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MR. TRAVIS: Hello, everybody, and welcome back to this next session of the Square One Roundtable. I'm Jeremy Travis, and pleased to be with you, and pleased to welcome people back after a remarkable discussion last night.

Our theme for this meeting of the Roundtable, which is spread over three days, is to explore the value of values, the ways in which we aspire to and operationalize certain values for the workings of our approach to harm, approach to restoration, our approach to accountability.

What are the values that we would like to ensure, or guideposts to that work, in the future and the work we do today, and our personal commitment to this work? So it's been a great discussion so far, rich beyond our wildest dreams. And today is a continuation of that very deep, very -- sometimes very personal, very emotional exploration of this question of values.

So I'd like to just quickly go over the agenda that we have for today, just to make sure that we're all oriented and grounded in the journey ahead. We'll spend the next 20 minutes or so, half-hour, reflecting on last night's presentation and discussion -- conversation really, between Marlon Peterson and Daryl Atkinson, which
was so thought-provoking and so timely and so lively.

It's great to see them interact with each other. They gave us a lot to think about. That was very, very salient as we think about the question of values, and as we move into this larger discussion that we're going to have today about the tension between the abolition aspirations and the question, what is an irreducible minimum, as to what role the state should play or a response should look like for these issues that are so complex.

So in many ways, last night was a great pivot. So we will have this discussion for -- just to reflect on that a bit, and then we have -- three of our colleagues have written blog posts that have been distributed beforehand. We will ask them to summarize those, their observations, their contributions.

Each one of them is -- sort of stands on its own, and together, they're a very powerful, powerful mix. So we'll hear from Marcia and Jonathan and -- Jon Simon and Nneka.

And then we'll -- about 10 minutes to the hour or so, we'll go into breakout rooms with the magic of Zoom that can do this for us. We don't even have to think about it. We'll end up with colleagues who we get to spend some more time together in a smaller setting.
And in each of those, there's been one of our colleagues who's been designated to listen carefully and take careful notes of the conversation and report it back to the larger group. And there's a Square One staff person assigned to each breakout session, who will also be listening with that goal in mind, to make sure that we capture everything that happens in those discussions.

Just speaking personally, I really treasure the time that we had in the small breakout sessions last week. It was really a good way to interact in a different modality.

This is a large screen. It's almost a sort of formalistic conversation, even though it gets to be very lively. But it's really great to have those highly informal, small group discussions.

So then after the breakout reports, we will take a break at 3:30 Eastern time, for a grand total of 15 minutes. We're really generous with time here. Fifteen minutes, we know, that it is probably more than you need, but we'll ask you to come back at 3:45.

And then Katharine will take over, and what a treat we have in store for us, here in the Roundtable and for those who get to watch this on YouTube. Danielle Allen, who has been a participant in the Square One discussions that we had on the social contract and wrote a
paper for that Roundtable meeting, she will be interviewed by Katharine about some of her thoughts on values and the role of values, and what are the guiding principles that we should keep in mind as we reimagine justice.

So that will be a discussion that we will participate in, but we will also hear the back-and-forth between Katharine and Danielle, which will be great. And then at quarter to 6:00, Eastern time, we'll ask Bruce Western to do that which he does so well, which is to help make sense out of the journey that we've traveled throughout the day.

So tomorrow is our final day of the Roundtable, writ large, with a capital R, results of the final day of this Roundtable session, and we'll talk about -- I'm sorry, not tomorrow -- next week. And we'll talk about what is ahead, as we wrap it up. So that's where we're headed.

And we're going to start with some reflections on the discussion last night between Marlon and Daryl. And as I said, I found it to be just the perfect table setting for today, in part because they teed up the issue of abolition versus -- we're using the phrase “irreducible minimum,” just perfectly for us.

But we also thought about the role of values, and you will recall that Daryl at one point had this nice
riff where he talked about moving from should to must to shall. Here's what we should do. There's an urgency. Here's what we must do.

And then there's this commitment: here's what we shall do. So then I think that captured some of our feeling within the Square One team and network that we want to not just be aspirational, but actually commit to change.

Big discussion last night also about this question about -- and the way that Marlon phrased it was, is the state equipped to follow the values that we might aspire to in our should/must/shall progression? And a great discussion really should be highlighted, I think, on racialized capitalism, just naming that and having that be foregrounded as an impediment. Can the state, can the system, can what's been created in this country ever aspire to the values that we might hold out?

And you know, at one point Daryl said, I just don't see it. I actually don't see this being possible, in his sort of deeper reflections about whether that can be created in this society, particularly for communities of color.

But at the same time, there was this discussion that went back and forth about how do we think about restoration? How do we think about reconciliation? How
do we think about some of the values as being operationalized in the moment or in the -- at a community level?

Marlon talked about what he called, sort of, the root exploration, exploration of the roots, R-O-O-T-S, going deep to see what's behind conflicts, what's behind problems, and not simply reacting to what happens in the moment. So who does that work? How is that work done, if that's important work to be done?

So there was a lot of ground covered last night. And I’ll end with something that I found, again, particularly insightful from Daryl, which was -- he talked about the underutilized muscles, the underdeveloped muscles in the movement.

And I think that's what this -- for me, that's what the Square One Project has been about, is just sort of -- what are the muscles that we need? What are the muscles that are underdeveloped? The way he framed it was, what are we for?

And that's the pivot to today's discussion about operationalizing values. So I would just ask anybody who'd like to offer their reflections on our discussion last night, and we'll then, 12:30 or so, tee up Marcia to be very direct about some of her thoughts.

And for this purpose, please also use the blue
hand signal that you would like to be called upon, and we'll spend some time getting your reflections on last night. And for those of you who couldn't make it last night, I just encourage you to find it on YouTube.

It was a really, really spectacular discussion.

MS. HUFFMAN: I think Monica has her hand raised, Jeremy.

MR. TRAVIS: There we go, and now I see it. Yes. Monica and then Courtney. Thanks.

Thanks, Katharine.

MS. BELL: Also, I mean, I think I share, in just really finding the conversation last night to have been provocative and important. And one of the things that stood out to me -- I guess, you know, I kind of come away from that conversation, and particularly the -- basically the -- I want to call it [audio distorted], but I'll say a different one: pessimism, and where that takes us, versus abolitionism and where that takes us is, like, you know, the -- kind of, how do we get from here to wherever we're going.

Like, how to motivate work here right now, given that there's not a plan to take us all out of here right now. So like, how to sustain labor, if that's one's view, I think, is just something that, you know, I have certainly been thinking about in terms of -- especially in
You know, how possible, I guess, do you have to think actual, full-on abolition is, in order to work toward it in the here and now. So you know --

MR. TRAVIS: Great. Thanks. Courtney, your thoughts from last night.

MS. ROBINSON: So it was such a great conversation and so much to take away from it. But for some reason, I kept really thinking about the value of forgiveness, and how is forgiveness tied to abolitionist work.

And is there -- can we garner enough forgiveness to really get to where we're trying to go? I just think about this in terms of -- I guess we're doing this live. So for people who are unaware, my father was incarcerated when I was six months old, spent 10 years in prison. And our path to forgiveness took 20 years, and this is someone who I am intimately connected to.

And so what does that mean, if we say that we have a value of forgiveness? It is: who are we forgiving? How are we forgiving? And what is the journey towards forgiveness? And how do we sustain the labor in forgiving?

So that sort of kept coming up for me, as I thought about abolitionist approaches.
MR. TRAVIS: Yeah. I think the mention -- the focus on forgiveness as a value really struck a chord. And I noticed in the group that gathered after, after we sort of went off-camera, that some of our colleagues said, that's the hardest one for me, personally.

And even if it is a value, and recognizing what you said, Courtney, that the question is, how do you hold that and for how long, and what does that journey look like? Is that still the aspiration? And to state that aspiration is, for some people, just very difficult.

I was also impressed that that was given so much attention last night. Jon?

DR. SIMON: It was an amazing conversation. I didn’t know either Marlon or Daryl well beforehand, but I'm certainly going to plunge into their written and spoken word. I found it -- I put in the chat, a sort of Du Bois-ian moment.

I mean, I kept thinking of W.E.B. Du Bois, that deep commitment to American struggle and history, but also recognition that maybe we just need to leave, as Daryl put it, at some point. And Du Bois ended his life in Ghana, I believe.

And I've often -- I mean, Bruce will attest to this. I mean, sociology has belatedly discovered Du Bois as its founder, and I don't think he was being taught or
Monica was even being taught as part of the canon in your sociology theory class. Now, we've decided he's -- and I think the great book by Aldon Morris, *The Scholar Denied*, certainly lays a foundation for it.

But his notion of double-consciousness was very much on my mind when I was listening to Marlon and Daryl, because the power of being able to see the possibilities, but also the realities of the white vision or the whiteness as a veil over your lived reality and the harm that does, but also the power from that vision, was definitely present last night.

MR. TRAVIS: Yeah. That was a great chat contribution last night. Jon, I appreciated it. Very thought-provoking and good historical reference.

Dona?

DR. MURPHEY: Do I take my own hand down there?

MR. TRAVIS: It should happen.

DR. MURPHEY: Okay.

MR. TRAVIS: Yeah.

DR. MURPHEY: Yeah. I also was thinking a lot about forgiveness or redemption. And I don't think that there is going to be, like, a single definition of this that we converge upon. I also don't think that it is static.

I think it's dynamic, even as we, you know,
maybe come closer to a shared understanding of what that looks like. I think that also changes, like, depending on a lot of different circumstances.

And I think that what is really fundamental, so like, operationalizing that, is to just be in continuous conversation with the stakeholders. That is just, I think, the fundamental thing we have to be doing, because it's not something that we can be prescriptive about, I don't think. Right?

Like, as this country changes in its demography, like, I think -- as a lot of things change, right. As technology changes us, like, as a lot of things are in flux, I don't think we can be super prescriptive about what that looks like. But I think what we can be prescriptive about is that it has to be inclusive, and it has to be continuous.

Yeah.

MR. TRAVIS: Great. Thank you so much for that. And last night, you also referenced, Dona, which I appreciated, the importance of inclusion of immigrant communities in the larger coalition as having a different but very real experience with marginalization and oppression.

Part of that conversation is very much underway, I think. So we need to keep that in mind as
well.

Bruce?

MR. WESTERN: I'd like to sort of pose a question to the group about, you know, what do we think forgiveness should look like? And so you know, one model I think of is South Africa's truth and reconciliation process. And the ground rules of that process is that, you know, people from the apartheid regime, individuals from the apartheid regime, would appear before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. And they would give a full accounting of what they did, and you know, all of the harms that they perpetrated.

And they were significantly immunized from any of the acts, of the violence that they perpetrated. And in a sense, that was a type of forgiveness, right? In exchange for truth, they would be immunized. So that's one kind of model.

And so they had an active role in that too. They had to come forward to the truth and reconciliation process and make a full accounting of what they did. So forgiveness doesn't depend just on the aggrieved party. It also depends a lot on the responsible party as well. So what would we think a process would look like?

I think we've got some clues, right -- with --
I think, Susan Glisson, in an earlier meeting, is -- you know, she reminds us that these are often importantly local processes, in which we're talking about the harms that have been confronted by specific communities in specific times and places and so on.

And so I sort of put that to the group. If we're to get more granular and concrete, what sort of forgiveness process do we feel like could be a foundation for more foundational change?

MR. TRAVIS: Bruce, and just to back that up one step, there's a question of what sort of acknowledgment of harm is required before you can even have that subsequent conversation. So you don't move to forgiveness right away.

Right? You have to -- there has to be some -- and I think this is what Dona was saying, and Courtney as well -- there has to be some process. There has to be some engagement --

MR. WESTERN: Absolutely.

MR. TRAVIS: -- between the parties.

So you referenced a state-sponsored engagement that becomes individualized, and that's one model we could think about. But certainly, forgiveness at an individual level requires some acknowledgment of harm, and we've seen that a bit.
Kris, you’re up next.

MR. STEELE: Thank you. Just in response to Bruce's question, and then reflecting on last night, two things that were very meaningful to me were, first of all, I think it was Bruce who raised that connection may be the antidote to violence.

And in addition to that, I think the statement was also made that banishment is not forgiveness. And I think that forgiveness includes validation. I think it includes hard work. It includes relationship, community, and restoration for both the individual who may have made a mistake, but also for the survivor.

And so it's -- I just don't think that -- I think it is absolutely a process, Jeremy, as you say, but I think it includes all of those elements, and ultimately, it ends probably in community.

MR. TRAVIS: Monica, we'd love to hear your thoughts.

MS. BELL: Yeah. So I mean, I’m really intrigued in the conversation about forgiveness. But I want to sort of ask in a clarifying way, forgiveness for what? Like, because I actually think the specific things, the specific issues would require different types of processes for forgiveness.

So it seems, like, implicit, I think, in a lot
of our conversation, is thinking about, like, you know --
this imagining particular sources of infractions, like,
individuals, like interpersonal violence or something like
that.

But when I'm thinking about forgiveness, at
least right now, I'm thinking about structural violence,
and like --

MR. TRAVIS: Right, right.

MS. BELL: -- violence. And then also think --
I mean, if you want to take it back to individuals, I
think the types of forgiveness structures that are needed
in an anti-carceral way for certain types of white-collar
crimes. Like, those create certain types of harms, and
the strategies for forgiveness would have to be different.

I think, at the very least -- so to take it
back to that, like, idea of the truth and reconciliation,
people acknowledging the harm they've created is one piece
of things. But of course, the earlier piece is hearing
about those harms from people who have been affected by
them in a deep way.

Because one of the problems, like, in the
American reparations conversation, for example, is there
are, like, all kinds of harms that have been exacted by
multiple systems of racial injustice. And it's hard
for -- A, it's hard for people to really understand them
in the moment, like, what -- the full nature of harm.

But beyond that, like -- I guess there's, like -- to me, it's hard to have a conversation about forgiveness, I guess is what I'm saying. It's hard for me to have a conversation about forgiveness if -- to have that be foregrounded, when it seems like a big part of thinking about forgiveness -- once we move past what I think the level is we're, like, imagining, is deep repair -- is, like, actual, not just accountability, but the restoration of people to -- and communities to their previous, or like, you know, would be otherwise, state.

MR. TRAVIS: Right. There -- I mean, there -- depends on the harm that we're talking about, and that then determines the steps, the many steps that have to be taken before forgiveness can even be discussed. So we have two folks who would like to make some observations.

I'll call on Nicole, and then Susan. And then unless there's somebody else who has the -- what we call the urgent wave, or there's one more thing you want to say on forgiveness, because we can continue this and should continue this.

So with thanks to Courtney for getting -- highlighting that from last night, let me ask Nicole to say a few things, and then Susan. And then we'll switch gears and talk to our bloggers.
DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: No. I -- just this idea of forgiveness, I -- and my first thought, for some people, it sounded like they were talking about reentry. So if you create harm, you know, are you welcome back to society, and what would it take?

But I was actually thinking of it totally the opposite, which is, you know, how does George Floyd's family forgive Chauvin, but also the institution that created Chauvin? And my issue with, you know, saying we've got to work with stakeholders is that most stakeholders will not admit the types of violence that they engage in, and they actively --

MR. TRAVIS: Right.

DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: -- hide it.

And so how do we -- you know, how do we heal from that? And how do we reform from that? And I -- you know, again, I know this firsthand by, you know, my work in jails, and you know, working with a supposed reformer, jailer, like Tom Dart, and you know, where you're constantly -- it's almost like getting gaslit, where you say there's a type of abuse going on.

No, it's not. No, it's not. You don't know what you've seen. You don't know what you heard. You know, it's, like -- well, I've got it on tape. I have someone talking about this abuse.
And so how do you heal, when the person won't acknowledge the harm they've done? And it almost reminds me of, like, domestic violence, like -- admit you're wrong, admit you're wrong, admit you're wrong. And the abuser is the one saying that, and they never will own the violence they're perpetrating.

And so I think about the police torture ring for Jon Burge that happened in Chicago. The reparations there was not about money. It was about education and having a narrative that set the record straight about what happened, and how the Chicago police tortured over 130 people, and did it over 30 years.

The biggest resistance to reparations in the city came from policing families that did not want their children to learn about the curriculum, the torture curriculum. And it shows that that truth is a very powerful tool.

You cannot have forgiveness, and therefore empowerment, without allowing the stories to be told and heard so the trauma can be put somewhere, right -- so people get a dignity reinstated. And therein lies the puzzle, which is the perpetrators and then those extended from them do not want those stories to be, right?

And yet the onus feels like it's those who are disempowered by the system, for them to forgive. But yet
I think if we're talking about stakeholders, I mean, the
word “stakeholders” means you have a stake. You are
holding onto a stake in the existing system that's
creating the violence.

So I think that really, to me, is the big
centerpiece. How do we change that portion? And that is
very difficult.

MR. TRAVIS: I see a multi-year Square One
Project emerging here, which is: what does truth and
reconciliation look like in this country? And I'm serious
about that, and I think that could be another undertaking.

Susan Glisson, and then we'll switch gears.

DR. GLISSON: Thanks, Jeremy. My apologies to
everyone for being late. I had a home emergency, and am
glad to be with everybody. And I don't know that I have a
whole lot to add to the really important insights that
y'all are offering.

I would just lift up the work of Pumla
Gobodo-Madikizela, who was the clinical psychologist for
the TRC. She wrote -- many of y'all know this work, A
*Human Being Died That Night*. She spent, after the TRC was
over, a number of visits with -- I believe his name was De
Kock -- I'm sure I'm mispronouncing it.

He was the head of the secret police. You
know, he enforced a lot of the extra-legal measures,
violence, that was meted out. And so she's grappling with the idea of remorse as integral to these processes, and I think that's something that's worth talking about.

What Monica lifted up really resonated with me. In our work in Mississippi, there's not a -- nobody brings up forgiveness as it relates to structural issues, except in the need sometimes, as we have seen it, for the titular leader of a system, right -- so the Chancellor of the University of Mississippi, even though he wasn't alive when the policy of excluding African Americans in the university began, at its beginning, in 1848, nevertheless, he occupied the position of power that represented that institution. And it was important as the representative of that institution to acknowledge what happened, to not deny it.

