we engage in agreements that says if we stop prosecuting X percent of the charges, we could save this many millions of dollars? And we have a commitment through this planning process to infuse in community-based agencies to culturally specific providers that everybody's screaming for. There's a way to do this.

So I really hope -- I mean, I'm almost 50. I've got, like, 10 years left in me in this job. If we can do this, this is my try. This is my try to make it happen.

Work with government and with folks who've been impacted by systems to see if they can find a different path forward, at least in our little microcosm of the country. I certainly hope so. If it fails, I think there'll be lessons learned. And if we succeed, there'll obviously be lessons learned.

MS. HUFFMAN: Abbey, thank you so much for sharing all that. And thanks again to Keith, Fatimah, Abbey, all of you all for really giving us these specific examples and putting images and ideas into our heads about values in real life, in individual lives and policymaking
and practice in systems. Very, very much appreciated -- all your thinking and your work.

So we're going to be now breaking out into small discussion groups for a little while, and you -- if I understand correctly, we don't have to do a thing. The magic of Zoom is going to route us into different rooms in just a moment here, where we'll have a chance for some informal discussions just for about 40 minutes or so. We're going to talk together in our smaller groups, so we have a chance to all dig in a little bit more and really spend a little more time in conversation.

We'll then come back to this group -- again automatically by the magic of Zoom -- and we'll have a couple little quick housekeeping. And then we will have our break from 4:30 to 4:45 Eastern before we come back for one last hour together to report out on the conversations we had in our smaller groups and to wrap up our day together.

So we will -- if Sukyi will jump in and correct me if I'm wrong about any of that, but I believe that we will now be able to just move into our different breakout groups and continue our conversations there.

(Whereupon, breakout group sessions were held.)

MS. HUFFMAN: Well, thank you to everyone. So I think we're all back. Yes. Okay. So we are now going
to take a little break. Thank you to everybody, and it was great to be able to be in those smaller groups and have the more intense and detailed conversations in that way. Really appreciate that.

So we're going to the same thing we did before. Quick 15 minutes. Just stay connected and turn off your mute and your video -- or mute yourself and turn off your video. And then, we'll pop right back on at 4:45 Eastern and wrap up our time together.

So thanks everybody, and we'll see you in a few minutes.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MS. HUFFMAN: Welcome back, everyone. We are back to livestreaming and also, therefore, welcoming back our observers who've been joining us throughout the day.

Great to be back together here. So we're going to take a little time to talk together about the conversations we were just able to have in our smaller breakout groups. We're going to start with short report-outs from a person who was in each of the groups. And then, we will move into a group discussion as before.

So we're going to start with hearing from Courtney, actually, to talk about what your group discussed.

MS. ROBINSON: Our group had a really rich and
powerful conversation. Some of the major things that really came out of our conversation was healing, and Bruce said healing has essential value to the work that we do.

And I thought that that was really a great sort of line to think about all the ways which we were talking about healing, both as the new stewards of transformation in terms of budget alchemy, you know, really sort of digging into this notion of healing.

And something key that Vivian mentioned was that healing had to happen at all levels. She used the phrase, From the pulpit to the back door, in thinking about when we're talking about healing and healing communities -- that the whole community should be healed, and not just who we have "identified" as the person who is either been harmed or done the harming. And so, really interesting to sort of talk through that.

And talking about the ways in which we're going about the healing, in thinking about bigger issues around government and should government be a part of the healing process? And does the structural racism and other -isms impact the government's ability to actually provide the kind of healing that is needed?

And when we have those kinds of structures taking on the healing process, are we taking away from the community leaders and community organizations and
community healers that do this work in a very culturally responsive way? So will the healing industry become co-opted by bigger corporations and organizations who take on the healing without thinking about the people that they are indeed healing?

And Kris and Abbey talked about, it's really time for us to rethink how folks in the government are using the budget, how things are allocated, what that looks like, and how that informs how we heal, and when we heal.

And I know we have a short time, so those are the big things, and I was fortunate -- we were fortunate to have the master in wrapping up sessions in our group. And so, if Bruce wants to add anything, the mic is for him.

MS. HUFFMAN: Bruce will hold, and we will put him to the test a little bit later on. So thank you, Courtney. Thank you so much.

Let's turn to -- next we have DeAnna, who can report out from the group that she was part of.

MS. HOSKINS: Well, thank you. I knew you were going to call on me next, Miss Katharine. So our group really had an enriched conversation, and we kind of started the conversation off with Monica starting off this idea that values can get co-opted. Right? That values
can become this sexy word, like criminal justice did re-
entry, and be co-opted to move the agenda to get what's
needed, but in practice, not being applied.

Emily went and shared about the power, and how
to dissolve those power structures. She said we need
intimacy and remarked about how people in power have such
little to lose. They're not really connected to the
issues.

One of her quotes was, If the same actors have
the power always, we won't get anywhere new. It's not
personal for most of them, so it really doesn't matter to
them. They don't have anything to lose. This issue
isn't -- it's not personal for those in power. So deeply,
when they have little to lose, they don't know how to stay
the course and they really don't see the human dignity in
others.

Then Gabriel kind of followed up and gave us a
sermon, a framework to understand all of it and how it
kneads together. And I know I'm going to mess this name
up, Gabriel, if you can help me. But you drew from -- is
it Paulio?


MS. HOSKINS: -- where he talks about values,
that we think about them in a classic, Western
structure. In power construct, values are aesthetic.
They are superficial. They are not embodied. They are not in coordination. It is not tactical.

Then, he went on to say that values are not just right belief or right convictions, it's a right that's lived out in action. If we are talking about a theory of change, values are important, but it has to be incarnational. It has to be embodied. It has to be lived out.

Which is where our conversation kind of then went about those who are most oppressed -- those who have that lived experience carries the brunt of the trauma, carries the brunt of -- almost the responsibility. And, you know, Susan kind of chimed in about how we, as white people, helping to organize -- helping to be allies, but in reality, we really need accomplices in this work.

So we kept going on and I think Emily wrapped us up really nicely. And Keith even spoke about the work that he does in an equity manner of, you employ people who have lived experience and actually, their lived experience is more experienced and more valuable than the person who has the education. But how do you make that equity within your organization?

And that's when Emily kind of talked about proximity and intimacy, right. Proximity is to the issue and the problem, but the intimacy is considering them a
colleague, considering them to be equitable in those positions of leadership and different things of that nature based on the fact they may not have the education that we put that is needed for that, but their lived experience makes them much more valuable.

Did I miss anything? Because we were everywhere. But it was really deep.

Jeremy? Do you want to follow up or share anything I missed?

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, DeAnna. Thank you so much. Yes, and we'll -- definitely others will have a chance to jump in. I'm appreciating the themes that emerged in these different conversations. And in ours as well.

Dona, do you want to report out on the third breakout group?

DR. MURPHEY: Sure. So I kind of tried to organize a summary in my questions and some solutions that we discussed. So some of the questions that were posed that were interesting -- Nicole started us off with maybe kind of reconsidering -- well, I mean, she said that we actually spent the day kind of grounding ourselves in the experience of the people who are most directly impacted by these policies that we're seeking to change, and asked us to kind of reconsider the framework of healing.
And, in particular, I think, some of what -- I personally have seen this done more among my colleagues who are in social work. I don't know if they do this -- I think maybe also in my therapy. We refer to it as patients. In the doctor/patient relationship, they're referred to as clients, I think because that language is supposed to be a bit more empowering.

But Nicole invited us to kind of reconsider that because even that language is other-izing. And Eric also added that -- he said we should regarding people who would be those most who most intimately feel the impact of these policies that we're talking about as brothers and sisters, not as clients.

Yeah. So those were some of the questions, and the question of, who are we healing? And who is doing the harming? Is this framework useful when the people who are actually responsible for the harm are now being asked to heal the problem that they've created themselves?

So good questions to consider, also. Nicole also mentioned that in terms of solutions, that we should, actually, embrace the role of being loud. You know, showing up in the streets. Shaming people because that has, actually, been very effective ultimately.

She did mention, though, that there are people who, of course, can't show up in those ways because fear
can be very paralyzing. Acknowledge that. Eric -- he went long and deep on the importance of representation in solutions and provided his own experience in the mayoral office in New York as an example of how this is so critical.

And he shared that he was from an impacted community himself, and that him being in the position that he's in has allowed him to represent the community that will then be impacted by the policies that are being generated by the mayor's office. And he really emphasized the importance of leading from a racial justice framework and leading with love.

He talked about how cultural change within organizations is so, so important and that it's not easy. He talked about it being important to regard people with experience as experts in themselves, and that they need to be themselves positioned to succeed and positioned to lead their own communities -- resourced to lead their own communities.

What else? He also mentioned, I think importantly, how we sometimes -- in thinking about government, we really over-rely on these external structures to manage our experiences, as opposed to thinking about ourselves as the solution generators.

And he said that it's important for us to be
connecting our communities to one another as vehicles for change. And I, then, kind of provided a counterpoint because all of what he discussed sounded very lovely to me. Right? But also sounded very foreign, because the community in which I'm embedded -- much of what he talks about is not really possible. At least, not right now. And I live in the south. I live in Texas.

And so, I mentioned, basically, how challenging it can be to think about how these things work in other places, but they really wouldn't work in that same way -- at least, not at this point in time where I am or where others are in the world. That kind of drives home the point that we have to think in a very local way about solutions, but also that it is actually still valuable to hear about how people have gotten there in other places.

What else? Jon mentioned that -- he had this great quote that I forget now. He might be able to share with us who said this, but that nations are imaginary communities, and he, again, emphasized the importance of the local.

And then, finally, in the solutions realm, Fatimah also talked about the importance of networks and community, and making sure that our communities have the resources they need for political mobilizations. And then, to make change, how network-building is ultimately
what is critical in making sure that we operationalize our collective values.

And again, emphasized the point that locally-owned and homegrown is going to always be the most relevant in generating solutions that we need for our communities. But that also we can benefit from national networks, where we're talking more globally about what is happening to all of our communities in different places and learning from one another.

And then she also talked about the importance of de-programming, decolonizing what we've learned about how to make change, and who has the power to do so. So yes. But that's basically it.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Dona. Thank you so much, everyone, for sharing those summaries of the conversations, and we're going to open it up now for reactions. If folks want to bring up things that also struck you in your own group's conversations or respond to others there, please go ahead and raise your participant hand and we'll get folks in the queue.

And -- great. Courtney, why don't you go right ahead?