But also, for us to say that's not enough. If you don't go about measures to repair the damage that you've done, then an apology is just words on a page. The only time forgiveness comes up in the conversations that we have been part of with community leaders is one-on-one, which then is particular to the individuals in that case.

I'm thinking of Alistair Little in Northern Ireland who went to jail at the age of 16 or 17 for killing someone during The Troubles. And he doesn't feel he ever has the right to ask for forgiveness from the
family of its victim.

So it's going to be particular, I think, to each place, and it's going to be messy and it's going to be hard. And the folks who caused the harm are going to have to dig deep, and they probably don't have the muscle memory to do that, so they're going to have to learn.

And it's difficult to have to ask folks who have been harmed to be patient while that happens for the -- you know, as they've been harmed. So my favorite definition of this sort of restorative justice as a kind of umbrella concept within which forgiveness might be a component is -- Theo Smith's from Emory.

He says that, for him, restorative justice is the ability to restore justice to -- restore dignity, rather, to the perpetrator and the victim. And what does that look like for each case?

So, thanks for the opportunity to say a few words.

MR. TRAVIS: Well, thanks go to you, Susan, for those words and for your work on this topic, which is just so exciting. I think those of us who were with you in Durham will remember vividly your contribution at the end of our time together there, about your work. And it was really a perfect capstone to that meeting of the Roundtable, and once again, the perfect ending here.
So dear friends, we're going to switch gears and we're going to do the following. We're going to ask our three colleagues, who have each written a blog post, to spend a few minutes, not many -- three to five is what they've been asked to do. We'll see how well we can keep to that. To summarize what it is that they've put into that writing, and just remembering that we're now thinking about moving towards this -- living in the tension.

We love to live in the tension here at Square One, and this tension is between abolition and what we call the irreducible minimum. And each of our colleagues has written not precisely on that topic, but in ways that shed light on that discussion.

So we'll hear from each of them, and we'll have a group discussion after their presentations. And we'll do them back-to-back, so we'll get a lot of ideas into the air, and then we will move into our breakout groups.

So our first up is Marcia Rincon-Gallardo, and the floor is yours.

MS. RINCON-GALLARDO: Good morning, or good afternoon, everyone. Can you hear me okay? Okay.

So to start off, I just want to first -- I don't have sage or cedar or copal. I'm in a totally different space, but I want to acknowledge the original people of the land.
I'm in Chumash land, and -- but wherever you are, you know, just acknowledging the original peoples of that land. And then I have to start by also just kind of reintroducing myself. My name is Marcia Rincon-Gallardo. My spirit name is Tlacapansin [phonetic]. And it took me all the way till almost being 60 years old to be able to have a traditional ceremony with one of our elders, who's 90, to actually name me according to our traditional ways.

And I start first by -- so you know, I'll be brief -- by saying that we have these ceremonial practices that -- you know, and it's different for all tribes and nations and Indigenous peoples. But there's this process where -- when we go to an all-night ceremony, from the time we walk in, let's say eight o'clock p.m. till midnight, we're asked to -- you know, to spill out, put out in front of the sacred fire, in front of our sacred instruments, in front of our loved ones and relatives, to share what it is that hurts us.

And we have people -- there's usually what people call the sponsor, who's sitting in the spot, the revered spot, to actually be there so that we can intentionally pray for them and for the purpose for which we were brought to pray for them for. And it could be a
happy moment, like a graduation, a birthday, or it could
be a very sad moment, someone who passed or someone's very
sick, or something -- somebody was wronged.

So up till midnight is the time that we speak
about those things. And then from midnight forward, it
is -- we are to think about the things that we want, those
things that -- and we have to visualize it and say it as
if it has occurred. And that is how we are taught.

So I tried to use that same format for writing
this paper, this blog, in the sense of trying my best to
articulate what has happened in the past in order so that
we could then think about what it is we need into the
future. And there's a lot of reconciling that needs to
happen, right?

In fact, that was the purpose of the paper was
to say, wait a minute. There's too much pain and too much
hurt from this particular system. And actually we go all
the way back.

We don't go back just to the 1600s. We have to
go all the way back, because this land -- we were here.
This is Anahuac. Right? This is Abianahuac. It's not
America. America was named by the Spaniards, America.
Right?

And so even the comment last night -- maybe we
have to leave America. No, this is our homeland. This is
our homeland, and we have -- we are connected and tied to it. And so, if we are connected and tied to this land, that we are connected and tied to everything, you know, whether they be the mountains, whether they be the air.

It's a very different paradigm and way of thinking, that then how do we use what was given to us ancestrally, to then take care of those things, to then move forward? So it's important, then, to reckon and to be able to state, what were the first prisons?

We're trying our hardest to show that our ancestors and the original people didn't use prisons, didn't use structures of four walls. We're trying to find -- to make sure, you know, research-wise, to be able to say, no, our ancestors never even used cages, right? Because we were successful in being able to handle offenses, and there were restorative practices. Even the truth and reconciliation -- they are peacemaking. This land has developed those processes, and to honor the peoples of this land, we go back to those.

We always go back to and ask, what did our ancestors do? We always go back in order to then go forward.

And so in the reconciliation, or the reckoning part of it, is to acknowledge how did our people respond to offenses or misbehavior, to then be able to say,
okay. And then the white men came with their values and were very clear about those values, those Puritan values, especially on the youth side, the youth justice side, that they came with values about children being born of sin, and that you had to beat the sin out of them.

And so that punishment-oriented process, unlike our ancestors, right, who felt and showed in their actions that children were born sacred, that life was sacred. And the worst response we could give to someone was to banish them, right -- to embarrass them, to put them away, keep them away from us. But that was the worst.

And so when we think about what was done and then think about then these structurally racist systems -- already in motion, structures that put us in -- how could I say this -- placed us is in situations where we had no power to be able to respond in the sense of, wait a minute. These are not our values, and so if they’re not our values, then we have to -- we’re being -- what’s the word I want to use here -- how to end preexisting structured injustice is, like -- it's taken us a minute to be able to respond and sit in our power, to be able to say, wait a minute.

We already have ways of responding. And so then, given that, what is it that we need to place forward? We talk a lot about not just ending, but what
are the solutions?

So we go back to our original -- we go back to the people who have already been sitting in these systems to say to them, okay, what has been your experience? And from your experience then, what is it that we need to be doing differently?

And so we share from them, and we know that it's a one-size-fits-all, that as original peoples from this land, we know that we're still invisible. There is the statistical genocide that happens to us, still. We're completely invisible, and so it's -- if we're invisible, then two things happen. There's no resources that come to us. And there is no representation of our people sitting in policy discussions, to even acknowledge that we have solutions.

So in this paper -- and so I will begin to close -- is, I wanted to reflect the paradigm shift of, what are values? And I'm not being -- this isn't, you know -- I think that it's important we recognize that peoples from all over this land are so diverse. That it's important to listen to the voices of all the people from this land in order to develop the more important values.

But there are some values, such as being humble, such as, you know, the ones written in the report, that we honor virtues of honesty and humbleness and
integrity. That it isn't just about money, right -- that
being a benefit to society, where success and wealth and a
rich life is not measured just by money.

And when we think also about redemption, it's
not necessarily -- it's pulling in on spirit and the
healing. There was a discussion about forgiveness, and I
think that we also have to recognize that when we believe
and feel spirit and have done our healing, that then
there's solutions, that the right solutions will come.
And I think that there's a lot of people on this land that
have lots of already thought-up solutions that we need to
go to.

So I think I'll leave it there, and I'll be
open for any discussion regarding the blog.

MR. TRAVIS: Thanks, Marcia. A perfect -- just
a perfect way to start, sort of the biggest frame possible
in some ways.

Let's turn next to Jon Simon, for your
thoughts, and then to be followed by Nneka.

DR. SIMON: Well, I'm honored to follow Marcia,
and just to bridge, I'm sitting on the unceded land of the
Ohlone people here in Alameda County, California. And I
have to say that, you know, you can't begin to even seek
forgiveness until you know that you're part of the
problem.
And I've lived in California in various ways for decades. And when I moved out here in '77, probably to get away from the Chicago police, who you can see followed me anyway, I loved California and felt this enormous sense of satisfaction in being an American who just moved to California at 18, and enjoy its universities and its fabled parks.

And Mendocino County might have been my favorite spot in the whole place. It's got the famous wildflower-covered, you know, cliffs along the ocean, with whales going by.

Well, it's also the site of maybe the greatest massacre of Native people to be conducted in California during the white settler period. And in 1859, about a thousand Natives were killed by a death squad that was literally paid out of the state budget to -- because the U.S. Cavalry would do what they wanted them to do in terms of -- and I don't know that there's even a marker up there right now. So our whole landscape is littered with such sites and I don't -- you know, when we talk about redemption or forgiveness, we would have to do a lot of work to unearth that.

Let me quickly move to a couple of things from my piece. So I -- first of all, it's an amazing time to talk about values. I know the arc of this wasn't planned
to take place during a global pandemic and a reckoning
with racial justice after the murder of George Floyd, but
what a time to think about values.

There's a reason that I think every time in
American history that there's been any leap in values,
it's usually followed a big bloodshed event of some
sort. And there's something about a lot of death that
makes the living more plastic in their ability to imagine
different institutions or different values. And to
revalue our values, to revisit our values.

I thought it was really telling on the first
day that -- or last week that we wanted to have a
discussion about values, but it became a discussion about
politics, as I think Jeremy and Bruce have both put it.
But I mean, that's exactly right, right?

I mean, the only values we should care about
are values that actually get experienced as part of
politics, or as I would call it, looking backwards,
history. My -- one of my teachers, Philip Selznick,
always talked about values, yes, but values in the world,
in the factory, in the New Deal, in various historical
moments of struggle.

I think what happens is that the only way you
come to know values is through a moment of political
upheaval in which those values have suddenly, as Bruce put
it last week, sort of become a motivation for people to take extraordinary risks and to do extraordinary things.
And I've mostly been a witness to that from comfortable spots.

But like I post the image of Hegel watching Napoleon ride by, which was apparently an apocryphal moment, in any event, these moments when social movements are transforming our society tend to be the moments, and I think they're particularly Black movements that have, for American society, triggered these re-valuation of values.

So very quickly. Today, I see the Black Lives Matter movement as -- while in some ways, it's a continuation of an abolition movement that goes back to enslavement, it's also a distinctive historical realization of that. And it's bringing two values to the fore that -- many values, but the ones I'd hold out are of human dignity and anti-violence.

And the reason I think they're interesting, to think about those two values, is that when we -- when you ask me to think about the irreducible minimum, I kind of like that, because it accepted that abolition is the right horizon. And then the question is, like, well, what values ought to anchor our sense of what we want left, or what we want after we transform the system as much as we can?
And it seems to me that while it's the Black Lives Matter movement that's bringing abolition to the fore right now, it's also bringing the irreducible minimum to the fore, which is, to me, anti-violence.

So very briefly, a word about each. Abolition, to me, is just about human dignity. Whenever somebody says, well, we need to abolish that, what they're saying is -- there's something about that that just is incompatible with human dignity.

And we might disagree, right? I mean, there are people who deeply believe that abortion is just not compatible with human dignity, and I respect their belief in that, even though I don't share it.

But there are many things in which we can agree, as George Floyd's murder showed, in terms of what is inhumanity and what human dignity requires. So when you're talking about abolishing something, whether it's ICE or the police or tenured faculty positions, you're asking whether -- or capitalism -- you're asking whether that practice is capable of being reformed enough that it's -- can fit with human dignity.

And I hear the Black Lives Matter movement saying our current criminal legal system is incompatible with human dignity. It's not just that it murders people with some regularity, Black people, but actually on a
daily basis, it's humiliating to people. And humiliation is the -- much, in some ways, more than death, the kind of ground-up indignity, or you know, we know dignity when it's denied us, right?

So we know dignity when it's -- when we're humiliated. And the cultural state -- I mean, from courtroom to jail to prison to police trauma -- show me the place where there's not humiliation, and I'll say, well, let's start there. Maybe there is something we can reform.

But there's so much humiliation built into the system. So it often seems that the alternative -- well, we don't want that humiliation. Let's change things. But what about violence?

Anti-violence, in some ways, is a late fruit of our society. As David Sklansky shows in a recent book, sort of, the law doesn't really focus on violence until really modern -- very modern times. And I'm not here to embrace, say, a treatment of people who have been convicted of "violent crimes" in a special way at all.

But I do think that one of the lessons maybe, or one of the values that has come to the fore during the war on crime, that the Black Lives Matter movement is radically reinterpreting for us, is anti-violence. Because if the real value -- if the real thing we want
from public safety, what we call public safety, is
guardianship of human dignity against its most challenging
threats to the human body, to the human life, to -- the
various things that we call, violence, which is not an
easy word to understand in its full ambit.

What I hear coming from the Black Lives Matter
movement loud and clear, and it's been coming from the
feminist movement, as well, for some time, is that the
current carceral legal system, even though it takes a
great deal if not all of its legitimacy from claiming to
be against violence and about repressing violence, it
actually does a terrible job of that. The fact that, you
know, violent crime is the category where the police are
supposedly the most effective, but they only supposedly
clear something like half of all violent crimes, and far
lower numbers in segregated communities of color.

And if you look at the history of the police,
of the prison, none of them were really invented to deal
with violent crime. They were designed to protect
property. They were designed to control disorderly
rabbles that were gathering in the cities because of
immigration, in the eyes of nativist populations, et
cetera. They had various jobs to do, but repressing
violence isn't one of them.

And if you think about any of them, it's hard
to see how they would stop violence. They're just not well calculated to do that, no disrespect to them in that regard.

So it seems to me, the irreducible minimum would say something like, criminal legal institutions are only tolerable to the extent that they can effectively suppress violence better than any combination of alternative ways of governing that situation, that we can find, are, because we know that it's going to be inherently humiliating to lots of the people who encounter it. To me, that suggests a pretty small minimum, although undoubtedly we could agree on some things.

So, you know, one of the things that I've been thinking a lot about is generation and change, and I think the Black Lives Matter movement is a really exciting opportunity for this whole country. I mean, the last time we had a Black-led change in our values in the 60s -- and remember, Black movements for liberation are always global. I mean, Du Bois said that the color line is the problem of the 20th century, and it's now the problem of the 21st century.

Then it seems to me that, you know, in many respects, the Black-led leadership of the movement in this country was taking the lead -- taking its lead from the anti-colonial independent movements around the world and
tried to fashion itself as a kind of revolutionary --
well, when you watch Fred Hampton in the Black -- *Judas
and the Black Messiah*, you know, he's offering the Rainbow
Coalition, and then asking the audience to -- are you a
revolutionary? It's a little bit awkward.

This is a different moment. And today,
actually, the world is looking at the Black Lives Matter
movement as maybe the leading expression of what a Black
liberation movement today can look like. And I find that
really promising for the fact that it can be durable and
have -- affect lasting change.

But I'm living in California, so that makes me
optimistic. So I'll stop there.

MR. TRAVIS: Thanks so much, Jon. And we're
going to move quickly to Nneka for her contribution, from
her blog, which is also very thought-provoking.

Nneka?

DR. JONES TAPIA: Thank you, thank you. I may
go a little off-script from the blog, just because I also
want to acknowledge where I am, just personally right now
in this moment.

And last night when we wrapped up our Square
One Roundtable discussion with Marlon and Daryl, I looked
at my news feed. I'm from North Carolina, and I saw where
police killed another Black man.
And as I think about Mr. Andrew Brown, Jr. this morning, afternoon, I'm sitting here today and I'm emotional. And it's okay for me to be emotional. And so I don't apologize if I cry this afternoon, because I just -- I really need to just grieve. I acknowledge the role that I played as a system actor, and ultimately, what impacted the sustainability of carceral systems.

In 2015, when I was appointed warden, it was this, like, nuanced idea. Oh, a psychologist is a warden of a correctional institution. And a lot of people applauded that.

And for me, it suggested that they recognize that something was missing in correctional institutions, and you know, this notion, if you just get the right people in place, you can fill that gap. And for 11-1/2 years in various positions, working in correctional institutions, that's what I tried to do. I tried to fill a gap.

And it was towards the end of my tenure that I realized that I -- and I believe -- nor could anyone else fit the gap of humanity in that system. Don't get me wrong. Like, there were moments where myself and my team, we celebrated.

When an officer was fired for excessive use of force, when vile acts were caught on camera and we were
able to sleep a little bit better because we removed that one person from this whole system of toxicity, we celebrated. But those moments were fleeting, and what was enduring was a fear that people had.

It was an enduring disconnection from anything that affirmed the worth of people. It was an enduring inhumanity in intolerable conditions by which we forced people to live and commune. And there was no, and is no enduring humanity or dignity in correctional institutions.

And for that reason, I firmly believe in the abolition of this system, because it causes immense damage to not just individuals, but families and communities. And in holding that belief and then reflecting on last night's conversation with brothers Marlon and Daryl, I have asked myself, what do I believe should happen with individuals who act in some of the most egregious ways?

And Marlon and Daryl described, you know, that person as someone we wouldn't want to meet in a dark alley, and I have looked these individuals in their eye. I've sat across from them. I've sat next to them, and I've pushed myself to see them, beyond the behavior they were charged with.

And in every case, not most, but every case, that person was a person that we as a community failed over and over again. And as I sit here today, I
understand that the American correctional institution does
nothing to correct that damage. It only multiples it.

And so what would I say should be done with a
person who commits egregious acts, a person that we
wouldn't want to see in a dark alley? And when I thought
about Mr. Andrew Brown, Jr., I said, I would want the same
thing to be done to that person that I would want done for
my children, for my boys. To provide unyielding support
as they confront the harm that they've experienced and the
harm that they've caused, and as they understand the
connections between the two, and educating them on the
ways they can turn their pain into some sort of promise,
and preparing the community to receive them again.

I'm angry with the officers who killed Mr.
Andrew Brown, Jr., but I also recognize that a lifetime in
a carceral system is not going to bring Mr. Brown back and
it's not going to correct the damage that they've done.
And so I do believe that we need a system of
accountability, because people will continue to cause
harm.

That's the reality of the world that we live
in. But that new system has to be rooted in healing and
safety, and that means healing and safety for everybody.