MS. ROBINSON: As Bruce mentioned, we were kind of wrapping up, so I kind of want to go back to some of things we were saying towards the end.
We were talking about who gets to define healing and who gets to teach healing. And Miss Vivian, you were saying something, and we got cut off. So I'm hoping you can recall what you were talking about in terms of those thoughts.

REV. NIXON: Yes. I think when you've lived in multiple spaces and on multiple sides of the coin, you're able to hear and see things in a way that, oh, wow, if that group heard that, they would feel alienated. And we do this all the time.

We're in these group conversations. We're speaking. We're making comments, and because we have this particular frame, we tend to almost take sides. Well, if we're on the side of this group that needs healing, then we have to be against this group. But I don't think it's either/or, because at some point, you may have been one side of the coin or the other.

So right now, you know, I've been engaged with a group of young people who are teaching, and some of the members of the class are old enough to be their parents. I'm old enough to be at least two of their grandmothers. And a young man said the other day in class -- he said, I have to confess -- and it's healing work that they're teaching. I have to confess that right now, all the sides of all my trauma triggers are being pulled because there's
the one side of me that felt inadequate because I wasn't educated.

I didn't go to college, and who am I to be doing this work? And in this position to teach this class? And then there's the flip side of me that remembers when I was a kid in the street hanging out and I was teased because I liked to read and I liked books and I liked school.

And he was like, How do we get a point where neither of those things is an absolute? How do we get to a point where people are, as I said yesterday -- that people are allowed to pursue whatever gives them joy, to pursue whatever their purpose is, and are also held accountable to one another so that harm is not something that we do to each other naturally?

And that's how an atmosphere of healing is created. We're always able to somehow picture what the other side looks like, and that's where I was going.

MS. ROBINSON: Thank you.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Vivian. Thank you, Courtney. Other thoughts or reactions folks have?

I'm really interested -- we had some conversation that came up in our room as Dona was talking about, you know, Eric was sharing his experience of bringing his life in the community into a government
structure and being supported in a range of ways in both
of those settings.

So I'm about to put you on the spot, Eric. Did
you want to add anything there?

MR. CUMBERBATCH: Sorry for the delay. I'm
just trying to unmute.

MS. HUFFMAN: No worries. Sorry. I put you
on the spot, but just --

MR. CUMBERBATCH: No. And I appreciate it. I
think I take a lot of time absorbing. I think that these
are all amazing people that are part of this group, and
the contributions are wonderful. So I'm absorbing -- and
in New York, it would be, I'm peeping game. That's sort
of what's happening right now.

But I think -- yeah. You know, really,
representation is key. And to have people -- individuals
that are from the communities, neighborhoods that policies
and procedures are ultimately being played out in and
oftentimes -- or more than not -- most of the time, have
been adverse occurrences and outcomes for that community.

Those are the individuals that you want to hear
from. And those are the individuals that need to be at
the forefront as academics, as researchers, as natural
scholars from navigating rough terrains.

And those are the individuals that I love to
bring not just to the table, but really build plans with: plans on what they're seeing, how systems are hurting them. What are solutions for implementation? And what are the resources needed to get to actual implementation on the ground? And how can government best support those practices?

So a lot of my work is lifting communities and supporting communities, and I don't do that from a bureaucratic approach or stance. I do that because my love for communities that I come from, my love for my people. And I think, you know, it's become such a foreign concept to have love in government or think of leading with love in this space.

And when we talk about a space that's so deeply rooted in punishment and harm, and compare that to other systems, we would never have a teacher hired that doesn't love children, or an athlete that doesn't love the sport they play. But in the justice space, we're almost expected not to lead with love, and to really have this very sterile and black-and-white approach to what engagement looks like.

So for me, I'm really about defining justice by healing, and healing environments that have been harmed historically for centuries, healing individuals that have experienced firsthand harm, healing individuals who caused
harm. And we know when we have all of these sort of components in a healthy estate, then we have the healthiest outcomes.

And that's really a lot of the position of just how I lead and really grateful for the advocacy that we have. People bring it up all the time -- well, in New York, you have so many resources. And well, that's true.

But our greatest resource are actually the residents in New York City. And we have a great wealth of activists and advocates, like the A.T. Mitchells, the Erica Fords, the [indiscernible], and Iesha Sekous, and all of these people that have embraced me and lifted me to these positions to best support and move communities forward.

And, you know, I think we're just blessed with great people, great minds. And those are the minds and people that have to be elevated into positions of power to really move us forward.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Eric. Thank you so much and that just -- you're putting me in mind that on our final day together in two weeks, we're going to be joined by more people from New York to talk about some of that work that you're describing. And so, just really looking forward to learning more and digging in more there.
Jeremy is up next. And then, Nicole will follow Jeremy. So, Jeremy, over to you.

MR. TRAVIS: Thanks, Katharine. So I just want to challenge us to extend our healing boundaries, to have in mind and have in our hearts some people we don't often bring into that healing discussion.

Those of you who were at the Oakland Roundtable will remember the moment -- I mean, it's on one of our videos, Square One videos -- where Eric Gonzalez, who was mentioned earlier today, who is the D.A. here in Brooklyn found it very, very difficult to continue talking when he was acknowledging the role that he and his office had played over many years in putting people in prison.

And if you remember the picture, which I have vividly in my mind, he just quit talking and sort of put his hand down on the microphone and just couldn't move forward. We have a number of members of the Roundtable, of the Square One family -- and I'm thinking here, in particular of our colleague, Nneka, who has written this paper, which is almost ready for publication on reimagining jails as healing facilities.

And she was also at Oakland, and talked a lot about the difficulty and the challenges and the trauma that she faced as a Black woman running the Cook County Jail -- and trained as she is as a psychologist is an
additional layer of complexity. And as we watched the challenges to the system, and some of the challenges to those who are, to use a sort of generic phrase, stakeholders who are running these agencies and have devoted their lives to them -- and some of whom are like Eric and like Nneka and others.

I put Abbey in this category. I think Kris mentioned some of his similar issues. I would put myself in this category, also. People who are just struggling with their professional lives and what they've given their lives to, and the shift in perspective in the country and what it means to the challenges to their own preconceptions of histories.

And in particular, lawyers, who have been the handmaidens of this system as prosecutors, and as defense counsel, and as judges. And when you talk to people these days, talking about going to prosecutors' offices -- which has always been problematic, unless you're going into one of the progressive prosecutors -- the few of them in the country -- I mean, that's just a no-no these days. You don't sign on with the machine.

And for some people, that's their starting point. But there are people who have worked in those systems, many of whom think that they're doing good work. And there's a healing obligation, too, for those
colleagues of ours, and we've tried at each of our Roundtables in Square One to have system actors. You know, police chief, a D.A. coming from the correction system. They are to at least be part of these discussions and maybe some of our best participants.

I think we just have to recognize that there's a level of different complexity for those who are feeling like they're doing their life's work when their professional aspirations are being challenged as being part of a system of oppression, which may be true. That doesn't mean that they're not hurting.

So it's just -- I mean, when we think about our healing obligations. I just want to put them in our minds and hearts as well. I've no answer, no next step other than just remembering Eric's face as he sat next to me in Oakland. He was in pain.

MS, HUFFMAN: Thanks, Jeremy. Nicole, over to you.

MS. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: Well, this is an ironic comment. I remember that well. I was the person presenting about violence committed by prosecutors in Chicago, and I took Eric's comment as very sincere.

And within about a half hour ago, he has just been tweeting out that Brooklyn is back. They conducted the first jury trial in Brooklyn since March. A man has
been released since 2020 and he'll now be sent to a cage for no less than 3.5 years, up to 15 during a pandemic, and he was just saying, My dedicated prosecutors are ready to continue conducting trials. The communication director says, Brooklyn's back.

And I think one of the key issues is that four days ago, cops had the pretextual stop and murder of Daunte Wright in Minneapolis. And today now, the same Brooklyn D.A. that was in front of all of us looking kind of hurt by the role that he may have played and made a commitment to all of us in public that he would do better, celebrates that a man's been pretextually stopped for tinted windows, and he'll now be in prison between 3.5 years to 15 years for gun possession.

And, you know, I struggle with this. I mean, the fact that it just literally happened 30 minutes ago on Twitter, and it's being adjudicated by the public, leads to my larger comment was that sometimes we are under -- or these officials are under lots of pressure to still continue the political rewards of tough on crime.

And so, whatever commitment Eric made to all of us at Oakland, his communications director certainly didn't get the message. Maybe his staff -- the rank and file prosecutors that provide additional pressure when he gets back. The judges that are elected by being more
punitive, by incarcerating more people. More guilty
verdicts, right? Prosecutors are still promoted based on
convictions and not based on dropping charges when it's
just.

And I think this is the hard part, is that the
work that I do is very critical. And this idea of coming
to the table with, say, I don't know -- the new director
of the Chicago Cook County Jail, Tom Dart. Tom Dart has
positioned himself as a reformer.

He could easily be sitting at the table with
all of us saying that he has his values in the right spot,
saying that the largest provider of mental health services
is the Cook County Jail. Yet when he was required or
urged by almost every city leader and medical professional
to release people during the initial pandemic, he had to
be sued and forced to do it.

And then once he did release people and it
started to manage the COVID spread, he then used it to
spin that it was his will that did it, when you can
actually see the court records that don't tell that same
story. And so I struggle, because I think some of my
biggest wins in terms of advocacy have not been through
sitting at a table healing, but they've been, in some
ways, forcing the hand of public officials.

And I guess I want to put that out there,
because I think we have a responsibility not just to sit at the table and make amends and heal. Because this Tom Dart -- for instance, you know, I wrote a piece about a sheriff mocking torture in the jail, knowing about torture in the Cook County Jail, doing so in front of a crowded room of people of color waiting for their loved ones to be released, terrifying every single person.

I'm not sure I want to heal at a table with a leader that condones that. And I don't know if I want to heal at a table with a communication director that spins that as something not so bad. Because at the heart of it, that makes me complicit.

And what I want to do is have ethical standards that draw a wall that say, This is the standards for which we stand for or I stand for, and when political leaders fall short of those standards, I will be the first one to speak out, even if that's a person I partnered with in the past. I think that is the ethical responsibility that we have.

That is how I sleep at night. And if that means, you know, we don't make friends or we don't pass a budget together or we -- I'm not sure -- have bipartisan support -- I don't know if it's a trade off. But I'm putting it out there because sometimes the actors that I've seen are so violent that I don't believe we can
partner with them and share the same values.

I will never be able to align with torture in the Cook County Jail. I will never be able to. I will never be able to say that that could be a healing institution until I acknowledge openly that they have engaged in human rights violation.