And the two points that I want to end with are
really sparked by my blog, but also sparked by the
conversation we had last night with Marlon and Daryl. And in last night's conversation, we talked about some individuals being irredeemable. And as I reflected on that conversation and my experiences working in this system, I felt compelled to share my reflection that no person is irredeemable.

No person is irredeemable. The system is. The system is irredeemable.

And the last point that I'll make is that, in order for us to uproot the system, we have to create space for practitioners and theorists of criminal justice reform and abolition to commune. And in that space, we have to acknowledge the harm that has been caused and is being caused. And we have to actively repair and renew our communities that are being harmed.

And we have to map out, truly map out, how we are going to build this new system that is grounded in safety and healing, and we must do that together.

MR. TRAVIS: Nneka, I think I speak for all of us when I say that we're really moved by your honesty and your bravery, your own personal journey that you've traveled and your reflection on your life and on these state of affairs in the country, and your willingness to bring that to this group today, and to provide that as a testimonial to the work ahead.
It was really, really powerful and deeply impactful. We are in your debt. So thank you, to you and to Jon and to Marcia.

It's quite -- Bruce yesterday said something about the magic of the Roundtable. And what we've just seen is the magic of the Roundtable, in the way that people can learn from each other and to have a cumulative -- an experience that is more than individual. It's also communal, and hopefully spreads beyond this screen to others as well.

I'm just quite, quite moved by what we just heard. We are going to continue this conversation, wherever it takes us, in our breakout rooms, and that will happen soon with the miracle of Zoom.

So you'll be in a preassigned room. There will be people who are responsible for reporting out from your session. Katharine, Bruce and I will be in, each of us -- in one of the breakout sessions.

For those of you who are watching this in real time, as observers, we will be -- Square One doesn't stop, so you'll be seeing some footage from earlier Square One events. So we hope you find them to be valuable and worthwhile.

And then we'll come back after a break at two o'clock, Eastern time, for a report out from the breakout
sessions at 2:30. So here we go. Magic of Zoom.

But with special gratitude to everybody who has just spoken. That was, I think, one of the deepest sessions we've had at Square One. It was really very moving. So okay.

Here we go. See you soon.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MR. TRAVIS: So welcome back, everyone. I hope you had a break that was restful, a little bit of change of pace, and I hope that your discussions in the breakout sessions were rich and rewarding and thought-provoking. I know the one that I was privileged to participate in was all those things.

So just to check about where we are in our process. We're now going to hear reports from the individuals, our colleagues who were given the assignment to report out on the discussions in those breakout sessions, and that will be Susan, Abbey, and Kris. And I'll do them right back-to-back, so that we can get all of the raw material into our discussion.

And then we'll have a group discussion about what we've just heard, and then we'll take another break at 3:30. And then after that break, come back for Danielle's discussion with Katharine. So that's where we are.
But before we start that, I just want to reflect on where we were when we went into our small breakout sessions. And we had just heard from Nneka about another, yet another painful episode, this one in her own state of North Carolina, another reminder of yet another Black man dying at the hands of law enforcement.

And Nneka said something that I want to underscore and focus on, which is that she felt very emotional at that moment, and that that might show in her presentation. We've come together in a time where there's deep pain being felt, particularly by our colleagues of color, and communities around the country. And I feel just so fortunate that we can come together and be there for each other at a difficult time.

But I also need to acknowledge that that's not a uniform experience within our group, and those of us who are white are not experiencing those events in the same way. And in another breakout session, one that I was not part of, this was an explicit topic of conversation.

I just want to bring it back to the full group, and to acknowledge that, to acknowledge that difference, and to acknowledge that pain and the deep emotions that come with that, and to say to people, if they feel that the discussion is just too difficult, too raw, to -- at the moment, we understand that.
And if it means you want to take some time away from this discussion, please feel absolutely free to do so. And certainly, if that brings emotions to the fore, that's a very important part of our time together, and an important vehicle for communicating precisely what we're talking about here, which is the deep nature of the harm that has been carried out, basically, by the way we approach the issues of justice in the country.

So with special recognition of that difference within our group, and that we're at a difficult moment nationally, but all of us who are thinking about the issues that arise every day and the long history that they represent are feeling a lot of pain and anguish and frustration and anger. And I guess the corollary that follows that observation is -- and we talked about it last time.

We talked about it a week ago. We've talked about it over time. We talked about it in Detroit. You remember how much we focused on trauma in the Detroit Roundtable.

This is also a time to take of ourselves and to recognize that there is a need for people who are doing the work to engage in whatever the appropriate for you forms of self-care and connectivity and solidarity with others.
So I thank those who raised up this issue in one of the breakout sessions. Thank Nneka for being so clear and explicit about where she was, but want her to know that she’s not alone, and that we embrace this challenge precisely because of what it represents -- is the deep hurt and the deep harm, the need for healing and justice. So thank you for being who you are, and for making this part of our Square One conversation.

So we're going to turn next to Susan Glisson who was the reporter in the group that I was part of. And after she does her report out, we'll ask Anamika who was our Square One staff person assigned to that group to see if there's anything that she would like to add to Susan's summary. And we'll do these back-to-back with Abbey and Kris, and then we'll open it up for discussion.

So Susan?

DR. GLISSON: Thanks, Jeremy. As I said in the small group, I do not have the gift that Bruce Western has. So I'm going to lift up -- there was so much richness in the conversation, I fear I will leave out something important, so I trust that my colleagues in that conversation will chime in.

Jeremy is a wonderful facilitator and got us going, and Courtney really grounded us in the conversation about how the idea, the concept of the power of humanity...
keeps coming up. Really, Nneka's idea that -- Nneka's idea, sorry -- that no one person is irredeemable.

But how do we maintain -- Courtney asked us a great question. How do we maintain humanity without sort of -- if I may use the word settling, kind of, for reform instead of full abolition? That the system is irredeemable, but the people are not -- how do you hold that tension?

Marcia talked about how structures flatten us. They dehumanize us. And so to resist, she shows up as her full self. Courtney noted the kind of exhaustion that then creates in folks who are trying to be their full selves in systems that are dehumanizing.

Dona noted, as well, the sort of -- the sense of overwhelm at how much there is to do, and what steps there are to take, but knowing clearly that we have to get to the roots of the problem, and there are many roots. She encouraged us with noting Finding Nemo, the idea of just keep swimming.

Jeremy lifted up the idea from last night's conversation with Daryl and Marlon about political education, and potentially political education being a precondition to abolition. And then Courtney, you know, noted part of what needs to be understood is that white supremacy culture is the air in which all of us breathe.
It shapes and limits and affects everybody, so that just bringing Black and Brown folks into a space with a group doesn't automatically fix things because of what white supremacy culture has done to dehumanize.

Marcia lifted that up as well as sort of, you know, another kind of genocide, that white supremacy culture makes Black and Brown people hate themselves. We lifted up -- so that idea of internalized racism. Dona was clear that in Texas they absolutely know the power of political engagement and political education, because they work really hard to try to prevent it from happening.

So Jeremy pondered what the outcome of an initiative might look like that really intentionally engaged in education and truth-telling, and given the skill set of the folks in the room, that's a kind of a muscle that could be exercised right away. There is a sense of sort of understanding this is a -- white supremacy is one way that this shows up, but there's a -- Dona says, there's a human tendency to create and sustain hierarchies and power differentials, so we want to keep that big idea in mind.

And then Eric really just laid it out, lifting up this really powerful question of, what if we start with de-gunning the police? How might that affect how we are policed? He suggested that law enforcement needs to have
healing as much as communities do in order to repair and restore balance and harmony, that the trauma that police officers have is being reflected back onto the communities in more harm.

So then Jeremy asked what the big question is: how large is the healing circle? Who gets to be a part of the healing circle? Involvement has to be real, authentic, and it can't be forced.

But we're at a particular, interesting moment in time that Black Lives Matter has opened up. And we've got opportunities to do some good work.

I hope that was okay.

MR. TRAVIS: Great. Yeah. More than okay. That was great. We'll turn to Anamika to add to, underscore, emphasize anything from Susan's overview.

MS. DWIVEDI: Hi, everyone. That was beautiful, Susan. You did a phenomenal job. I guess I will just lift up how Susan contributed to conversation. I noticed that didn't make it in there.

And she shared that what it always goes back to her is organizing, and while that work is laborious and unglamourous and sometimes even boring, that's what we have to do. And then she also underscored a point, that really was a theme of this conversation, around history.

If you don't know the history, then it's easier for us to
deny the truth, which is then what led folks into the
political education conversation.

So -- and then one last thing is, Eric shared a
little bit more about toxic masculinity, and the very Euro
male-centric tendencies that has come to dominate the
West. And he shared that in -- from his perspective, that
perspective has taken us as far as it can, and any further
it will take us, it will likely cause harm.

So that's what I'll add. But that was
wonderful, Susan. Thanks.

MR. TRAVIS: Great.

DR. GLISSON: You're welcome.

MR. TRAVIS: Thank you, Susan. Thank you,
Anamika.

We are going to keep moving along and ask Abbey
to report out on the discussion in her group, and she will
supported in that by Madison.

MS. STAMP: Great. Thank you, Jeremy. So
myself and Keith and Bruce and Nneka and Danielle and
Monica were all together in a group.

And I just want to start by thanking Jeremy for
finding such an eloquent way to name a tension that I've
been thinking about. So thank you for that, as we dive
into this.

So I, you know, in having this conversation
about abolition versus irreducible minimum, at the end, I think, what we ended up coming to is, no matter what you stand or what you think about this, that the value really should be that abolition is the goal. Even if you can't get there, that pointing all of the efforts into that direction is really what's important, even if it's sort of in phases.

So Danielle at one point brought up the prison or carceral systems in Europe. And is that good enough? Does it work? And we kind of sat in a conversation around -- maybe that's, like, a less bad option. Just, you know, is that something that we might want to hold onto or not?

Is it something our social fabric could actually accomplish in that space? But really, how might that type of penal system be a journey towards abolition? Clearly, it's not abolition because it exists in the first place.

We had a lot of conversation about redemption, like Susan just summarized. Nneka mentioned that no person is irredeemable, but the system is irredeemable. Keith added that society needs to redeem itself.

And we talked about how redemption needs to be consistent, and accountability on all levels is something that we should all lean into, no matter how hard or
uncomfortable that can be, particularly as we were talking about the results of the Chauvin case and the verdict there.

Monica leaned hard into vision and future thinking, and really thinking about and talking about what kind of world are we building towards? What do we want communities to look like? And we really appreciated that framing, because it really makes the intangible and kind of the foggy and the unknown create some clarity. And even if we all have different wants and vision, that is really important to lean into that.

And then we just talked about, how do you make the change happen and the critical resistance. Keith mentioned his son asking, what would a world without prisons look like and how -- when we're done in this space, how the next generation coming up maybe could help grow the seeds that we've planted and that they would be better able to visualize a more thriving and successful and prison-less and carceral state-less future together.

And then Danielle also mentioned that in order to do that, we have to be able to connect all levels of government and systems, from the city to the state to the feds, to create national, meaningful, and permanent change. And towards the end, we talked about ambiguity and how changes needed, moving towards abolition, is
critical, but that we need to lean into that ambiguity. And it's okay if we don't know what it's going to look like, but the importance of putting your weight forward and continuing to charge in and agitate and capitalize on all of the momentum, hopefully, will add to the constancy.

And just continuing to really just lean into it, even though for some of our colleagues the ambiguity might be hard to buy into, because folks need to know what’s going to happen before they engage in the future.

But I think that's some common ground, that these convenings continue to build, and just remembering that the foundation is really moving towards abolition.

(Pause.)

MR. TRAVIS: Sorry about that. Thank you, Abbey.

And Madison, what would you like to add?

MS. DAWKINS: Hi, everyone. I'm Madison. Abbey did a really phenomenal job.

A huge core of our conversation was about the ambiguity and specifically moving from where we are now and where we want to be. And Danielle gave the example that in education and all these other domains, it's a lot easier to galvanize people and bring people along to have these conversations.

So we talked about the concrete steps to get us
there and the different modes and keeping consistency and making sure or ensuring that people are in -- within -- brought into the process of moving towards abolition. So that's just one point I want to underscore.

Thank you. Again, Abbey, you really did well at summarizing.

MR. TRAVIS: And thank you, Madison.

And then, Kris, to be supported by Evie.

MR. STEELE: Thank you. I just want to start by saying, thank you for the opportunity to participate in these small groups. We got to experience one of the most intimate, real, and at times, raw conversations that I've been in, in a while.

And so I just kind of wanted to start from the end, and we'll get back to the beginning. But Nicole acknowledged that this is a vulnerable time, and that we're all kind of experiencing vulnerability, but certainly, people who are Black or Brown are experiencing it in much different ways. And so, Jeremy, I just want to say thank you again for acknowledging that, and for eloquently giving us the space to own that in our conversations.

We kind of started with the question of what would be, you know -- what are the identifiable, irreducible minimums? And our group quickly didn't even
really entertain that question and went straight to abolition as the goal.

Vivian started us off by saying that she had a very hard time embracing a concept of a roadmap of how to improve the current system or how to, you know, get to where we need to be. She said that she feels like we are in an emergency room kind of situation, and that we need to acknowledge that. And that it's very, very important.

She kind of got us started on this by raising something that Marlon said last night. And that was, you know, even if we move to a new system where we had, say, social workers instead of correctional officers, if we're not careful, social workers could become racist, and we could buy in -- or we could, you know, have this structural, systematic racism creep in.

And so Vivian very, very pointedly said, you know, the question that we need to be asking ourselves is, what is it that we cannot accept and then let's get rid of it. Let's just start getting rid of the things that we agree that we cannot accept.

Emily very quickly came in and talked quite extensively and comprehensively about the need to focus on process. And in essence, she said that outcomes will never be any different so long as the process is not changed, and that if we really want to get to where we
need to be, the focus really ought to be on establishing
the process. We spent a great deal of time talking about
how process matters.

But another point that I thought was very
important is that, as we talk about a new paradigm or
changes, it's incredibly important that we not leave those
behind who are caught in the current system. She -- Emily
said that it would be very unjust to have a vision without
considering the pragmatic applications to those who are
still in the system that we have today.

We had a very decent conversation around what
changing the process looks like and how do we begin to
change the power structure and the resources that support
the current system. And understood and acknowledged that
so long as the white majority, the white male majority
continues to make the decisions and create the system,
that the outcomes will be the same. And that even with
new funding, if we don't have a different process in place
with different people making the decisions, and making the
rules, that there would be no difference.

So process matters. And so I would say that
our group probably believes that you won't have to worry
about the outcome or the product, so long as the process
is right.

So we spent a great deal of time talking about
the power structure and the resources that would allow a new system to come into being, and how we can create that. And the statement was made that we're going to have to uproot, un-root the current power structure to allow for a better process. We're just going to have to ultimately get to that point, and that money that is appropriated -- if the rules aren't written correctly, the money is going to go to the same entities who are going to find a way to capture it and continue the same work that's happening right now.

We talked about some examples of how, for way too long, we've been trying to improve a system that just doesn't work and finding areas within the system that may be less harmful, but in reality turn out to be just as harmful. Electronic monitoring. We talked about hot spot policing. We talked about the -- you know, the body cam initiative.

And at the end of the day, it's time to start over. I mean, it's really time to acknowledge that what we have in place is just not working. It's time to reimagine the work that we're doing and make sure that we have a power structure in place that allows people to lead who need to be leading, and it's people -- it's the Black community, it's the Latino community that needs to be leading in establishing the system, and that there will be
a struggle in shifting these resources from systems that embody structural racism to individuals and communities that can help reduce violence.

We also had a very candid conversation of how scholars oftentimes want to study and develop solutions within the current system, and how we need to call that out too, if ultimately we're going to get to the point that we start to truly reimagine our criminal justice system or our approach to criminal justice issues.

Nicole said that it's also very important how we speak about things. And we were talking -- we kind of moved from an academic discussion to a practical discussion with Pastor Mike being a part of our group and directly involved in forming some initiatives and some direction around the funding that's coming forward in the Biden administration for public safety.

And Nicole reminded us, rather than saying that we're going to invest in the most violent communities, that that's not fair. We should be saying that we're going to invest in communities that are most victimized or that are most under-resourced. And we talked about how we can be intentional about making sure that we are not including, but replacing the current structure with Black-led, Latino-led individuals to determine how these resources will be invested and how they will be utilized.
And that it's also important to look long term and not just short term, and not just think of -- not just settle for investments to be made in a two-year or a three-year or a five-year period of time, but really begin to look at longevity in investment.

Something else that I thought was very important is to think about how we measure the success of a reimagined system. And Emily pointed out that, you know, oftentimes we look at recidivism rates or a reduction in recidivism as potential success. And she said, that's wrong, and that we ought to really consider about asset development and asset growth within communities to determine what a successful reimagined approach would look like.

Again, I would just say thank you to everyone who participated in our group. I would end by saying that Jon sort of, for me, kind of put a fine point on our discussion, as we were talking about very practical ways to -- what do we now in this moment in time?

And Jon offered up that it's time to call for a moratorium on police stops, on auto stops, until we can, you know, stop the tragic events that are happening. We just need to stop what we're doing, so that we don't continue to see the same thing play out over and over again.
MR. TRAVIS: Thanks so much, Kris. You covered a lot of ground.

Evie, what would you like to add to that?

MS. LOPOO: Yeah. Well, it's nice to be here with all of you guys. So thanks for having me.

Kris did a really wonderful job of kind of highlighting some of the things that we discussed in our small group. So really, I just want to kind of reemphasize some of the things he was talking about.

In particular, you know, Pastor Mike was talking a lot about the ways that his group that's doing the violence prevention work and the initiative that Biden has put out for public safety have been working to rewrite, like, $10 billion worth of RFPs, and trying to think about -- and Vivian and Emily and Nicole -- well, basically everyone was in agreement about the ways that -- how RFPs really can have a fundamental effect on who is eligible for funding, and also, you know, what outcomes are being measured.

You know, Kris mentioned that recidivism is often way too overemphasized. But also, you know, who is eligible for receiving these kinds of finances? And a lot of times, those people who have worked with system actors in the past, and Nicole mentioned this specifically, are those that are immediately thought of to be the first
people to receive funding for future research. So those people that have been involved, working in, you know, police offices or organizations often are the first people that this money -- you know, gravitate towards this money. So thinking about new and creative ways that resource allocation can happen was something that I thought was super interesting about the conversation.