I cannot sit down with the Chicago Police without saying they executed Fred Hampton. They've executed and assaulted people in their homes. They've done it for generations. I cannot sit down at the same table.

So what's left is, what I joke is the hatchet. I shame you. I call you out. I expose you with either data or narratives or stories, but I make sure that the truth be told. And if the court system can't provide justice for us, then being a truth-teller is all we've got.

Because as we see, sometimes the worst part of these murders -- the murder of George Floyd or the murder of Adam Toledo -- is the violence itself, but then, the spin. The spin that conceals and covers it up. And so, I think as reformers and as people who want to change the system, these are the higher order callings that we have to reconcile.

When do we sit down to heal? And when do we
say enough's enough and we need to burn it all down? It's hard.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thanks, Nicole. Thank you very much.

Pastor Mike, you're up next. And then Dona.

REV. McBRIDE: I remember when I was in Ferguson. One of the times we got arrested -- myself, Cornel West, a few of us were getting booked in the jail and I had my San Francisco Hunters Point mean mug on. I was just mean mugging every single cop. You know, every single -- that was booking me.

And Dr. West is like, Oh, God bless you. Thank you, dear brother. Thank you, dear brother, as they're, Oh, we need to fingerprint you, Doctor. Oh. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, dear brother. Thank you, dear sister.

And he's calling the folks that are booking us, Dear brother, Dear sister. And I'm coming up behind him mean mugging all of them. Like, you know -- I didn't cuss at them because I still had my collar on, but that's what I was thinking in my mind, right.

So after we got processed, we're sitting in a cell together. I said, Doc, why are you calling these people, Dear brother, Dear sister? Man, like, we're out here getting our heads cracked. He said, Oh, dear Brother
McBride, Brother McBride, Brother McBride. Always leave the porch light on, because you never know when they're going to want to come home.

And, you know, I didn't appreciate what he said at the time, and some days I still don't. But I do wrestle with this idea of what does it mean to keep the porch light on so folks can come home. Which means that I never give up on the possibility of people experiencing transformation, even if it's not at the pace that I would want them to experience it.

But I do believe that we have to make sure we're defining what home is, right? And I don't believe that home -- or, at least, the arrival or destination for many of us, who, through the course of our lives, have been elevated to positions to oversee spaces of systemic and structural violence unbeknownst to us.

Home is not having a personal transformation, and then going back to those systems and continuing to superintend in the same way. I think home is realizing that if I am an agent of this oppression and I have a personal transformation, then I must continue to be willing to be critiqued until I am an agent of liberation. And I think that is the distinction that I want to continue to make, and I want to be held accountable to as a faith leader, as an organizer, as a citizen of this
world. You know, none of us can do this work from a perfect place. We all have our foibles. We all have our needs, as Vivian has profoundly stated, to be healed along the way continuously.

But when we are a part of a system that continues to literally take the lives of our family members and loved ones and we personalize the critique of those who are trying to remind us how death-dealing that system is, then I think that we must make it a station between the protagonist and the antagonist in the story, right. And so, I still have to say I do think it's really important for us to have space for folks to be at tables where it may not be clear or may be very clear where they sit in the kind of constellation of either status quo reform or revolutionary.

But I think we must not allow their presence to either mute the continued truth-telling that has to happen in order for systems and conditions to be changed. We should always, I think, create space for them to be there, as long as they are willing to be willing to hear and absorb the criticism that comes with their superintendence of systems that continue, literally, to take the lives of folks, to try to cover up those dastardly deeds, to spin it and make it appear like we're all being gaslit.

And it is those conditions, literally, right
now that many of us are enduring. I mean, we are being
gaslit every day now. There are more law enforcement --
former law enforcement folks on cable news trying to
explain to all of us why we are not seeing what we're
seeing.

I mean, there used to be some balance. They
used to have, like, an activist and a law enforcement.

Now, I just see only former cops on cable news trying to
explain how a 26-year-old veteran can mistake a taser for
a gun. And we extend compassion to them and not to the
person whose family's literally openly mourning on TV.

That is a form of terror in my mind that this
whole experience of reimagining public safety, to the
point where now people who were in political office that
literally a year ago did not want to reimagine public
safety are now using the language of reimagining public
safety as a way to try to co-opt the whole movement
itself.

And so, I do want to leave the porch light on,
but I also want those who say they are coming home to be
willing to sit in the tension of what that actually
means. You can't be the emperor in the empire, and then,
show up to the rebellion the next day and say you are the
leader of the rebellion.

There has to be a cooling-off period, I guess
is what I'm saying.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Pastor Mike. Dona, you're up, and then, we'll go to Keith.

DR. MURPHEY: Yes. So, Nicole, what you said super resonates with me. Like, I've been a part of so many conversations like this, where there are attempts to bring together people who are kind of part of the establishment, and they're basically perpetuating systems of harm. And then, people who are activists who are really trying to transform the systems.

And it does make me wonder. For the people who ostensibly commit to changing their practice, who haven't really demonstrated that in the past -- who don't really have political motive to really change what they're doing anyway presently -- are they really going to change?

But what they're telling me, and I've seen this many times, is that they don't ultimately change. That they don't actually substantiate what's happening in these kinds of conversations.

I don't think that that's everyone, though. So like to Pastor Mike's point -- I think there are some people who will change, right? So I absolutely agree that there has to be space for that.