And then most importantly, I think I just wanted to reemphasize the fact that it was really powerful how intimate our conversation got so quickly, and just kind of really emphasizes how deeply people bring themselves to this work and to these conversations. So I just wanted to basically show -- extend my gratitude for letting me part of that conversation, even if I was just a listener.

So thank you.

MR. TRAVIS: Thanks, Evie. So just a listener. I want this entire screen to just recognize that Bruce and Katharine and I have the great privilege every two weeks of having a meeting of something called the Square One Steering Committee, I think we call ourselves, where we get to sit with Anamika and Madison and Evie and talk about the future of the Square One Project.
We learn from them. They are driving this work. They are the hope for the future, and even though they don't show up physically, because their videos are off right now, they show up in lots of other ways. So we're grateful to them, and this gives me a chance to say thank you to our colleagues, who are just spectacular.

Oh, look at all those hearts and applause and everything. So, look at the ground that's been covered in the breakout groups. And I said this morning that the breakout group experience for me last time was so rich and so just iterative, and the communication was so easy and back and forth and back forth, that it really helped me think about what we've done in the morning. And I hoped that you've had that experience as well.

But I'm inviting anybody who would like to pick up on any thread. It's an open discussion at this point for the next 20, 25 minutes or so. Any point that was referenced that's a new one. So rather than go back over what we've discussed before, and we've covered a lot of ground already, what struck you as being new, not for your group, but from another group?

So just to respect the work done in the other breakout groups, when you were hearing the reports back from Susan and Katharine -- sorry -- Susan and Kris and Abbey and the supporting work by the Square One team, did
something hit you, and you say that's new, and I want to work it a little bit? I want to work it within this group.

What would you find that really got you thinking in a different way, not what we discussed before, not what was discussed in your group, where you say, god, that was fresh, that was really fresh and additive to where we are?

Somebody will come up with something, and use your blue hand, if you could.

DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: I just wanted to say that I was really moved, but also I felt personally very troubled by what Pastor Mike had revealed in our group, and I -- again, I know you said speak outside the group, but --

MR. TRAVIS: That's okay. That's okay.

DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: -- I think the idea that I'm -- you know, I am an academic researcher. Right? I'm an empiricist. I, you know, apply for grants. I don't -- but I've also kind of pushed back from some of that because I feel like it requires you to, in some ways, create research that will allow the police to keep wanting to work with you. And I've never been -- I don't -- I have a standard that would say I won't do that.
But what Pastor Mike was kind of saying was that, you know, it was almost like he was fighting the academics. And that really is heartbreaking for me, and I feel like there's enough of us here that are academics that we should be able to mobilize on his behalf and on other activists', you know, behalf. Because, you know, I think there is a way that we can create research that merely just amplifies the violence that we're seeing, you know, things like hot spot policing, things that are solutions, but really just more forms of incarceration. Body cams, as, you know, a solution for accountability, when accountability is what police are pushing back on.

So I just put that out there. I don't know the solution. I mean, Jonathan and I both said, you know, if there was some kind of document that we all could sign on behalf of -- you know, we know violence prevention money is coming and it should include these players at the table and should not exclude, you know.

And it would require us to stand up to some of our colleagues, and that's really difficult and really hard to do, but I feel like in this moment it is required. And I put that out there because, you know, there's so many of us academics at the table.

Some have actually participated in previous Square One Projects, but they've been less inclined to say
critical things about police, even at this moment. And so it really is a balancing act. But I think, after hearing Pastor Mike make this plea, it really does -- to me, there feels like a sense of urgency, because if the money is coopted away from experts like Pastor Mike, that would truly be a tragedy.

And if we stay silent about it, it feels like we'd be complicit, so --

MR. TRAVIS: I'm seeing some nodding of heads here. Monica is certainly in agreement.

And I don't know if you are with us, Pastor Mike, but if you want to restate the observation that you made, it's important when we do have scholars at the table, and we're all in touch with scholarly communities where we could carry a message from Square One.

DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: And Pastor Mike, I don't want to restate your eloquent words. I'm just -- I was just very struck by it. As an academic who has seen on the other side, thinking, wait. Weren't you the person doing hot spot policing, targeting Black communities, and you know -- and looking the other way when you saw police doing nefarious things?

And now, you're applying for a grant for body cams so you can also get that money, which is about police accountability? It's not compatible, ethically. And yet
it's happening within the academy, and that -- when Pastor Mike also observed it from another vantage point, I think that, to me, was powerful.

REV. McBRIEDE: Well, thank you, Doc. I think I was -- I felt like I was emoting more than I was eloquently stating something, so I don't know if I can capture that. You had me in a bottle. But I'll just [inaudible] the example.

So you know, many of you know that we've been able to secure a $5 billion commitment from the Biden administration to fund peace, or what we're calling like, you know, public health, approaches to gun violence prevention, and the Biden administration has agreed to put that inside the infrastructure bill.

But there was also another effort to put, or to open up, up to $10 billion worth of grants in the -- in 25 agencies across -- 25 programs across five agencies. And so just part of what we're talking about when we're talking about the RFP process, is, what does it mean for us to build into RFPs these kind of -- a safeguard that the resources are going to Black and Brown community violence prevention groups on the ground and not being sucked up by -- and I -- you know, I don't mind mentioning the names I've mentioned, the Everytowns, the Giffords, the Bradys, the David Kennedys, the Gary Slutkins, the --
you know, Thomas Abts, like the range of scholars, criminologists, you know, big firms, advocacy groups that historically have literally been obstructionist to us trying to replace or at least scale up these efforts that are Black-/Brown-led in communities across the country, or even just as body of work.

And I guess part of what I was sharing is that, if it's true that $600 million is going to be coming to, you know, a select group of cities across the country that reach these kinds of measures around the number of gun-related shootings or homicides, we're seeing these groups that have historically either been lukewarm, cool or obstructionist, literally reconstituting themselves to compete for these public dollars that we are intending to go to actually build a new public safety sector that centers and is led by Black and Brown folks. And they're using the academy.

They're using their big organizations to lap all of us smaller Black- and Brown-led groups who don't have that kind of national infrastructure to be able to compete in that, you know. Well, you know, I'm certainly one of the folks who ain't afraid to, you know, call this out. But you know, a lot of other folks are fearful because it impacts people's funding.

It impacts people getting black-balled. A lot
of this is relationships behind the scenes, with folks at
the federal level, in the White House, in the DOJ, at the
municipality level.

And so you know, as Square One being a place
that I've found to be a center of gravity that -- at least
for me, where it's, like -- our values, we're trying to
live them out actually through how we lead and how we act,
you know, I was just saying, some of these dollars perhaps
we could use to help build out a more counterbalance to
this kind of criminologist sector that pathologizes and
profits off of Black, you know, criminality to use Khalil
Gibran Muhammad's language, and help appreciate that there
is a new way to deal with public safety that does not
require you showing up to a fight and shooting a Black
girl four times, you know, in the chest, right?

Like, there are literally other ways that we
could do this, but we need resources and we need the
expertise of folks who can wage some of these fights, so
we're just not all having to do it by ourselves. And so
that's the best I can do to recapture kind of what I was
ranting about.

MR. TRAVIS: Well, your best is always pretty
good, so thank you for that, Pastor Mike. We can continue
this theme. You didn't particularly call out the
scholarly community, which Nicole had taken from your
earlier conversation. I just want to leave on the table as well, because I think that's an important challenge.

And I'm reminded of the discussion we had last Square One Roundtable with Elizabeth Hinton on the history of federal funding that came with certain expectations, at least rhetorically, where the money never went for community organizing, community capacity-building, community voice. And we're learning from that history. If she were here, she would urge us to do that.

Who would like to pick up on the thread of this federal opportunity, which is relatively recent? We've talked about it. I'd say it's less than a month since that's been announced, and lots of organizations.

And Pastor Mike has showed in this slide, there's a wonderful poster, basically, of some of the people leading this effort who are involved in the community level, anti-violence work. And it's a tribute to them that they are able to bring it to this point and get support from Susan Rice and others, so that this is even a possibility. But now's the time to be protective, I guess, of that work and to make sure that the intentions are carried out.

So the floor is open to continue on that discussion or anything else that people would like to bring before the group.
Yes, Courtney?

MS. ROBINSON: I thought I saw Monica's hand first, but I'll jump in. So as someone who runs a small nonprofit, funded a small nonprofit, I think this has -- and I'm also an adjunct professor, so I sit in both of these lanes.

This is a really important conversation in terms of nonprofits and the work that we do. We're boots on the ground all the time. But we rarely get the funding, because in the funding game you have to have money to get money. And so the reasons why university professors often get the bigger grants is because they have the institutional budget that supports the grant that they're applying for.

And so it would be great if RFPs accounted for smaller organizations who can't have robust research, because we don't have the budget for it. So it's like a chicken-and-the-egg kind of thing. They want you to have all these fleshed-out metrics, but you don't have the money to pay a researcher to actually do the work that they're asking you to have.

And so while we will see things in our community about researchers coming in to help, researchers often come in to help themselves. And I can say that because I sit on both sides, and I've been able to say to
my colleagues, okay, you want to come in with my kids, my Black and Brown kids, to do A. What are you going to do for this organization?

And so I think we have to start doing more of those kinds of things as academics, really thinking about what are you bringing to the organization, just not what you're taking away and you're going to go off and you're going to write articles and books and not give anything back to the community that you were researching.

So those are just some of my thoughts around this issue.

MR. TRAVIS: Thanks, Courtney. I would invite any of my Square One colleagues who would like to, to just report on a parallel activity that's under development now about sort of research methods. That sounds so dry. I don't mean the actual research methods, but the research enterprise, and how the research enterprise would be different with the sort of racial equity lens that we are bringing into it.

We had this discussion in Detroit, if you may recall, where there was some very direct challenges to some of the academics in the room. And that became as a parallel conversation where there's hope now at the Justice Lab at Columbia to actually bring people together to facilitate that discussion.
So Bruce, not to put you on the spot or Katharine or Anamika, who is working on this, this might be something that people -- we could engage some of these folks on, thinking about bringing this conversation into that -- and that on the table.

MR. WESTERN: Yeah. So we're thinking about site-based work as part of the next chapter of the Square One work. And one of the things that we hear is that there's often an appetite for research among different community organizations and actors, but researchers are typically so tightly ensconced with public agencies and have been a resource for public agencies.

There's an uneven playing field where there's information and analysis that state agencies have access to, that communities often do not. And so we're thinking about a role for researchers supporting community organizations and very -- and the frame for research questions should originate with communities. And researchers, both in dialogue and collaboration with community actors in the way that they -- more typically, our state agencies.

So we're trying to figure out, you know, how do we design that? How do we play a role that's genuinely supportive and not self-interested, in the way that Courtney and Pastor Mike have described?
And you know, that's what -- and how can there be a role for community actors and organizations in the design and conduct of research that we often see with sort of research practice partnerships, which involves working with state agencies?

So that's -- we're in the process of conceptualizing that, designing that right now. And I think we're also hearing the concerns that Pastor Mike and Nicole and Courtney have raised, and we're trying to be responsive to it.

MS. HUFFMAN: Yeah. And maybe, just really quickly, if Anamika -- if you're still where you can come on screen for just a second? Anamika is helping us put together a piece to go alongside that work at the list of localities that Bruce mentioned.

Anamika, do you want to talk for just a minute about that?

MS. DWIVEDI: Sure. Bruce, you did a really good job sharing some of the prompting questions that we've been considering, and I would just throw a few more into the mix.

You know, I think what we're hoping to do is, kind of, share that research can be values-based, which I think really comports with this Roundtable. You know, how can research be designed, conducted and deployed to create
a racially just and equitable world? How can it be used to advance liberation?

And Bruce shared with you all, and of course, we've heard this for a very long time, like, that means that who's at the forefront must change. So in addition to those particular questions that perhaps the agenda will address, I've been considering a lot about the process that we're going to use to do such a Roundtable.

So like, you know, who really needs to hear how research must change? Who -- off of whose backs or off of whose work or labor should they hear that from? You know, how do we ensure that the Roundtable process itself is an equitable, just, compassionate, loving place where folks aren't learning off of the -- off of others?

And then so I've been really thinking about a process that can be employed to have a generative discussion. And then how can it be generative? What -- you know, connections are real and funding is a real thing, what else can come out of a discussion like this? What are the concrete and tangible things?

And you know, I think that's something that I'm hoping to learn from this process with you all, so that we can continuously evolve and do better and be accountable to people in order to advance equity, racial justice and liberation.
So that's all I have. Thanks.

MR. TRAVIS: Thank you, Anamika, Bruce and Katharine. Just to see where we are, we're going to take a break in about five minutes or so. Then we'll return for a discussion between Katharine and Danielle, which promises to be really exciting and timely, and it really is also so linked to what we were just talking about here, which is the operationalizing of these values.

So when you talk about what federal funding looks like, you know, that's, you know, really getting down to brass tacks, and who's "eligible," whatever that means, to apply for that funding, how is it distributed. And particularly in this case, which I really appreciate from Pastor Mike's intervention, is that this remarkable reality which might in fact be a pivot point in paradigm-shifting on safety and well-being and community-led intervention -- ironic, I think, that it might come from the federal government, but the fact that that's even a possibility is a tribute to those organizations that are listed on that poster. And we're fortunate that two of them are Square One colleagues. Pastor Mike with his organization and Fatimah Dreier with HAVI have been at the forefront, and others that we've been in touch with. So that's a moment to pay attention to.
So yes, Nicole?

DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: I just want to say that Professor Bell put a link in the chat that was written by Robert Vargas. And I think it really does encapsulate what the brave work that needs to be done, and it really -- it focuses on the Crime Lab at the University of Chicago, and talks about, you know, how the lab's research, in and of itself, has focused on individual behavior.

It sees Black people, Black communities, as needing to be fixed, and that that whole orientation is really, you know, one that reproduces racial stigma, while not always solving the problem of violence. And it also cites Elizabeth Hinton's work.

And so I really think it's an excellent, you know, kind of model for -- I mean, you know, all of us can name who is doing this. You know, it's not like we don't know, and I think -- but it does take some acts of bravery like this to, in some ways, call it out, and say we need a new model of how scholarship should be done.

And so I just -- you know, thank you, Professor, for sharing that. And I -- it's worth looking at, as we think about moving forward.

MR. TRAVIS: Thanks, Nicole. And thanks, Monica, for providing it. I just put it on my screen.
I'll look at it in the next break.

Danielle, we're going to ask you to close it out, and then we'll take a break, and ask you to start us again.

So then your thoughts on this?

DR. ALLEN: You don't need to do that. It is just really on the research side. I just think this is an incredibly important conversation. And the question is, from my point of view, how do we empower nonprofits to use the existing research infrastructure that exists in the form of universities?

Corporations show up on campus all the time and say we're having trouble answering X and Y question, and we will give you a grant if you are willing to work on this question. So the question is, really, how can nonprofits show up on campus and say we are having problems answering X and Y, and we can give you a grant because the federal funds are flowing through us if you will work on this project.

And I think, honestly, just setting up nonprofits to be the people making the RFPs to the academy would be transformative, and academics know how to do this. They do it for corporations. So it's really not about change of habits.

It's just a question of who's in the position
to come on campus and say, we need X research done and
we've got grants that we can deliver if you can do this
work on our behalf.

MR. TRAVIS: Thank you. So I'm putting in the
chat -- there's a group at CUNY that you might know about,
called, the Public Science Project, that has been really,
in my journey on this, in the forefront of thinking about
participatory action research.

There it is. You can check it out. They've
got a great website. I'm proud to say that a number of
John Jay students and faculty have been part of it, and
there we go.

Okay. So here we are. We are going to take --
do you feel like you've been pampered today with too many
breaks? And we're going to take another one, just to take
another deep breath.

And we're going to come back for the discussion
led by Katharine with Danielle, and then we'll move
towards the end of the day. What a full day it's already
been, and the reason for this break is to just sort of
take stock and to come back with, I was going to say, a
clear head; that's not right.

I want your head to be full and crowded and
messy with lots of neurons bouncing around. So it's not
quite a clear head, but just ready -- just re-energized
for a great discussion that's coming up. So we'll see you in 15 minutes.

Is that right, Katharine? Yeah. Okay.

And enjoy your break, and thanks for the work in the breakout sessions, for these summaries. And a special thanks to Pastor Mike and Nicole for really focusing this last discussion.

This is actionable with the research. And I know with Pastor Mike in the lead, it's actionable in terms of what the federal government is going to do with these funds, assuming that they're appropriated, a big question mark there.

So it's actually a very good time to be raising these very concrete issues where we can have -- put our values to work. So thanks all, and we'll see you soon.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MS. HUFFMAN: Welcome back, everyone. All right. Well, everyone, I think, is coming back on screen here, and so we will go ahead and get started with the last part of our conversation for today's Roundtable convening.

It's been a terrific ride and really a lot of really interesting ground covered thus far. And as we've dug in on these questions about the principles of -- the values of justice and what they are and how we can move
towards them, we're ready this afternoon to talk about operationalizing the values of justice, and to consider what guiding principles might look like.

To lead us in that conversation, to get us kicked off, it is my great pleasure to introduce Danielle Allen, who is the James Bryant Conant University Professor and the Director of the Safra Center for Ethics at Harvard University, who's going to take us through some thoughts to get our conversation going.

And we've -- as you've all seen, we've been trying to break up our format a little bit with this Roundtable to give folks different ways to engage. So today, we're going to have Danielle start off our conversation, as we often do. And then we'll open up for some group discussion after her presentation, during which we'll invite you all to join in, raise your electronic hands as usual, and we'll have some conversation among our group.

And then we'll take another pause in about an hour, and Danielle is going to share with us a sort of a specific example of what this -- what these ideas might look like as applied, in practice, and let us use that as sort of another jumping-off point for our discussion.

So that will take us through the next couple of hours, and then we'll have our usual wrap-up with Bruce,
and finish our day together. So just wanted to give you all that little bit of a roadmap.

   So Danielle, it's so great to have you here, and I'm going to hand over to you to get us started in this conversation, building on these previous discussions about values, to help us think about -- what are the guiding principles? What are the mechanisms that can actually put this into place? And how can they guide us in our work?

   So I believe you have screen-sharing powers in the magic of Zoom, and I will hand it over to you to get us started, and encourage folks to think about your comments and your questions. And we'll come back for a group discussion in a few minutes.

   Danielle, over to you.

   DR. ALLEN: Thanks a lot, Katharine, I appreciate it. And I do have some things to share, but this is definitely a space for discussion and for jumping in. I think, in many ways, I'll be retracing some ground you've already covered in the last few days of this Square One session, and I think everybody is ready to dig in and really lay out action pathways.

   So in that regard, if that's where the energy takes you, that's completely fine. So I will be, you know, responsive to you, as we go.
I took the question about operationalizing values quite literally, and understood it to have both a social science component and a practical, sort of, application component. So as a social science matter, I think one of the things that is really hard about working with values is that so many people in the social sciences are trained that their work has nothing whatsoever to do with values.

They are positive social scientists. Their jobs are empirical or modeling, and their job is really to characterize the world as it is. And a distinction between studying what is and thinking about what ought to be goes way back to David Hume, philosopher and political economist, and has kind of shaped a lot of the way in which people think about research over time.

It's problematic. I'll say something about that, the distinction between "is" and "ought," but -- so that's one feature of what it means to think about operationalizing values. And then other is about this question of the movement from values to application and practical context.

So I'm going to talk about both things, and really make the case that the work belongs together, thinking about values and thinking about the empirical realities, both in terms of social science and in terms of
how you transform them.

So let me go ahead and share my screen. A lot of this is going to be, relatively speaking, theoretical. I am a political philosopher, so that's the starting point. But the goal is to get from there to the work in practice.

So let's see. Okay. So I'm really going to focus on ethical reasoning, and the case that I am making, but I think you all experience day in and day out in your work, is that ethical reasoning is just a permanent part of our activities.

Everybody on this call who is a practitioner or who is working on justice reform knows that. For the academic researchers, I think it's been a matter of kind of coming into awareness about the centrality of values to even academic work.

So at the end of the day, facts and values can't be separated from each other. That's the really fundamental point. The question of what facts are even salient or important to us already flows from a question of what we value.

So when I see a data visualization -- I'll show it to you later in this presentation about -- there is one in the New York Times from 2015 by David Leonhardt and his colleagues called, "1.5 Million Missing Black Men."
Some of you may have seen it or may remember it. And it was really just a sort of numbers-based diagnosis of how many African-American men were walking around in the community compared to numbers of African-American women, the sort of huge gap between the presence of women and the presence of men, and a lot of that reflecting incarceration, reflecting early mortality and the like.

The fact that that's a fact we care about reflects already a set of values, the value of human life, of human dignity, of human worth, of an expectation of a certain degree of human thriving and flourishing for people. And then the fact that this set of facts was showing up, that those things we value are not present.

So the facts that we choose to pay attention to already flow from the values we bring in to analyzing the world. So if, in trying to do problem-solving, that's a matter of diagnosing a problem, prescribing a kind of action, and then, you know, looking at that to see what further diagnosis you need, facts and values are operating at every single one of the levels for the diagnosis in terms of what facts matter for the prescription, for the plan of action, because how we act in the world is another thing that we make decisions about based on our values.

So again, you know, values are just never
absent from any part of the work. So for that reason, I always like to call values out as their own moment when I'm talking to people about iterative problem-solving, so that, you know, instead of just thinking you've got a problem and you've got to diagnose it, come up with a prescription, come up with an action strategy, I like to ask people to take a moment to just stop and work on values explicitly so they can think about how their values are factoring into the work of diagnosing a problem, of coming up with the prescriptions, and the like.

Now, the interesting thing about recognizing that driving change and just plain living in the world in general requires all four of these moments: clarity about your values, being able to diagnose the world around you in terms of your values, develop prescriptions in relationship to them, and then action strategies that align with your values.

There is another issue that -- it's not as if there's a single starting point in this process. You can really start from any part of the cycle. And here, I'm going to actually draw on the military as an interesting source of approaches to things.

The military has a hard job to do in terms of trying to train soldiers to make, you know, really quick decisions in context of uncertainty, and they want those
decisions to align with preexisting protocols, including ethical protocols. But they also recognize that people are making fast decisions, and as they make those decisions, they'll be laying down new patterns.

So the U.S. military had developed a protocol that they called, OODA, Observe, Orient, Decide, Act, as a way of getting at how people, in fact, operationalize values and do iterative problem-solving and judgment work.

So Observe is a little bit like diagnosing your circumstances. Orienting is orienting in those circumstances in relationship to your values and the other core guiding principles you're using. And then Deciding and Acting.

As they began to teach people this way of thinking about bringing values and other elements into their work, they were criticized by other entities. And the Australians had developed a different model and advocated for what they called the ASDA Loop, A-S-D-A: Act, Sense, Decide, and Adapt.

And what this means is, you know, they're recognizing that, you know, especially in military contexts, but in life generally, people are always in some sense having to make decisions, having to get something done before they actually time to observe and orient. So there's a way in which important decision-making starts.
from a moment of action, actually.

But then as you act, you need to follow that up with diagnosis, really understand the consequences for the lived outcomes from your action, make judgments about that, and adapt. So the point is that there's a kind of adaptation principle that is really important to bringing values into connection with concrete actions and concrete policies. So it really is an iterative process, a constant adaptation and working, again, on issues of alignment.

So I try to capture this by encouraging people to think about five components in the work of bringing values in relationship to real change. There are the question of what values you have, how you're diagnosing the problems to be solved, the prescriptions, the action strategies that you'll develop, then also real attention to the lived outcomes that flow from those action strategies and the readiness to bring those back into consideration in relationship to values in order to support adaptation and changing direction. Okay?

But to the point I was saying before and to the point of the military example, you -- a person can start this cycle from any place on it. So I am a philosopher. I happen to start from working on values. That's just what I do. That's the business that I'm in.
Bruce is a social scientist. You know, he starts from diagnosis without even necessarily, you know -- obviously, values are infusing what he's choosing to work on, but social science -- I'm going to caricature you a little bit, Bruce, I apologize -- has trained him just to go ahead and start from diagnosis without necessarily taking a lot of time to stop and think about values.

And so what this cycle does is help people ask the question of which part of the cycle is my, sort of, sweet spot or the place that I'm residing? And how do I make sure I connect to the other parts of the cycle? So if I'm a social scientist, how do I find the moments where I make space for thinking about values?

If I'm dealing with the lived outcomes of policies other people have imposed, how do I find the way to get back upstream and start changing those action strategies? How do I make sure that I can bring other people who are affecting those policies into conversations around values?

That's part of the work, and that's hard. And so then just -- I mean, this is sort of silly chart that came out of a workshop. I was just trying to help people recognize that different parts, different roles in our society have kind of taken ownership of different aspects
of this cycle. And so one of the challenges of really
driving transformation and putting values together with
policy is about building partnerships across different
role categories.

So who works on values officially? Well, philosophers do. So do people in the domain of
religion. Pastor Mike, for example, Reverend Nixon. Also, people in the domain of culture, movie-makers,
authors, et cetera, artists.

Who works on diagnosis routinely? All of our positive social scientist friends. But protesters do
too. That's what protesters are always doing, is diagnosing things that are wrong.

Who works on prescriptions? Policymakers, lawyers, a lot. I mean, the prescription space is really
flooded with lawyers. And then that matters because you get a certain kind of category of prescription if lawyers
own that space. And economists also have a fair chunk of territory in that space. And so sometimes you have to figure out how to make room for other people in the prescription space.

Action strategy, politics, advocates, community organizers. They tend to own that space. And then citizens, people in the community own the lived outcomes space.
And one of the problems is that often experts in one of these spaces just plain don't pay attention to experts in the other space. So you all know this from your experience, for sure.

I was really struck by a friend who's an economist in the Economics Department at Harvard who, after the 2016 election, he was reflecting on the impact of globalization on the politics of the country and the way globalization had caused damage to a lot of communities, as jobs left, especially the Rust Belt area, some of the more rural parts of the country and the like.

And he said, you know, my colleagues and I, we always knew that globalization would be a 20-year process to completely work its way through our economic system. But I only have just now realized, I never stopped to consider what 20 years feels like in the life of a person living through it. Okay?

And that was just, for me, a really powerful moment because it captured the way in which academic research is often so badly separated from lived outcomes. And the point of the cycle I'm trying to describe here is to suggest to people that none of -- nobody's work is complete unless it has touched on all five of these dimensions, and that academic researchers need to recognize that they are responsible for the values
part of the conversation. They are responsible for the
lived outcomes part of the conversation, et cetera.

So how does this all relate to justice
reform? I mean, here are some of the diagnostics that
you're all familiar with, we're all familiar with, I'll
just, you know, remind you of.

These are just, you know, small, empirical
snapshots of the world that we currently live in, and none
of this is new to any of you. Growth of income
inequality, which in its rate of increase and timetable,
coincides, of course, with growth in incarceration. And
then the fact that, of course, there are incredible racial
disparities aligned with all of that growth.

Again, none of this is news. And that as
incarceration grew and got more intense, it -- we
ultimately reached everybody, so that in the first decade
of the 2000s, white women saw the greatest rate of
increase in incarceration, which is important to remember.

So when we have a set of diagnostics like that,
I mean, I think a lot of people have come into the issue
of thinking about our criminal legal system from that
space of diagnosis, just registering things that are wrong
or in the space of lived outcomes, feeling the damage in
communities. That's -- certainly my own experience was
just feeling the damage in the community around me.
And so then the question is, having, you know, had those lived outcomes and experience, seeing the diagnostics starting to emerge, can we clarify the values that are activating our powerful sense that something is profoundly wrong? And that's the work you've all been doing, that Square One has been doing over many years and has reached an incredibly powerful, cumulative point. And so then having done that, right, there's an opportunity to come back to prescriptions and action strategies.

So I think of the work that has been underway in the Square One context as really, in such an important way, growing out of this 2015 report from Jeremy and Bruce that you all know, where the group reviews all the different causes and consequences of the rise of incarceration. And then in the famous Chapter 12, says, you know, not only are there all of these empirical things that we have to consider, but there's this other issue, which is that, in the demand of justice, empirical evidence by itself cannot point the way to policy, yet an explicit and transparent expression of normative principles has been notably missing as U.S. incarceration rates dramatically rose over the past four decades. Normative principles have deep roots in jurisprudence and theories of governance and are needed to supplement empirical evidence to guide future policy and research.
From my point of view, this is a transformative moment, the moment when there's a really important public statement about the necessity of doing work on values and principles, if we're ever going to transform the legal system, the justice system. And of course, the team that produced this report started that work, in that document, to try to focus on some principles that were sort of pertinent to the justice system as we've known it.

But the conversation has continued. And so we've really had the chance to dig into the question of what values should anchor a new effort at prescriptions and action strategies?

And as you all know, the place that I think we've started to land is to recognize that the concepts of public safety and well-being, safety and happiness, the general welfare are really emerging to the top of our conversations as the ones that deserve our attention. That we've had distorted definitions of public safety, definitions that have depended too much on counting crime rates that have been racialized and in ways that entrench racial domination, and that have left out the safety and well-being of communities of color and communities of lower socioeconomic resources and unhoused communities over time.

So a lot of work, as you all know -- you've all
contributed -- has gone into rebuilding these core concepts, giving ourselves a set of new anchoring definitions. And we can go back to those diagnostics that I showed you, the missing Black men, incarceration rates and so forth. And every single one of those diagnostics can be explained in terms of a failure in relationship to values of these kinds.

But so then the question comes, okay. Now, if we're clear about anchoring values and we're clear how they help us understand what's wrong with what we've lived through, how do we get to the prescriptions and the action strategies?

And so, you know, we have been working with a big network. Many of you have been participating. And we've been trying to flesh out the components of principles that could help us think about how to clarify which policies are the most valuable ones.

And I shared a draft document in advance with you. Many of you on this call have contributed to it. It's still very much in progress, but I just wanted to call out a little bit of the text from it, to give you a sense of what we're doing, what we're saying.

Oops, sorry. Now, of course, my Zoom screen is slightly blocking the text, and so I can't read it. So I'm going to just quickly go ahead and read it this way.
A just system of justice and public safety starts from recognition of basic human worth, achieves a movement from a desire for reckoning to a commitment to repair and healing, and develops human-centered concepts of accountability, capable of delivering well-being and safety for all.

This undertaking depends on pursuing the following seven human goods: relational health and community health, freedom from domination, self-determination, participation, economic dignity and security, data transparency, and recognition and redress of past state harm.

A new foundation for justice, as embodied in our systems of public safety and sanction for wrongdoing, will flow from focusing on the seven human goods above and the principles for policymaking that follow from them. There may also be other goods that we have not yet identified, but this new foundation, the hypothesis is, will deliver a well-being and safety to all.

Now, there's a lot still to be debated in these terms and in these definitions. In the document that I shared with you, there's a sort of paragraph articulating the kind of policy principle that would flow from each of these seven human goods. And you know, we really welcome your feedback and engagement on them.
But so the question then, of course, is, how do you get from this picture of a set of principles to operationalizing them? And again, taking that to be both in the terms of thinking about metrics, in terms of thinking about politics, and in -- or sorry, policies, rather, and then in terms of bringing new policies into reality in concrete contexts.

So here, I'm going to just say something about the ambition of the effort, the ambition of the cause of abolition and of justice reform, and encourage everybody to be ambitious, but also recognize that the ambition of comprehensive transformation requires partnership. So you know, it requires -- just as on that chart that I showed you with the sort of different roles people are playing, it requires people working from different roles to do different parts of the work of building a new paradigm and getting it into place.

And so the elements of getting a new paradigm into place, I think, and this comes out of work with other colleagues as well, depend on clarity about the normative foundations for the new paradigm. That's the second box there, so sort of, level one element. It's the deepest level of change, and that's really what you've been working on with the values conversation.

It requires a policy model that really brings
those values to life. That's level two. Then you also need emblematic polices, you know, sort of, concrete examples of policies that count as realizing the values. And they need to be emblematic, because that also helps teach people how to make policy and build organizational practices that align with the values.

You need key metrics. That should say level four. Sorry that's missing. And you also need vernacular narratives, level five, ordinary ways of talking about this paradigm, how the pieces fit together.

So I'm going to give you some examples that come out of the world of political economy, and then bring it back to the question of justice. Okay? So these are old paradigms, two very old paradigms, and one we're still living in, but many of us hope will become an old paradigm. So three paradigms of political economy. Okay?

Classical liberalism really dates to the late 18th and 19th century. Keynesian social democracy from the first half of the 20th century, and neoliberalism, which is the kind of political economy we've all been living with for the last 40 years. And each of these paradigms, each of these sort of systematic ways of organizing the world, has a set of normative foundations.

So in classical liberalism, for example, the things that are really valued are order and rule, liberty,
autonomy, a sort of anti-paternalistic approach to policy, whereas in Keynesian social democracy, a sort of early 20th century product, and then really built up in post-war Britain, the anchor values are things like solidarity and security and fairness.

In the world of neoliberalism that we've all been living in, the anchor values have been things like freedom and procedural justice. And these anchor values are connected to very different policy models. So if you go to the fourth column, go back to classical liberalism, and the policy model is one in which the division of labor and specialization in competitive markets really take precedence. That's what people focus on.

In contrast, in the Keynesian moment, there's a real focus on the economic concepts of aggregate demand, solidarity wages, so investing in wages for the sake of supporting social solidarity. And then in our most recent period, the policy model has depended on concepts of self-interest, the notion that you're really just structuring incentives to activate self-interest, and again, competitive markets have come back to the fore.

And each of these policy model has then had emblematic policies. Okay? So with classical liberalism, free trade, anti-monopoly work, complementarity between state-provided infrastructure and private investments,
whereas in the Keynesian world, sort of welfare state, there's been an emphasis on tax and transfer, public goods redistribution, and egalitarian, supply-side policies.

And for neoliberalism, laissez-faire, school vouchers and negative income tax. Now, that's all very technical. Right? That's the sort of -- the language of the people who own the policymaking landscape, of economists and lawyers.

But the reason the paradigms really take is because they also come to have vernacular narratives, folk ways of capturing the core ideas. And so in the last column, in classic liberalism, the famous statement from Adam Smith: it's not the benevolence of the -- sorry, that should say the butcher, the brewer, the baker. It's not from their benevolence that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest. Okay?

That was a kind of common catchphrase that captures these ideas from classical liberalism, whereas in the Keynesian context, the vernacular narratives that emerged were things like well-paid workers sustain demand in the economy, and that savings is prudent for a family, but not for a government when the economy is in recession.

And then more recently, for the neoliberal paradigm, ideas like that the government that governs best governs least, that labor unions are nothing other than
special interest groups, that there's no such thing as society, and you get what you pay for. Okay?

So those kind of very common phrases actually catch a whole paradigm that's been built up through,
again, you know, work on values, actually, plus work on policies, plus emblematic policies. All right.

So where could we go? I hope, collectively,
that we can go to something that is about shrinking the footprint of capitalism or right-sizing capitalism, you could think about it as.

So the first row there is an emerging paradigm for political economy. It's actually exactly the paradigm that we are seeing emergent in Biden's infrastructure policy. His infrastructure policy is a really good example of what has been emerging in the last, sort of, five to eight years in work done by people in the political economy.

And then the second row is a set of suggestions for how the components of a new paradigm for justice could potentially come together. Again, it's just a sort of first-pass set of thinking. But, so let me just run through the political economy row, and then I'll do the justice row, and then we'll be about ready to switch over the conversation.

So the normative foundations of this new
approach to the economy focus on the value of non-domination in the first instance, or un-dominated social relations. On the value of voice, that is, of empowering people to set directions for themselves, and on the value of sustainability.

And the policy model that is connected to this recognizes the place of identity in economics, the fact that people's -- what people want in the world is not just a matter of what economists call utility or sort of basic self-interest, but also depends on their communities and their understanding of the good that comes from the communities they're members of. A lot of focus on networks and things called mechanism design. I'll come back to that.

But so what are some emblematic policies in this space? Wealth distribution to support inclusive innovation, workplace rights and voice, for example, and competition for the market that is not letting corporations define the market, but insisting that the power of political institutions should actually help structure the market, so that the market is working in the interests of everybody.