I mean, this, at the end of the day, is why I'm like, Thank God for democracy. Democracy allows us to be
like, See ya. You know? Like, we gave you your chance and you didn't show up. So goodbye. You know?

I mean, I'm so grateful that we have a system, and this is why we have to do everything possible to preserve the things in democracy that allow the system to actually be truly reflective of the people. And I think the way that democracy has meant to be instituted in this country, it's not truly democratic. We know that by things like the electoral college, for instance. By things like voter suppression that's going on everywhere.

So it's like there are barriers in place from us living out democracy in the way that I think it should be lived out if all of us were showing up.

If we actually had ethnic studies in our schools and kids were really learning about their histories and embracing the contributions that all of our communities have made to this country, understanding fundamentally all of the harm that has been perpetrated by the various actors -- that, I think, would empower us all to really be engaged in these power structures and our democracy would be much healthier than it is right now.

But I do think that democracy, fundamentally, provides the opportunity for change and -- yeah. That's why it works to do what you do, which is to show up in the streets and be like, This is wrong. Right? And I'm going
to speak out about it. I'm not going to be quiet.

The other thing I also wanted to kind of invite everyone to do, because this is something that I think about on a constant basis -- I'm constantly reflecting on this -- is that we all are complicit. We live in a society that is fundamentally premised on exploitation and extraction. All of us do.

You know, I thought about this when some of my friends years ago decided that they were going to pull out from Amazon. I'm not going to be an Amazon Prime member anymore, and I was like, Oh, God. But it's so convenient. It's so convenient.

But, you know, Amazon supports ICE. Right? Microsoft supports ICE. Are we going to pull out from all of these things? If we don't, aren't we complicit?

All of us are supporting these systems at some level. So it's like your comfort and the proximity to harm -- that's what it is at the end of the day. Right? And when your community is being directly harmed, of course, you're going to want to show up.

There's a necessity for you to show up almost, right? Other people who don't experience that, they sit apart from it. They're not going to necessarily show up. They don't feel the pressure. The necessity isn't there.
So, you know, those folks, in my judgment, just shouldn't be sitting there. They shouldn't be sitting in positions of influence or positions of power if ultimately the policies are going to impact people who don't look like them.

And again, thank God for democracy.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Dona. Thank you so much.

We had a quick insistent wave from Nicole. I'm going to give you the floor for a moment. And then, we'll go to Keith. No apologies necessary. Okay. Go ahead.

MS. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: I wanted to just make a quick clarification that we've lived in a time where so many elected officials have really gained from tough-on-crime punitive practices. And I think the new hope for me is that if we can make it politically disadvantageous when people are overtly punitive, when people violate their power -- when we expose that, and then, educate voters. That, to me, is another, I think, short-term goal for transformation is that people can be equally scared of the other side.

And I think we see that in local D.A.s losing races. And so, it happened in Philly, and it happened in Chicago, and it happened in the district where Tamir Rice was shot. It can happen. Right?
And so, when that happens, that momentum is something we can capitalize on. So I bring in that more critical point. I just wanted to end on that part, which is that that can have political momentum, as long as we're not scared to throw the hatchet when necessary.

Thank you.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Nicole. Thanks.

Keith, over to you. And then, Gabe, you'll follow.

MR. WATTLEY: Thanks. What I hear in what Nicole shared, especially just at the end, is talking about accountability. You know, I've seen a lot of accountability in prison, but not because they're in prison.

Prison's kind of the opposite of accountability. Prison's just about punishment. But I've seen it when people who are in prison create communities of other people in prison to whom they're accountable.

And it's a public declaration. First, ownership and telling of the truth -- who've they've been, who they've harmed, how've they've been, and a declaration that they're going to be and do something different. And that it's public in a group of people who will hold them accountable.

It's a safe space, so they don't fear physical
harm because one's going to be vulnerable in a space like that. But there's a shared agreement that folks are there to change their lives. And they do it publicly and when they fall short, they're reminded. They're called out. There's a consequence to the community.

And it seems like a missing piece when public officials make these proclamations, declarations. Usually, they don't tell enough of the truth first. And then, even when they do, it's not clear that there's that much of a consequence.

I mean, I think as Nicole offered some examples of what negative consequences can do. People talk about shaming. Shaming can be a great motivator, and I think we don't take enough advantage of that opportunity. I think we should do that.

I think the thing I was also reflecting on here in California -- just about how we make all these statements about how we want to change. We want to have a progressive system. We have dramatically reduced our prison population. Yet even last year during the pandemic, we had the lowest rate of parole grants in seven years.

Only 16 percent of the scheduled parole hearings resulted in parole grants in California. California has almost 40,000 people serving life
sentences, and we continue to avoid the tough discussions about how we are treating disproportionately Black and Brown people as the most violent, feared.

We basically still consider them super-predators who never had a chance to change. And we still claim to have a progressive state because we haven't held elected officials accountable to doing something different -- to having different policies, different practices.

And so, we're going to continue to get what we got until we change that. But the accountability piece is missing.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Keith. Gabe, over to you.

REV. SALGUERO: I think -- can you all hear me? Thank you.


REV. SALGUERO: This last session is quite difficult. I almost lowered my hand and withdrew because first of all, I hear the word progressive a lot. I'm not sure what it means. You know, I'd like a working definition.