And so what are some vernacular narratives that have come into being? One is that cooperation works, and that there is complementarity between moral
sentiments -- again, the things that we care about coming out of our communities and our material interests.

So in the space of justice, on the bottom line, the same sorts of anchor values, I think, are coming out in the conversations we're all having about dignity and voice and health in communities. So those are the terms, roughly identified there.

And the policy model is one that really elevates lived-experience policymaking. Iterative co-design -- that's kind of what we were talking about before, with nonprofits and academic researchers working together. This policy model emphasizes public health models, network social effects, power sharing, intersectional identities, and democracy tools as justice tools.

And so here is a just completely preliminary set of emblematic policies that would represent this model: demilitarized policing, de-escalation as a standard element of police protocol, shifts of budget from policing to violence prevention and health services, credible messenger programs, no pretrial detention/cash bail, and system of alternatives to incarceration.

And so what are some vernacular narratives that capture this paradigm? Human beings are fundamentally social. There's no excuse for wanton police violence.
The biggest obstacle to successful reentry is incarceration itself. Our job is the politics of care. We're building a school-to-voting-booth pipeline. Get our people healthy.

Those are just sentences that I've heard in conversations like these, in Square One workshops and other contexts, that capture, I think, the direction that people are trying to work on. So the -- one second, sorry -- I'm going to -- this is a slightly longer list of those example emblematic policies.

And if I could wave a magic wand, I would love to just sort of crowdsource everybody's sort of favorite example of a policy that moves us in the direction of the kinds of values articulated by those seven principles I started out with.

That's the first critical step in terms of how you operationalize values, is you actually find concrete examples, whether in the world or in a sort of space of imagination and solution proposal, that count as examples of those policies. And you also then begin to find ordinary language and vocabulary for talking about why these emblematic policies are so valuable.

And the package, put together, starts to teach people, decision-makers in all kinds of levels, as well as public opinion, in ways that can drive transformation. So
there's more to be said here.

There's some things that I'm hoping to say about metrics too, but I will save that for part two. And just pause here for now to let people digest and respond and talk.

MS. HUFFMAN: Great.

DR. ALLEN: That was a lot.

MS. HUFFMAN: No. Danielle, thank you so much for walking us through that, for all of those thoughts, and as you were talking, I was sort of hearing in my head, you know, the conversation that started last night, with, for example, Marlon saying, what if we organized everything around forgiveness?

And then we spent time earlier today kind of moving through the steps on your circle of, like -- if that's a value, then what does that look like in these different -- at these different points around the circle? How do we think about that, as we diagnose?

And at the point of diagnosis, what are our prescriptions? What are our actions? But then what are the lived experiences?

That then brought us back around to, like -- wait, what about that value? And it was -- it's just really, really telling, really powerful, how this can help us structure our thinking.
So I want to open it up for folks. Danielle prompted us with a question there at the end, of what are some of the examples of policies? But -- so feel free to answer that question, but also invite folks' reactions and thoughts to this.

And we will do our usual hand-raising with the availability of the urgent wave for anyone who needs it at any point. I'll -- we are going to try to turn back to Danielle in about half an hour, so that we can get a little bit more information from her on the table.

And so I'll ask folks to try to be a little bit brief in your comments just so we make sure we have time to -- for anyone who wants to, to have a moment to speak. So let's see. We have a raised hand.

Dona, go ahead.

DR. MURPHEY: Sorry. I was trying to unmute. I really like the framework, the circle, that you have shared with us. But as I was examining it, I was wondering -- it looked to me as if it were not at all linear in this fashion, that actually many of these things inform and also constrain many of the other things on that circle.

And is that something that, like, you or we, are, like, exploring further?

DR. ALLEN: I mean, it's definitely not
linear. And so I want to -- I mean, it -- however, I think -- so the reason I go ahead and leave it in a circle that looks linear is as a kind of mode of discipline, really. So that people remind themselves, what am I doing on values?

What am I doing on diagnosis? What am I doing on prescription? And stop at every moment to figure out which is the piece of this that I'm still weak on. Right?

So you -- sometimes you might need to jump from values to prescription. You may have done tons of work on diagnosis, and it's time to sort of go from values to prescription. So it's more a matter of making sure that one's always sort of thinking about how those five moments connect to each other, and making sure also that the different people who have resources to bring to bear for each of the five are participating. Right?

Because -- and that's part of the challenge, is that none of us can actually cover that whole circle ourselves in isolation. It's always about partnership. And sometimes, I think, just remembering to ask, you know, do we have all the resources we need for each of those five points, is important to getting the work done.

It's also okay to go backwards. You don't always have to go forwards. You can go -- values, diagnosis, values, diagnosis, values, diagnosis, before
you sort of start moving on to prescriptions as well.

I've seen different groups do all kinds of things with that sort of circle, basically.

MS. HUFFMAN: Nicole, do you want to jump in?

DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: Yeah. I was going to say that there is, you know -- there has been a growing movement within sociology as a discipline that has been challenging some of the ideas that social scientists shouldn't be driven by values and ethics.

And so back in 1967, Howie Becker had asked the question, whose side are we on? You know, in this kind of important article, what he was trying to say is -- he was writing at a time of civil rights and Vietnam War and widespread social change. And he challenged us to think about whether objectivity and value neutrality, you know, like, whether we could be neutral, and that we should, in some ways, pick a side.

And you know, I was talking -- we were doing a book discussion on the new book, The Torture Letters, by Professor Laurence, and you know, I offered him that question. And he said, that's me, you know -- give him a softball, and he said, you know, if we can't be -- if we have to be neutral on torture, you know, we're really in a bad place here.

And you know, I couldn't agree more, which is,
you know, early in the pandemic when everything shut down, I put some of this text -- I wrote an article for Context, which is our magazine in sociology. And I wrote this in my book, Crook County, you know, our pursuit of objectivity in our research scares us into incorporating considerations of compassion, morality, humanity and grace into our research, despite the overwhelming evidence that it may be the antidote for the pain and loss we are experiencing in this moment.

And then I basically at the end of the article say, if there's anything called sociological malpractice, but insert whatever social science it is, it would be noticing and measuring inequality, and then, you know, raising your hands and saying, there's nothing I can do for it. And so you know, I would even -- as a social scientist, I would even go farther and say, when can we call it malpractice?

And this is in addition to research that causes harm, which we talked about in the last session. So it's not just the -- I'm neutral, which I think is a form of complicity, but it is research that actually causes harm.

And so I'd love to hear your perspective on harm creation, in that we also have the capacity to create harm, either by doing nothing or sometimes doing something.
DR. ALLEN: Yeah, yeah. No. Absolutely. I mean, I think that's where, for me, the lived outcomes piece is so important, right. That is, it's not enough to just sort of do your piece of research and leave it at that.

You need to actually be connected with people who have more understanding of lived outcomes, of that flow from that research or that policy development and the like, and it's also not about one-off conversation. I mean, that's where I do think one of the most important things coming out of the Square One conversation, and not just -- I mean, many other sites too, is this point about co-design, right -- co-design of research, co-design of policy.

So you know, that was one of those -- what's the policy paradigm that's emerging right now, as we do this work together? It's a co-design paradigm. That's a very different approach to policymaking than has been in place, really, you know, ever, probably.

And it's important to recognize that that sort of different approach to research and to policymaking itself flows out of values, right, as a sort of recognition that if we are trying to move towards securing well-being for all, the only sound foundation for doing that epistemologically is one that includes all who are
affected by the research and the policy in setting the
direction for it.

So the first value is the well-being and
flourishing for all, and that -- you know, those are small
words, "for all." They capture inclusion, plainly. They
also capture and end to racial domination and to white
supremacy and the like. And so sometimes, you know, we've
got to say that explicitly too, the words "for all" don't
necessarily speak all of that to everybody.

But the point is that that commitment, that
values commitment to well-being for all is a fundamental
commitment and a new commitment in the sense that, you
know, basically the world is just too full of too many
times and places where people have accepted a status quo
of domination and exclusion, right?

So in that regard, you know, once you do truly
embrace the "for all" words, in all the depth of their
meaning, a lot of other things have to change. And that's
what we are really naming, I think, across this
conversation, is all the other things have to change, once
you take the "for all" words seriously.

MS. HUFFMAN: Jeremy, did you want to jump in
with a question?

MR. TRAVIS: Yeah, if I could? I see other
hands up. Just if I could, quickly?
Danielle, in our Square One discussions, we've mentioned two other realities. And I wonder how they fit into your really elegant schematic here?

One is the importance of organizing to bring about a change that would be aligned with a different set of values, and how, as you look at these three different sort of frameworks that you put up there, I'm not sure whether any of them were accomplished -- those shifts through organizing. So what is the shift about?

And the related, flip side of that is -- we've talked a lot about power-sharing and demands for change by people in power, and if there are deeply entrenched interests, which there are, in the status quo, what's it going to take, basically, to change that power dynamic -- the status quo, basically?

So organizing and prospect for change, given --

DR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MR. TRAVIS: -- the status quo.

DR. ALLEN: Yeah. If we double-click on action strategies, right, that takes us into that whole conversation, and absolutely -- I mean, and organizing is a part of the answer. Another part of the answer is just -- you know, it's power-mapping, but a related piece with that is also just systems mapping.

So we were talking about this in our breakout
group earlier, which is, you know, we -- in this country
in particular, we have a really unusual level of
complexity in our jurisdictional structures, with all the
layers of our federal system, and then even at the local
level, you've got city governments. You've got county
governments. You've got kinds of regional governments, et
ce tera, and then they're all working in a context of sort
of state government, where all the different state
governments have -- they're all completely different,
basically.

I was doing pandemic work and interviewing
somebody in Illinois coming out of the public health
context who said to me, you know, if you've seen public
health infrastructure in one state, you've seen public
health infrastructure in one state. And that's, sort of,
roughly speaking, exactly the same thing with our justice
system.

So nonetheless, that's why I actually do think
starting locally is so important, because at the end of
the day we can't actually answer from the top what will
work, precisely because, like, the channels, like, from
the top down to locality, are just so different. Like,
it's an almost infinite array of possibilities.

So what you really do have to do is figure out
at the local level what could work in our community. What
do we want to build in our community? And then ask questions.

I was saying to Abbey earlier, well, given this, given that this is what we want at the local level, what do we need at the state level to make that possible? What do we need at the federal level to make that possible?

If we ask the questions in that order, then you can start to see very clearly, like, who the stakeholders are, because they're, like, limited to your more limited local area, the first instance, but then there's a very clear line from that to articulating what you need at the level of the state. And then that becomes a very, kind of, clear line of action.

So yes, you need organizing, and that's sort of on three dimensions, organizing at the local level, which Abbey is doing, and I hope we could talk about that work, because it sounds like everybody should hear about it. And then organizing that takes the learnings from that and applies it to driving change at the state level, driving change at the federal level. Right?

But I would say, like, in that order, whereas very often we go the other way round. We sort of start -- we think we need to organize from the federal level first. I think it really is important to go from this
level up, but to have people, like, working together.

So you know, just one last thing to say there. I've made reference to the educational policy landscape previously. When people are trying to drive change in that, I mean, what they do do is set up, you know, big coalitions, and they'll have one chunk of folks working on state policy advocacy, another chunk working on federal policy advocacy, but making sure that that's aligned.

And it's, you know, different models at different points in time, but currently, that alignment is driven by views from a local level about what's needed by way of resources, changes to regulations or policies or mandates and the like at the state and the federal level.

MS. HUFFMAN: Yeah. That's -- that makes so much sense. It's really interesting, you know, thinking what Pastor Mike was talking about a little while ago, and the way in which, you know, sort of identifying the federal lever of billions and billions of dollars, and then doing the local organizing and bringing the local perspective to bear on that, so that it then can be driven back down to the local level. Like, that's just a brilliant work on the part of the advocates and organizers who've put that model together.

Marcia, your hand is raised.
MS. RINCON-GALLARDO: Thank you, Danielle. I really appreciated the -- I'm an audio-visual learner, and definitely the layout was very, very helpful.

I think the two things that came up for me, as I was listening to you, and I'll have to spend some time -- I've been doing a lot of self-care lately, so haven't really delved deep into some of the materials that were sent. Two things that came up for me is -- you know, when we have these definitions of well-being, I often have to ask myself, what is the definition of those things?

Or even medical models. Right? Because I ask the question of -- are we coming from a colonized thinking of these things or decolonized place? So even structures, right? These structures that we develop, are they coming from a decolonized place?

Because for Brown folk that or Indigenous folk that are not even seen. Right? So when we looked at the data that you presented, I had to ask, you know, are Brown folks, Latinos, or Indigenous people in the white category?

Or in what category are they? Because otherwise, we're not even shown --

DR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MS. RINCON-GALLARDO: -- in the data.

So then we go to the next question, which is,
okay -- does these structures -- are you talking about -- when we say, everybody, it's, like, really everybody? Or is it -- you know, because in honoring that people have come at these things with different values, then where does that live?

Because I know that, especially, you know -- I've been around reform work forever, for 25 years, especially on the youth side. And I agree with you that starting at a local level, not only is that the function of changing these things, by closing down systems -- is best at a -- has to be done at a local level, and then scaled up to state. But second most importantly is, that's where you really -- the uniqueness of each community gets to live, right?

And so anyway, those were some comments and questions about, you know, coming from decolonized places, how do we trust, you know, that these schemes, that these diagrams, that these philosophies and ways of thinking actually include some of the values of people that are normally not seen?

DR. ALLEN: Right. I want to share something, again, real fast. Just go back here.

And this is only partial, but -- so the short answer is yes. I think, for the first time, we have decolonized foundations to work from, and does that mean
that they have no flaws?

   No, I'm sure it doesn't, because everybody in
some ways will, I think, almost inevitably produce acts of
domination that other people need to critique them for,
that need to be undone. So no, nothing's perfect. But I
do think, again, for the first time, we are actually
working with decolonized intellectual foundations.

   So this is a small point, but if you -- if I
were running down the whole column here, the third column,
from all the other models previously -- like, if I went
back to this red slide -- let me go back to the previous
slide. Okay, everybody in this column is white, and
every -- I think, yeah -- everybody here is also a man.
Okay?

   So in other words, our intellectual
foundations, our normative foundations have absolutely
been exclusionary and dominating, for sure. And this
square here is half people of color in this square, and
it's not even a complete list of everybody, obviously,
who's making the critical difference here.

   So the point is just that we do, for the first
time, in philosophy -- okay, this sounds kind of crazy.
This seems like it doesn't -- like, most people think
philosophy doesn't matter. But nonetheless, for the first
time in the history of the world, okay, we actually have a
huge body of really impactful philosophy being produced by
people of color and recognized by others.

People of color have produced philosophy for a
long time, and including in even formal categories and
spaces, in addition to the many ways in which cultures
have been producing philosophy for a long time. But in
terms of the intersection of the production of philosophy
with institutional structures and decision-making and the
like, for the first time, we do have decolonized
intellectual foundations flowing into the work and into
the process.

So for the specifics of definitions of well-being, coming out of this work, I mean, the definitions
come from concepts of non-domination. That is, you have
to start from that, and people need to be able to
participate in shaping the definitions of well-being.

So the sort of process of decolonized power
relations is actually brought into the definition of well-being here. So that's just, you know, a small answer to
your very important, big question.

MS. HUFFMAN: We have a quick, insistent wave
from Nicole. And then we're going to have time -- I think
we'll have -- Jon has one more question, comment to raise,
and Danielle, then we'll turn to you for a response, and
we can turn to the next part of our conversation, if that
works for everybody.

So Nicole, why don't you go ahead quickly?

DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: This is just a quick shout-out, though. But I guess -- and just to this larger point, Black feminist scholars, for instance, have been doing value-based work in the social sciences for a long time. They have often been pushed out into gender studies or AFAM or Black studies rather than getting tenure in sociology departments.

I mean, we have to be put this out there. So I just -- you know, I know you know. It sounds like philosophy has the same problem.

But I just want to make sure that, you know, there is this undercurrent of Black -- I would say Black sociologists, critical race scholars, certainly, that do not remove values from this. They include narrative, and that's, you know -- this -- I think we need to say that. Because even just saying that the generalization that sociologists or social scientists don't have value-based, that -- I would just -- you have to say the word “white” before that because this has been done.

Angela Davis, Dorothy Roberts, Kim Crenshaw -- I mean, there's so many. So I just want to put -- I have to give them a shout-out, because they've been doing it right. And it would be -- it would probably just obscure
their work if we didn't put that big caveat in the front
of the presentation, so --

DR. ALLEN: One hundred percent.

DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: Yeah.

DR. ALLEN: One hundred --

DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: Yeah.

DR. ALLEN: -- percent. And I should say --

when I say it's the first time in the world, I --
because -- this is embarrassing. I think of, like,

millennia-length scale.

DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: Yes.

DR. ALLEN: I'm not just talking -- I don't
mean, now. I don't mean, 2021. I do mean, you know, in
this last period of time. And I am thinking about people
like Angela Davis and Kimberlé Crenshaw as well, and of
course, you know, I'm also thinking about Du Bois and
Fanon and so forth.

So there --


Hello. Yeah.

DR. ALLEN: There's an arc of this, right, over
the last century.

DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: Yeah.

DR. ALLEN: But yeah. But it's building to a
point of transforming the core. I think that's the
additional point.

That is a change from where we were when Du Bois was --

DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: Right. And if Du Bois was given his due credit, maybe social science would look very different. I just -- if he wasn't sent off from Penn, and you know, he -- if that -- we would have centered into Du Bois-ian sociology to be sociology.

We would have exactly what we need for this moment, but we -- well, that didn't happen. Right?

DR. ALLEN: Right. Yeah.

MS. HUFFMAN: Great.

Jon, why don't you jump in here and then --

DR. SIMON: Just briefly. I loved this project, and I am very much closely following it. I found this really helpful, the table.

And I just had a thought I wanted to pin around it, which is that if you think about neoliberal political economy in terms of the vernacular narratives, they -- I would say, they, and not in a conspiratorial sense, but the progenitors of that recognize the synergies between political economy and criminal justice and embraced it.

I mean, Gary Becker wrote an influential article about crime from an economic perspective. The whole idea of prices -- remember the era of "use a gun, go
to prison," or you know, 10, 20, life, that you're really setting out a price signal. And it had enormous appeal, as recently as a quarter century ago.

Since we're in New York, figuratively speaking, you know, I -- it brings my memory to being -- visiting at NYU in '96 when Giuliani was being, you know, crowned for a second term. And sort of, neoliberal New York was in glory and seemingly winning its war on crime at the same time. Very different moment now.

But I wonder if we need to think about how to make the vernacular of shrinking capitalism more integrated with a vision of the transformation of the penal state. I mean, neoliberalism was very good at seeing that -- leveraging that connection, the dissatisfactions with that.

DR. ALLEN: Yeah. No. I think that is right, and I hope that the conversation that's underway here could help achieve that. I mean, I think the folks working under this heading of shrinking capitalism are in -- they're in their own early stages of understanding of how the work they're doing in the political economy space connects to other domains.

So I have shared some of this sort of justice work with them in the hopes that their own interest in non-domination -- they could come to see the justice realm
as being one where working that idea through here too is really, really important. So I think there's a lot of potential.

And I think -- I mean, to the point that some of us were talking about earlier, lots of the things -- when we imagine a world without prisons, when we imagine a different world here, one of the things we need in order to succeed in terms of addressing violence when it does emerge and the like is strong social services, right. Sort of strong economic foundations for people, strong health foundations for people, and so forth. And you don't get any of that without a political economy that's delivering that, right?

So these things really are hand-in-glove with each other. But if you look at -- I mean, I'm sure -- I know everybody has looked at the Biden infrastructure bill, right, but -- and you've seen the debate about the definitions of infrastructure, right. This question, you know, is only hard infrastructure what gets to count as infrastructure? Or is everything else infrastructure?

That debate is the debate between the neoliberal paradigm and this new paradigm, the shrinking capitalism paradigm. But that is exactly it. Like, that -- these are the paradigms fighting with each other right now, and we should all hope that the new paradigm,
the economy of care and the like, wins.

MS. HUFFMAN: Danielle, why don't we -- I'll turn to you if you want to share the next part of your presentation, and then we can return to conversation? That would be terrific.


And so this now -- I'm going to share something that's going to feel really small bore. So I apologize for that. It's going to feel so inadequate to the moment and to the work that you are all trying to do, so I just want to apologize for that up front.

But this is just focused on the metrics piece and the importance of -- you know, of rethinking what we're measuring. And again, I know you all know the importance of that, but I just wanted to walk you through one example where that kind of work was really fundamental to transforming organizational practice, okay.

And so this comes -- it does not come from the space of justice reform. It comes from work on diversity and inclusion or inclusion and belonging in the university context. So forgive me for the self-referential example.

So a few years ago, I co-chaired a task force at Harvard on inclusion and belonging, and as, you know, every university is trying to figure this out. And we did proceed in a fashion similar to what I articulated here,
with working through values, diagnosis, prescription, action strategies, lived outcomes and the like.

So as we did this work on the task force, we literally started by working on a values statement, and we also worked on empirical diagnosis, and we did those things in parallel with each other. So you know, the University had had a habit of collecting inclusion and belonging data, and so of course, we sort of gathered what existed.

But as we worked on our values statement, we also -- I realized that we cared about stuff that the University hadn't been tracking in its data. So we would then, you know, adjust what we were asking for, from a research perspective, and in various ways, had to start doing some new research in order to be able to actually tell, you know, how things were going in relationship to the values that we were articulating.

So then, once we'd done that work and had settled on some newly formulated goals, we also sought to identify supporting factors for those goals. So what you need to see upstream in terms of norms, in terms of practices, in terms of organizational structures, in order to get the outcomes that are your goals.

And so then, once we had those goals and some clarity about, you know, in effect, hypotheses about
supporting factors, we combed the existing literature for measurement constructs that could be used to trace both the supporting factors and the goals. And again -- because there was nothing out there that had exactly the sort of survey shape or research shape of what we were now interested in.

So we were sort of cherry-picking from a variety of different kind of studies, for those specific metrics, measurements, constructs that actually did align with what we were looking for and then try to start building new instruments.

We did the same thing around practices and policy ideas. We just looked -- and this is like that exemplary policies point that I made -- we just looked for anything anybody was doing that looked like it counted as an example of the goals that we had. And we tried to gather this all up into one place in order to start having a picture of what a whole set of things you might do would look like.

And then of course we wanted to develop tools to measure alignment between lived outcomes that might flow from these new practices and policies, with the goals. With regard to action strategies, we did do the work of mapping the stakeholders who had a role in operationalizing the pertinent policies and
recommendations, and we developed political strategies in relationship to each.

So obviously, the scale of the university is a heck of a lot smaller than the scale of the country. That's what I mean about -- it's not exactly being a useful example. The actions are the same. You just need, like, a much bigger body of coordinating people to do it more broadly.

But just to focus on the first part, the metrics -- let's make this really concrete -- so from step one to step two, how did we go from values clarification to starting to have tools to operationalize things? This was the language from the statement we used, just actually, ultimately, internally, to shape our work.

We had a slightly different version of it in the final document, but Harvard's motto is "veritas" or truth. "In all things, we strive towards truth and academic excellence. Toward that end, our campus community recognizes each person's inherent dignity, strives to foster each person's potential, and promotes the bonds and bridges that allow us to support each other, to grow with each other and to learn from each other, including through disagreement.

"If we succeed in cultivating and sustaining such a campus, members of the University, regardless of
background, identity and role" -- we really wanted to include staff, who'd always been left out before in this work on inclusion and belonging -- so "regardless of background, identity and role, will enjoy full and genuine membership in our community.

"Each will have an ownership stake. It will ring true to say, 'We are all Harvard.' And because membership entails not only rights, but responsibilities, our success requires that each of us understands how we contribute to crafting this community, to supporting academic excellence, to fostering individual well-being, and to respecting each other's dignity and contributions."

So we ended up boiling that down into wanting to have the outcomes of academic achievement for all. In other words, everybody came to campus with a certain set of academic goals, and everybody deserved to be able to achieve in relationship to the goals they came with. Satisfied professional development -- making sure we were including staff in that picture of development and well-being, and the sense of belonging. Those were sort of three overarching goals. We thought the supporting factors involved academic and social integration, knowledge of skill development, support and motivation, monitoring and advising. So you know, it gets pretty granular pretty quickly.
And so we then did the work I just described of combing through literature to find constructs. We looked at a whole lot of diversity and inclusion surveys from a lot of different universities, and didn't find any that actually aligned with the values that we had laid out.

Lots of people had pieces and parts, because everybody is working in a similar space. But nobody had really boiled down the values and really kind of concentrated their measurement around those values.

So we combed through everything, gathered everything up, kind of organized it in terms of who was hitting which part of our values and goals, and then clarified for ourselves the kind of structure we wanted and started trying to boil it down. And after a long process -- it was, like, ultimately a year-and-a-half-long process, we ended up with a 10-question survey that is now being used on a regular basis at Harvard to track how the community is doing.

And so just to give you that -- so these are the 10 questions we ended up with. “I feel like I belong at Harvard. My relationships at Harvard are as satisfying as I would want them to be. I feel like I can be my authentic self at Harvard.

“The academic goals or professional goals I have for myself are being met at Harvard. I know what
constitutes good performance in my role. I receive meaningful recognition for doing good work. I feel comfortable giving opinions and feedback to people at Harvard who have more decision-making authority than I do.

“I believe Harvard leadership will take appropriate action in response to incidents of harassment or discrimination. I have the knowledge to address hostile, harassing or intimidating behavior that I witness. And please suggest one or two concrete actions that you believe would improve the climate for all members of the Harvard community.”

So 10 questions, very simple survey. Takes people three minutes to do. And for us, it really boiled down that values perspective that we started out with, and then gives us a way of holding the University to account over time for whether or not it is realizing those values in all the standard practices and protocols and actions taken every year.

So that was a really small example, as I said, but I just wanted to show you -- I wanted to be able to have one case where you could see the sort of -- the line of movement from the values statement to something as mundane as a 10-question survey that's being administered on a regular basis in an organization.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thanks, Danielle. Thanks for
that. Yeah. It really does -- just harkening back to our
discussion about research and about what are we asking,
and about what we are measuring, and all of that. I mean,
the this topic is right on point.

I'll invite folks to raise your hands with
comments or questions. You can ask questions of Danielle,
but this is also our opportunity to talk amongst
ourselves. So don't feel like that's the only way to
engage the conversation. We encourage folks to share just
what this prompts for you, what this brings up for you,
thoughts and feedback you have generally.

Monica, do you want to jump in first?

MS. BELL: Yeah, I will. You know, I'm so
grateful for that presentation. I found that to be really
helpful.

I wanted to know a little bit more about the
process of moving from the values to the actual survey,
because I think that could be just helpful for us,
thinking about metrics in these other contexts, and like,
who's putting their hands in to develop them? And also
how the data are analyzed, would be helpful as well.

DR. ALLEN: I have a long documentation memo
that I can send you, so I will do that. But just in sort
of a shorter answer, I mean, it was a big group project.

The first stage involved myself and several
graduate student research assistants, a diverse group. Diverse both in terms of personal background and in terms of department and discipline, and also reaching out -- we also built a kind of advisory committee so that people like Jim Sidanius, who's a psychologist who works on issues of race and diversity, and a whole range of others.

We had probably about eight people from different departments around the University who were a kind of intellectual advisory group, and we really wrestled through the sort of logic model with them. And that was the sort of first step of it.

And then what we actually ended up doing was taking a sort of structure for a survey and comparing the existing school surveys to it, to show school leadership where we thought their surveys were not actually hitting the right targets from a values point of view.

And then we had a stage where we were working with every school to try to help them bring their survey to a level of catching these key value areas. And then ultimately came to the conclusion that the most efficient thing to do would just be to actually add a survey that would be really short, but would unify the whole campus around something, as opposed to having different surveys in different places.

So the point of saying all that is just to say
a lot of stakeholders were involved, so it didn't just go from research into, you know -- in use. It went through decision-makers. It went through focus groups with students and staff and the like, along the way, and at each point along the way, we checked the values again.

It's, like, the values themselves are always also being discussed, as you're also kind of looking at whether or not the instrument realizes the values in a kind of authentic way.

MS. HUFFMAN: Other thoughts or questions that folks might want to share?

DR. ALLEN: I'll just throw one little thing out, which is -- you know, I know a lot of people are working on, for example, making sure that things like police killings are reported in public health data, right -- that we've had this problem of various kinds of state violence not counting from sort of public health metrics.

And that, I think, is a very important, powerful project and one that, you know, it would be good to, you know, bring to the surface for discussion, and you know, broad engagement in the question of those public health metrics and what should go in them that might facilitate movements in the directions we're all discussing.
MS. HUFFMAN: Jeremy?

MR. TRAVIS: Yeah. Two questions, Danielle. This is absolutely fascinating. We don't often see that trajectory from idea to formulation of a group to think it through, to articulation of values, to a 10-question survey.

So two very practical questions. If you look back on that critically, is there anything that you would do differently, looking at where you ended up? And just, if you can give us some sense of what has changed at Harvard because of this?

I'm assuming, without knowing, that there was some impetus for the creation of your committee, that -- and it almost doesn't matter what it was, but you were created -- but you were also there to address some issues. And has there been forward movement on something where you'd say there's a plausible connection between this process and that change within the Harvard community?

DR. ALLEN: I think one of the biggest changes has been the empowerment of people, both students and staff, in particular, to say we are supposed to be at the decision-making table. Look, this says so. Right? Even the survey says so, because it says, do I -- can I speak up to people with more authority than I have?

And that's the -- I think many things have
changed, but probably the biggest thing is the number of just academic committees that now have students on them, when they never did, number of, kind of, faculty committees that now include lecturers when they -- you know, lecturers were not included previously. They were sort of limited to tenured faculty, and the like.

So there is a kind of spreading democratization of deliberative and decision-making context in the University. I think that's probably the biggest impact so far.

MR. TRAVIS: Anything you would do differently, Danielle?

DR. ALLEN: Yes. So that's actually interesting, and it's funny because it relates to things that I do differently again in other contexts too. So I mentioned the sort of work with the different schools, trying to, you know, take their surveys to them and see if we can help them adjust their surveys.

I think, you know, we actually tried in the beginning to produce, sort of, model surveys for each school. That was a wasted effort, ultimately, in the same way that I think sometimes when people try to produce a kind of model policy for, like, 50 different states, it's a wasted effort. Because the contexts are just so variable that what you really do need to give people is
design principles.

And the kind of combination of the goals and our short, 10-question survey is much more powerful as sort of design principles, than giving people a whole blueprint for what they should be doing.

MR. TRAVIS: Yeah. Simplicity for the guideposts. Yeah. That's --

DR. ALLEN: Yeah, exactly.

MR. TRAVIS: -- a great, great lesson.

DR. ALLEN: Yeah. But making sure you have that measurement piece, right. Because if we had just had the goals and not the survey, you know, honestly, I think nothing would come from them. Okay?

So it really matters that we made it to that simple survey that is in use, at the end of the path.

DR. MURPHEY: You mentioned --

MS. HUFFMAN: Next questions?

DR. MURPHEY: Oh, sorry.


DR. MURPHEY: Sorry. Did you mention who had access to the data?

DR. ALLEN: You mean, now, with the survey that's in use or the previous --

DR. MURPHEY: Right.

DR. ALLEN: -- data that we were working with?
DR. MURPHEY: Well, I guess, all of the above, but yeah.

DR. ALLEN: Yeah. That's a great question, and you know, one of the things we struggled with in the work was discovering how limited access to data was. And we had to force access, at least for our group, to chunks of data that were off-limits.

And we did in our overall recommendations recommend data transparency and establishing a norm of that. This survey data is transparent, I believe.

Actually, honestly, I have to admit, I have not been close to it for the last year, so I would have to go back and actually check, but it's supposed to be transparent and broadly accessible for use.

I don't know how much progress we've made with the specific schools in terms of how well they're doing at the data transparency recommendation for their specific school's specific surveys.

MS. HUFFMAN: Jump in with a question or comment? Yeah, Bruce, over to you.

MR. WESTERN: This isn't specifically about the data piece, but includes it. This is also thinking about the whole model of, sort of, ethically guided problem-solving that you've described. And I'm trying to bring your perspective and approach in the work you've done in
conversation with how we were talking about it in the earlier part of the afternoon.

I've a bunch of thoughts there, but I want to pick up one piece here. And one thing that's sort of come up is a thread, and it came up in our breakout sessions. It came up last night too.

So a lot of the work that people are doing around the table is very deeply ethically infused, and it continuously spills over into people's professional roles. And they're often thinking about their own moral journey in the work.

Nneka spoke about this earlier this afternoon, sort of reflecting on her own role running Cook County Jail. And how -- what place does that question have? Like, the moral journey of the person doing the work in this way of thinking about addressing and solving really big, hard, sort of -- not just policy problems, but you know, social problems in the world?

DR. ALLEN: Uh-huh. Well, you know, funny you should ask. I have another framework for that.

And let's see if I can find it easily or not. Let's see. I don't know if I can right now. I might have to send to everybody afterwards.

MR. WESTERN: Nothing like Elizabeth Warren, Danielle, you know, I have a --
DR. ALLEN: So I have a framework for that. The framework I have for that is called, the "Ten Questions for Young Change-Makers." Because I actually developed it for young people. So no offense to all of you, but you can use it too. It's all right.

But it is exactly that question, Bruce. It's exactly about that journey of understanding what you care about and why, how to make choices about actually protecting yourself, because you also have to think about that, too, as you move toward situating your own action in the world.

And then the question of how to move from what you care about and why, how to make it about more than yourself, how to make sure you're protecting yourself, too. How to find allies, how to identify the action strategies that will help you take something that you want to give voice to, to something that you want to have influence over.

But -- so I mean, the first part of the journey really is about that, you know, reflection on what matters to you and why. And then clarifying the sort of choices you have in front of you for acting on what matters to you.

And I think, you know, for me, I also spend a lot of time when I do workshops with young people around
that -- well, all kinds of people, but we do talk a lot
about the different roles that are available. You know,
not everybody has to be, you know, an activist, or not
everybody has to be, you know, a sort of hard-charging
reformer.

There are lots of other ways also that you can
make the difference in the world that matters to you. And
to the point I was making originally with the circle, you
know, we really do need all kinds of expertise.

So I often have kids in my office, right --
wrestling with the question of whether or not they should
be, you know, more or less, an activist or a lawyer.
That's kind of a common dilemma.

And we need lawyers, right? We need lawyers
who are on the sides of activists, so I definitely want to
encourage some of those kids to be lawyers, even if I am
also encouraging others of those kids to be activists.

And so that's, you know, an important thing, is
that, you know, you can do good work from across a whole
variety of roles. And the question is, like, how do you
get to do good work?

That starts with that self-reflection about
what matters to you and why, how you weigh questions of
what you want to share. That's how we formulate the self-
protection question. How much do I want to share, why and
with whom?

   And then the question of, you know, once you're clear about those things, how you start building partnerships, finding allies, learning how to convert voice into influence. But I can't find it quickly right now.

   If I can find it, I'll send it to everybody.

MR. WESTERN: That's great.

DR. ALLEN: It used to have its own website. Somehow it seems to be buried under other things right now. So --

MR. WESTERN: That's great.

DR. ALLEN: This will give you some info, anyway.

MS. HUFFMAN: Other --

DR. ALLEN: I'll put it here.


Other thoughts and comments? I am looking around the screen, and I know about the work that many of you all have done, but I -- this situates you, possibly, at least on the surface, at particularly points around the circle or in this work. But would love to hear folks' thoughts about how would you see this potentially applying or not applying to the work that you're doing? Or
anything else you'd like to share.

Oh, Abbey, over to you.

MS. STAMP: Great. Thanks. Danielle, thank you. I haven't been in school in a very, very long time, and I felt really deep in the water, so thank you for this opportunity. Abbey, listen, listen, listen.

The circle is really helpful and I was actually thinking about something that Daryl said last night. Thank you so much to Square One for recording that, because I was able to watch it before I hit the hay.