And I hear the word accountability and I'd like to unpack accountability. I agree with what I think I hear most people saying, and this is what I hear. It may
not be what people are saying, so please correct me.

You know, accountability -- some people have -- there's disparate amount of powers, right? So an attorney general is not the same as Jane Doe or Juanita Doe citizen in terms of power and impact that their decisions make. And so, as to quote popular culture, With great power should come great accountability.

I'm changing the actual phrase, right. It was great responsibility, but there should be great accountability, and that's for all of you Marvel fans. That's from Spiderman.

And so, I used to live in New York. I'm born and raised there. Now I live in the south. Never get it wrong, Orlando, Florida is the south in many ways.

And so, when I hear that promises are broken, I agree that there's accountability. There should be accountability.

I'm looking at the Chauvin case, clearly, and I remind people that's the Chauvin case. Right? He's on the trial. It's not the George Floyd case. Okay? It's the George Floyd murder, but it's the Chauvin case.

He's being tried, and what accountability looks like there. And we'll see in the days and weeks to come. And the list goes on and on.

And so, I think that me, as a pastor, when I'm
dealing especially with my counterparts who we tussle with a great deal, white Evangelicals, who oftentimes have not had the experience I have, who do not get it, and take different perspectives. Not always, but oftentimes on issues of justice and criminal justice, and incarceration, and parole -- everything like that.

But one of the things they say to me is, You know, Gabe -- well, when they really want to kind of hold me to it, they're like, Pastor Gabe -- when they start the word with Pastor, I know they're trying to tell me something. Say, Pastor Gabe, you say you want criminal justice reform for some people and you want the justice system to meet mercy, but for other people, you want heavier sentences.

And so the argument becomes about consistency. The consistency of my position across the criminal justice system. That is, I think, a fair question, even though it's historically uninformed and doesn't understand the unequal distribution of power and politics and race and all of that. But from their kind of very myopic lens, I think what they're trying to say is if I want criminal justice reform and if I talk about parole, when I hold other people accountable, what is the equivalent to that?

That is a difficult conversation for me to have. It's also difficult across generations. So I'm
Latino. I've been pulled over for DWB -- driving while Brown. I worked at Princeton for a while and was asked, even though I was in academia, what am I doing in this neighborhood? And I was like, I'm going to my office.

So I get that. But I just -- when I have this conversation with my parents, who are Boomers, and I think some people posted that -- a few times a generational divide -- they, too, ask me what is my consistency. Even though they have had similar experience, and my father is a formerly incarcerated person.

And so, in our breakaway session, the word paradox and tension came up about six or seven times, and in that conversation, the paradox and tension was tied to the credibility of the movement. I don't have an answer, but I do know those are the questions I have. Not with academia. Not with my fellow academics. Not with activists or advocates. With people who go to my church every Sunday from every walk of life. Some with PhDs and some who are formerly incarcerated persons and are illiterate, and everywhere in between.

And so, how do we deal with the consistency of accountability, even as we talk about reform, transformation, undoing, whatever -- wherever you fall on that spectrum. And I think that's a very sincere question for the credibility of the movement in the communities.
where I serve, and these are communities of color.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Gabe. Thank you very much. Thanks to everyone for those comments. Really, really appreciate this conversation.

So we're going to be turning to Bruce in just a couple minutes to kind of wrap us up from our day. Before we do that, if anyone has any last thoughts, feel free to raise your hand.

REV. NIXON: I can't see my raised hand button right now. My eyes --

MS. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: It's okay. I'll just interrupt you.

REV. NIXON: You know, in a world where doing the work that we do, whether we're doing it from the point of view of a researcher, an academic -- from a service provider or an on-the-ground activist -- or someone who works in government and is really trying to do the right thing -- and I have to believe that some people in government are.

So no matter where you're doing this work from, the fact that it has become professionalized at every level, from the grassroots activists to the high level official in government, this work has become professionalized. It has become an industry. No one can deny that. There's too much evidence out there about
where all the philanthropic dollars are going.

And that has had an impact on the way the work is done, on the risks people are willing to take. And I think at the end, we each have to find where our own center is -- our own moral center, our own center of values, and decide where the line is drawn.

And then, when the line is crossed, what is our response going to be? And it doesn't have to be in unison, because my response may not be public shaming. It may be a private conversation.

But if your response is public shaming, that has to be okay with me. Because you know what? You have a right to that.

But the rule for me, if we want a world with less harm is going to be done to groups of people who have historically been harmed, then we have to take on the motto, First, do no harm. And that doesn't mean let people slide. It just means doing harm is an active decision to almost participate in the same systems that have destroyed my ancestors and wants to destroy my nieces and nephews.

And that's difficult. It's not easy because it's not instinct. It's a choice.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Vivian. Thank you very much. Thanks to everybody who's been sharing your
thoughts.

So, Bruce, I'm going to hand it over to you for a few minutes to help wrap us up a little bit. And then, we'll talk about where we go from here with our conversations next week.

Bruce?

MR. WESTERN: Yeah. Boy, this was a very strong conversation for me. My summary is not very tidy.

So we began this morning with Monica and Leah, the two big themes I saw in the morning's conversation -- we started with values. That was the charge.

But then, we turned to politics and the tension between politics and values, these relatively contextless statements of principle. And politics makes things complicated because it is the context, and politics can divert us from principle.