The YouTube was fantastic. But how he talked about -- and I mentioned this in the paper I wrote for the Executive Session on racial justice, but how law enforcement assisted diversion, the outcomes are really showing that white people benefit. So just that generic criminal justice reform always benefits white people more than anybody else. We have to really lean into that intentionality.

That happened in Multnomah County, and now LEAD is taking a turn, and it's turning into something different. It's really prioritizing folks who are struggling with addiction and homelessness, and prioritizing Black men for eligibility for all of the things, all of the good things.

And I think if we had had the values, the
diagnosis, the prescription, the strategies, and the lived outcomes as a framework beforehand, that we could have understood what some of the challenges and problems were, and in the iterative space, made some improvements before it kind of got a little crazy, and you know, kind of took some time and energy to do that.

So just thank you for the model and for helping me, you know, like, cognitively have to check in this afternoon. It was awesome. Thank you.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thanks, Abbey. Other thoughts that folks have? Vivian, over to you.

REV. NIXON: Hi. Danielle, this was great. You know, the conversations along the way were great too.

I remember the day that the economist came and gave -- I'm still -- I still want those slides. I think you might have sent them to me, but I lost them.

So if you can send those --

DR. ALLEN: Oh, I'll resend them. Sure.

REV. NIXON: But definitely the ones that he did that day --

DR. ALLEN: Yeah.

REV. NIXON: -- they were -- like, my mind was blown.

DR. ALLEN: I'll send them to you. Yes. Sam's slides. Yeah.
REV. NIXON: But what I think about your line/circle diagram is -- I have been really sitting here thinking of the numbers of areas of my life with -- that thinking pattern is helpful. It's unbelievable how almost in a way generic and simple it is, but yet so complex.

So thank you for presenting this. I do think there is a possibility that we're moving into that one, two, three, fourth column.

Is it the fourth?

DR. ALLEN: Exactly.

REV. NIXON: I -- you know, I don't know if we'll ever get beyond that, but the way you chart it out makes it so simple to understand.

And so to me, this brings up a point that may or may not be relevant to this conversation, but I think it's relevant to the whole Square One Project -- is that the hard work that academics do to come up with these ideas and theories to make the world a better place, or not, depending upon what you believe, whether or not that's the role of an academic -- I think it should be.

If they were just more accessible, like, if more people could understand that the outcomes of the research that you do, in language that people really can relate to, I think whole communities would behave differently, would invest in their own lives differently,
would access the power that they have differently, which is why I really love the column that uses colloquialisms to match the theory.

I just -- yeah. I think that more research should be presented in that way so that it is more accessible to the public, and I'm just going to continue to follow you and try to be like you.

DR. ALLEN: Well, Vivian, you know, you know how much of your voice is in the work that we've been trying to do, and I hope you heard the combination of well-being and safety as a pair in that.

REVEREND NIXON: Yeah.

DR. ALLEN: That's thanks --

REV. NIXON: I did.

DR. ALLEN: -- to you. So --

REV. NIXON: Yeah. It's really great work, so thank you for sharing it with us.

DR. ALLEN: No. Thank you. I would love to brainstorm with you about the point you just made, because I think you're right. I was thinking about this.

After our breakout group earlier -- because I said, I have this question that I just can't answer for myself, of why has it been so much harder to coordinate for nationally scaled-up transformative action in the justice space than in other spaces, though now, it's
occurred.

It's happened thanks to the Movement for Black Lives, BLM specifically. So they've done it, and I mean, though we're still -- there's still a lot of room to go in terms of achieving that, kind of, wholesale coordination.

And I was just -- after our breakout group, I was thinking about it. And I said, I think the answer is actually the one that you just said, Vivian, which is, it’s just lack of representation of impacted people and communities of color in so many decision-making spaces, research spaces and the like.

So in the other areas I was mentioning, education issues, democracy reform, where I have seen just a kind of faster transition to really broad-scale coordination, people are actually integrated into political representation, into academic contexts. And I think, like, that's the answer to the failure of us to achieve the level of coordination we seek.

So I think your point is a really deep one about, you know, our work not being available to people, not being accessible to people, but I think that issue fundamentally is one of representation. So I do -- that brings me back to the need to figure out how to solve the representation problems in every dimension of our organizational structures.
Yeah.

REV. NIXON: Yeah. I think every --

DR. ALLEN: Like, once people are at the table, they get the stuff, you know? Like --

REV. NIXON: I mean, if it's presented in the right way, because there are papers I read that I just -- no matter how many times I read them, I could not articulate it back. Right? I think every research paper should be required to have one that you submit to the journal, and then a second, like, you know, my research paper for the other people.

Like, here it is in regular language.

DR. ALLEN: Right.

REV. NIXON: Yeah. But --

DR. ALLEN: Yeah. But by the same token, I mean, that is true, but I think, you know, when you or somebody else is at a table with researchers, you know, if the researcher is still writing and communicating that way, like, you know, three interactions down the road, then that's a real failure on the part of the researcher, right?

So you know, having people at a table then actually is also how researchers learn how to do their own communicating differently.

REV. NIXON: Yeah. But it's a function too of
how you get where you need to go as an academic. So I get it, that you're trained in a certain way. And in order to move up that ladder, you've got to do it.

DR. ALLEN: Yeah. It's a deep point, though. Because there's just a deep, you know -- it's a deep blockage or obstacle to what we're all trying to do.

MS. HUFFMAN: I think we see -- thank you, Vivian and Danielle.

So the -- we have a couple more raised hands.

If folks would like to get in the queue, we -- I'm sensing we may finish a little early on this Friday afternoon, but folks should definitely jump in the queue if you have other questions or thoughts you'd like to raise.

We'll hear from Susan and Dona, and anyone else who raises a hand. And then Danielle, we'll turn back to you for any closing thoughts you'd like to give, and then turn to Bruce. So with that, I will turn to actually -- let's see who's next?

Susan. Yes.

DR. GLISSON: Thanks, Katharine. Thank you so much, Professor Allen. This is just brilliant and wonderful, amazing. I can't wait to dig in more.

I'm thinking -- the conversation that you and Reverend Nixon just had was really rich. And I'm -- it's reminding me of, you know, when Ella Baker called all the
students together, to Shaw University, to create SNCC. For them to create SNCC, she encouraged them to stay separate, right, from the SCLC. And she deliberately kept the northern students out of the organizing conversations with the southern students, because of the ways that white supremacy had prevented, you know, access to some of the things that the northern students had.

I'm remembering a story that Lawrence Guyot told me once about a northern student, and he was really excited about Hegel. And he wanted to, you know, talk to Guyot about Hegel and Hegel's importance.

And Guyot said, Listen, what I want you to do is go down to a street corner in McComb, Mississippi, and I want you to talk about Hegel, and I want you to tell me how many community folks come talk to you.

Fast forward. We were doing the Mississippi Truth Project, right --

DR. ALLEN: I used to carry Hegel with me on airplanes so that people wouldn't talk to me. So --

DR. GLISSON: That is awesome. Fast forward to when we were trying to -- we tried really hard for a little while to create a Truth Commission in Mississippi. And it -- we had the -- we were doing oral histories, you know, to help lift up people's stories, and we also had academics who were coming in to do research,
right -- to document patterns of abuse and that sort of thing. And we were really kind of more excited about the oral histories, you know, just because those stories just haven't been told.

And then there was this interesting meeting one day, when a community member said, You have to privilege the academic stuff, because the people in Jackson and the legislature don't care about our stories. They're only going to listen to the academics, that the academics are going to be ones that are legitimate.

So I'm just -- I just want to lift those two stories up, because there's such a need for that marriage, you know, to come together for the bridge to be built, whatever the right metaphor is. And I think the conversation that you and Reverend Nixon just had, and the work you're doing really points us in that way.

And so I'm really appreciative.

DR. ALLEN: Thank you so much for sharing that, Susan. I appreciate it. I think you've put it perfectly.

I mean, that's exactly right. And figuring out how to build that bridge and how to make space for it, so that people know they need it, that's -- those are the key things.

I mean, by people who need to know, they need to -- I mean, the legislators too --
DR. GLISSON: The legislators.

DR. ALLEN: -- don't know they need it, but they do need it to do their jobs better. Yeah.

DR. GLISSON: They do. Or a different legislature. Need to be different legislators.

DR. ALLEN: That's the other solution. That's what --

MS. HUFFMAN: All of the above. All right.

Dona, we'll turn to you for a last question/comment, and then, Danielle, back to you before we wrap up for the day. This has been just a great, great conversation.

Dona, over to you.

DR. MURPHEY: Thanks. Yeah. No. I wanted to say -- actually, I wanted to make a different comment, that just -- following on Susan's comment.

I think it's important, too, to make sure that, like, in that partnership between academics and people who have, like, lived experience, that -- you know, like, this organizing principle that we talk about often is, like -- know when to step up and know when to step back, right?

And I think it is important to not have people who have those platforms actually speak for those other individuals, but really to know when it's appropriate to actually use those platforms and that leverage to step
back and to allow somebody else to step into that position to speak for themselves. I think that's actually really, really important.

I don't -- I mean, I often am trying to do that, like, as -- when I do, like, medical advocacy, like, I realize that people listen to me more, right? Like, if I show up at a county commissioners court meeting and I have something to say about, you know, something that the county hospital did to an undocumented patient, right -- I realize that I have a lot more sway. And I also think that I have the ability to stay using that sway and that influence to say this is why you have to actually listen to this person, right?

Like, and then just to bring them with me and to have that person actually be the person to speak -- I really don't believe in speaking for people. Like, I speak with people. I advocate with people. I don't advocate for people. And I think that's also important.

The other thing I wanted to say is that this problem with, like, criminal justice reform having, you know -- the continued challenge being that there is a lack of representation, that I think is also a problem in many other spaces. Like, in health care, it's a huge problem. Right?

Like, this dynamic, I think, historically,
culturally, within medicine between the doctor and the patient, rather than the doctor and the patient. Right? Like, I think this is a problem, and it's -- yeah, it's not just in criminal justice.

It's in a lot of other areas, I think. Anyway, that's just what I wanted to say.

DR. ALLEN: Thank you, Dona, for sharing that. I appreciate it. And yes, it's -- that's super important.

We need to speak with and advocate with, absolutely, yeah -- not for. Yeah. Thank you.

Katharine, you wanted me to --

MS. HUFFMAN: Danielle, yeah, you're -- over to you for any closing comments or thoughts you have. No pressure. And then we'll turn to Bruce.

DR. ALLEN: Well, mostly just thank you. I mean, it's always the case that the conversations in Square One sessions are extraordinary, and the human gifts everybody has given this afternoon, I'm very grateful for, and I'm also just encouraged.

I learned a lot today about things that you are all working on that I didn't know about previously, and that really lifts my heart. It has been a pretty intense time, and a really hard week in particular. So a couple of you have made reference to that.
It's true for me too. I was pretty tired, I have to admit, before this, and I'm leaving this session actually less tired than I was at the beginning. That's saying something. That's not usually the dynamic of attendance at an academic event.

So thank you, everybody. I think you've helped me see paths forward I hadn't seen before. I'm very grateful.

MS. HUFFMAN: Well, a huge thanks to you, Danielle, for all of your thinking and your work and your time and your presence with all of us through this. And we look forward to the many continuing conversations next Friday, as well as ongoing beyond that. So thanks so much.

Bruce, we'll hand over to you for a few minutes to close us out with the day's conversation and go from there.

MR. WESTERN: Yeah. This was a very big day, I think, of three sorts of points.

So we began the day reflecting on the conversation from the night before between Daryl Atkinson and Marlon Peterson, and we began by talking about forgiveness, which was an important theme. And I think in our group -- today was so interesting for me because I think in our group we've developed over this Roundtable,
over earlier work from Square One, a way of thinking about the process of building justice in the country.

And part of what was super interesting about today was that Danielle has been working on that same problem as well. And so I'm going to try and bring these two ways of thinking about building justice together. And I'm doing it on the fly, and it's -- I don't know.

I haven't quite put it together in my own mind. But I think very much, within the Square One conversation, I think restorative justice is often a model for us that we try and project out to the policy and political process, and we try and think in those terms about our own role.

And so I think the idea of forgiveness was very resonant for us from the Marlon and Daryl conversation. Partly because that is how we think of -- it's part of a process of a non-punitive way of healing in the aftermath of harm.

And so we're thinking about our process of building justice as a process of -- very much as a process of restoration and healing. And Jeremy spoke right at the top of the day about the central importance of healing.

And behind that problem is the emotional and physical toll that's taken by violence. And that's what we're trying to heal, all of the damage that's done
emotionally and physically by violence. And healing, I think, has two dimensions in the way we've been talking about it.

There's a relational component. We're trying to set relationships right again after harm has been caused. And there's a power component, we're trying to re-empower those who have lost power by being harmed. Restoration is partly a project of empowerment.

And these sorts of ideas, setting relationships right and empowering, I think, flows through all of our conversations. It flows through our model of what practice should look like in -- under a new kind of justice, a non-punitive kind of justice. It flows through the way we're talking about the relationship between researchers and communities. We're trying to re-balance the power relationship between those two actors, who has expertise.

So from there we went to a discussion of the irreducible minimum, and the issue of abolition was front and center. And abolition was described in a few different ways in the conversation. It wasn't just freedom from human captivity, right? That could be one version of abolition, but Nneka and Susan both said they use practically identical language.

No one is irredeemable. Right? So in a world
in which -- in the justice that we're conceiving, no one is irredeemable.

And interestingly, I thought, Daryl said last night, you know -- he's thinking of a language of reconstruction, as much as abolition. And I think that's also very consistent with this idea that no one is irredeemable. And so I think we're sort of -- we're building a model of justice and a process that would promote justice in our conversation.

There are two big challenges that surfaced in our conversation to this restorative healing model of justice. One is that at one level, we want the people who are really, really proximate to harm to have more voice in the process of change, but the harm that they have suffered impairs their agency. It is -- so many times on this call, people spoke about being worn out, exhausted, questioning, self-questioning about their own role and relationship to the work. Keith spoke very strongly to this in the subgroup.

The second thing is, right, suffering harm is -- it's an emotional event. It brings our emotions to the surface. And I wonder if part of the emotions that we experience as a consequence of suffering harm and living close to harm in this work -- I wonder if part of that emotion is also a wellspring of retributive sentiment?
And I'm not sure we've fully grappled with that because, you know, people have also expressed anger in this conversation. I think this very vexed discussion we have of system actors -- what is the relationship of system actors to the justice process -- reflects that we're kind of mad at people, you know.

We haven't totally made peace with our own retributive sentiment. And I wonder if we need to struggle more with that? Okay. That's kind of the morning sessions. And then -- and it's very organic, that discussion.

Danielle's presentation and her model of this ethically guided problem-solving is very analytical. And it's -- there are components to it, and there are specific kinds of roles associated with components. The thing that I loved about it, for me, was a little bit one layer below the surface.

I thought she was describing in the diagrams, values, diagnosis, prescription, action plan -- this was a paradigm. This was an interlocking set of ideas and practices and roles that operated systemically together to create a whole variety of effects that create racial inequality in the system, that create enduring inequalities and injustices that persist across generations and over historical time.
Making change is paradigm-shifting work, is disrupting the logic of all of these interlocking pieces. So this is not -- in this framework, change is not tinkering at the margins. It's re-conceiving of a new logic.

And it's -- so it's entirely -- I feel we're entirely on the same page. Reimagining justice, we say, right? That's Square One. This is the same kind of project.

It's ambitious work, and she said -- and I love this -- ambitious work requires partnership. And there's a lot of different roles. There's a role for philosophers and researchers and lawyers and organizers and citizens. And that's very additive, I think, to the conversation that we're having.

And it also says, there are plural forms of expertise. Different people are good at different things, and we have to act together in order to disrupt the logic and create a new paradigm. So how do we bring these two approaches together?

This is my last point. I think, from -- a starting point for the Square One perspective -- lived experience is very, very elevated. And I think we try and center lived experience.

And so I want to think about, in this circle of
values, diagnosis, prescription and action plan, you know, what would that look like if lived experience was somehow centered in that process? Because I think that's often the case for us.

The second thing is that, you know, you could look at the diagram and think, okay, this is how you do large-scale change with a hard policy problem. I see it very processually. This is a cycle that gets repeated iteratively, over and over, over and over again. And we want to make a virtuous circle of this ongoing collaboration between all of these different actors playing all of these different roles with multiple forms of expertise.

And I think, you know, this is very political. This is about redistributing power. You know, there's lots of -- power is very distributed in this sort of model, and it takes power away from the experts and the state. And so I think it's very generative and additive to the conversation we've been having.

So you know, that's where I landed in, you know, trying to bring these different threads together. I have announcements. Should I go with --

MS. HUFFMAN: You have the close-out, Bruce.

Yes. Thank you. Thanks for that.

MR. WESTERN: Okay. So we're going to meet
again, and it's in a week's time on April 30. And we will start -- the livestream will start at noon, and we can -- the Zoom room will be open at 11:30 for people who want to check in then.

This next meeting, right, every meeting we do justice in the location we're at. If we're in person, we would have been in New York City for this last meeting. So we will have a special session on justice in New York, the justice questions that are being confronted in New York City. And that's going to be followed by our closing session on the aspirations for the values of justice.

The Justice in New York panel will include Eric Cumberbatch -- many people, but including Eric Cumberbatch, who was on Detroit Roundtable. Vivian will be on the Justice in New York panel, and Danielle Sered from the Executive Session.

As we wait, we request that you review the pre-reading material. There will be pre-reading material that we'll circulate. Please note that Danielle's paper has only been -- oh, Danielle Sered's paper this is -- has only been shared to the Roundtable participants. So we'd ask, when you get Danielle's paper, not to circulate that. It's in the publication pipeline.

Boy. That was a pretty amazing day. I'm just constantly -- like, I'm searching for the word. I don't
want to say amazed, because -- inspired, I think, by how much people bring of themselves to this conversation, and you know, people bring all of their life experience and intelligence and wisdom and their emotional selves.

I wish we could be retiring to the bar, as our next step to process this all. But my heart's very full with all of you today, and thank you so much, and we'll see you next week.

MS. HUFFMAN: Thanks, everyone.

(Whereupon, the Roundtable was recessed, to resume Friday, April 30, 2021.)
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