And then, after our break, we heard from our three blog authors for whom healing was a central theme, and healing, I think could be a central value. Certainly, that's how I heard Abbey, Keith, and Fatimah. And it's important because healing puts harm at the center of any project and it's an alternative to a punitive response to harm.

So for me, that's a lot of possibility in that idea. And included in a project of healing are people who
have harmed others, and they themselves are candidates from healing, as I heard that discussion.

And then, in this most recent conversation, we've returned to the theme of politics again. So we're iterating between the theme of values and politics. And the question that has come up for us is to whom do we extend this value of healing, right?

And as Gabe put it, this question -- this very vexing question of consistency. If we want to see healing in the communities that have been so victimized by mass incarceration and over-policing -- and that's coming from a place of compassion and connectedness -- do we extend the project of healing to others that have harmed? The officials that have staffed the whole edifice of mass incarceration. Do we keep the porch light on, as Pastor Mike says?

And we're divided over that question, and there are ways -- I see constructive signs of how to think about that question in the conversation. We can think of accountability as part of a healing process and that's helpful for thinking of the status of our officials, and we should be thinking about accountability for them. We may be able to think about shaming, as Keith said.

John Braithwaite, the criminological theorist talks about reintegrative shaming. There is a positive
role for shaming, in his view, that brings people back in
to the social compact. Maybe that's a way of keeping the

porch light on.

And then, the final thing for me this whole
day, there's been this sort of subtext running through
it. You know, this is kind of the magic of the Roundtable
for me that things come out that I don't expect.

And so, a third piece of this is this question
about our own conduct. What does -- to conduct ourselves
morally in this work, what does that mean? And Vivian
spoke to this at the end. I felt that Kris and others
have been speaking to this, too, throughout the day.

I've got to think about this idea that Vivian
put on the table that there's a tension between
professionalization and moral conduct. And I think part
of it is to do with -- professionalization, in part, is a
structure of rewards. And for us to access those
rewards -- for us to advance professionally, we may be
motivated to do things that divert us from our own moral
commitments, and we may cause harm as a consequence.
Right? Embracing our professional role and the rewards
that it offers, and certainly, we see in the officials
that we have issues with.

But Vivian is saying, you know -- as I hear
Vivian -- we should turn that lens on ourselves as well.
So then I come to the end of today, I think, with more questions than answers, which is why we're just at the end of day one, I guess.

So I just think you guys are brilliant. And, yeah, we've got more work to do.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thank you, Bruce. Thank you so much, and just huge thanks to everyone for being here around this table with us and the sustained energy and engagement and commitment to having these conversations, even as there is so much happening in everyone's lives and in our communities and our world otherwise.

So with that, we'll be wrapping up for today, and I just have a few things to remind folks about. Next week, we have a similar schedule to what we had this week. We'll be gathering on Thursday evening. And then, gathering again on Friday for the afternoon, or for the six hours, depending on where you are in the country.

On Thursday evening, we'll gather as a group first at 5 o'clock for some continued conversation and reflections from this conversation -- from what folks have had a chance to think about and bring to it after having a period of time to reflect a bit when we connect together.

And then, we'll all join the keynote event for this Roundtable, a conversation on reckoning with the justice system. That'll be a conversation between Daryl
Atkinson, the founder and co-director of Forward Justice, and Marlon Peterson, who's the host of the Decarcerated podcast, and the founder and chief re-imaginator of the Precedential Group.

I think many folks know both of them. As I said before, they've been parts of our Roundtables and played different roles in the past, and just really looking forward to that conversation between the two of them.

And then, we'll open up to a little bit of a Q and A from this group, and also from others who may be watching the livestream of that conversation.

Then, on Friday, we'll join again at 6:00, and we're going to be building off of this conversation. We have some really interesting sessions that I think are going to build on this conversation today -- this last conversation, especially.

We're going to be talking about the irreducible minimum and abolition. We'll have opening remarks there, similar to the way that we did this afternoon. Our colleagues Marcia and Jonathan and Nneka will present some opening thoughts, and you all already have the materials that they've put together to start that discussion.

And then, we'll break out into breakout sessions and come back together again. Similarly, we'll
follow in the afternoon with a discussion on operationalizing the values of justice, and discussion about what the guiding principles of that could like.

That'll be led by Danielle Allen, who participated in our fourth Roundtable, and we'll open that up. And then, we'll have a full group discussion there, as well.

So you'll be receiving the information -- the papers from both Danielle Allen and, actually, also the final paper that you still don't have, which is written by Danielle Sered and our other Square One colleague, Amanda Alexander. Both of those are papers that are not yet available publicly. And so, they'll be coming to you directly.

And we'll again, ask you not to circulate those, as with Monica's paper from earlier today just because they're still pre-publication. But wanted everyone to have those thoughts and information in advance.

So with that, I will wrap us up for the day. Again, with just huge gratitude to each and every one of you for what you've brought to this today, and for what you'll carry from this and bring back to us next week.

We just really, really appreciate that and you are really informing the work that we're doing at Square
One, and also, will give us a lot to work with as we move forward together over the next couple weeks. So thank you for that.

So with that, happy Friday to everyone. I hope folks have some moment of rest coming to you in whatever way that might look like. And we'll look forward to seeing you next week.

Thanks, everyone.

(Whereupon, the Roundtable was recessed, to resume Thursday, April 22, 2021.)
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