

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

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS, CONTINUED

Zoom meeting  
12:00 p.m. EDT  
Friday,  
April 23, 2021

## PARTICIPANTS:

Aisha McWeay | Executive Director, Still She Rises Tulsa

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

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

Courtney Robinson | Founder, Excellence and Advancement Foundation

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

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

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

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

Eddie Bocanegra | Senior Director, READI Chicago Heartland Alliance

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

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

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

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

Gabriel Salguero | Founder, National Latino Evangelical Coalition

Heather Rice-Minus | Vice President of Government Affairs and Church Mobilization, Prison Fellowship

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

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

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

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

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

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

Kristian Caballero | Community Outreach Coordinator, Texas Appleseed

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

Marcia Rincon-Gallardo | Executive Director, NOXTIN

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

Vivian Nixon | Executive Director, Community and College Fellowship

I N D E X

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Session Launch	5
The Irreducible Minimum and Abolition Writers:	26
Jonathan Simon	
Marcia Rincon-Gallardo	
Nneka Jones Tapia	
Report Out and Discussion	46
Operationalizing the Value of Justice: The	82
Guiding Principles	
Moderator: Katharine Huffman	
Presenter: Danielle Allen	
Session Wrap-up	158
Session End	165

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 MR. TRAVIS: Hello, everybody, and welcome back  
3 to this next session of the Square One Roundtable. I'm  
4 Jeremy Travis, and pleased to be with you, and pleased to  
5 welcome people back after a remarkable discussion last  
6 night.

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

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

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

1 was so thought-provoking and so timely and so lively.

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

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

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

21           And then we'll -- about 10 minutes to the hour  
22 or so, we'll go into breakout rooms with the magic of Zoom  
23 that can do this for us. We don't even have to think  
24 about it. We'll end up with colleagues who we get to  
25 spend some more time together in a smaller setting.

1           And in each of those, there's been one of our  
2 colleagues who's been designated to listen carefully and  
3 take careful notes of the conversation and report it back  
4 to the larger group. And there's a Square One staff  
5 person assigned to each breakout session, who will also be  
6 listening with that goal in mind, to make sure that we  
7 capture everything that happens in those discussions.

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

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

16           So then after the breakout reports, we will  
17 take a break at 3:30 Eastern time, for a grand total of  
18 15 minutes. We're really generous with time here.  
19 Fifteen minutes, we know, that it is probably more than  
20 you need, but we'll ask you to come back at 3:45.

21           And then Katharine will take over, and what a  
22 treat we have in store for us, here in the Roundtable and  
23 for those who get to watch this on YouTube. Danielle  
24 Allen, who has been a participant in the Square One  
25 discussions that we had on the social contract and wrote a

1 paper for that Roundtable meeting, she will be interviewed  
2 by Katharine about some of her thoughts on values and the  
3 role of values, and what are the guiding principles that  
4 we should keep in mind as we reimagine justice.

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

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

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

24 But we also thought about the role of values,  
25 and you will recall that Daryl at one point had this nice



1 riff where he talked about moving from should to must to  
2 shall. Here's what we should do. There's an urgency.  
3 Here's what we must do.

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

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

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

23 But at the same time, there was this discussion  
24 that went back and forth about how do we think about  
25 restoration? How do we think about reconciliation? How

1 do we think about some of the values as being  
2 operationalized in the moment or in the -- at a community  
3 level?

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

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

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

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

25 And for this purpose, please also use the blue

1 hand signal that you would like to be called upon, and  
2 we'll spend some time getting your reflections on last  
3 night. And for those of you who couldn't make it last  
4 night, I just encourage you to find it on YouTube.

5 It was a really, really spectacular discussion.

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

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

10 Thanks, Katharine.

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

21 Like, how to motivate work here right now,  
22 given that there's not a plan to take us all out of here  
23 right now. So like, how to sustain labor, if that's one's  
24 view, I think, is just something that, you know, I have  
25 certainly been thinking about in terms of -- especially in

1 terms of abolition.

2           You know, how possible, I guess, do you have to  
3 think actual, full-on abolition is, in order to work  
4 toward it in the here and now. So you know --

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

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

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

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

24           So that sort of kept coming up for me, as I  
25 thought about abolitionist approaches.

1 MR. TRAVIS: Yeah. I think the mention -- the  
2 focus on forgiveness as a value really struck a chord.  
3 And I noticed in the group that gathered after, after we  
4 sort of went off-camera, that some of our colleagues said,  
5 that's the hardest one for me, personally.

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

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

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

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

23 And I've often -- I mean, Bruce will attest to  
24 this. I mean, sociology has belatedly discovered Du Bois  
25 as its founder, and I don't think he was being taught or

1 Monica was even being taught as part of the canon in your  
2 sociology theory class. Now, we've decided he's -- and I  
3 think the great book by Aldon Morris, *The Scholar Denied*,  
4 certainly lays a foundation for it.

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

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

15 Dona?

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

17 MR. TRAVIS: It should happen.

18 DR. MURPHEY: Okay.

19 MR. TRAVIS: Yeah.

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

25 I think it's dynamic, even as we, you know,

1 maybe come closer to a shared understanding of what that  
2 looks like. I think that also changes, like, depending on  
3 a lot of different circumstances.

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

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

17 Yeah.

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

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

1 well.

2 Bruce?

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

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

18 And so they had an active role in that too.  
19 They had to come forward to the truth and reconciliation  
20 process and make a full accounting of what they did.

21 So forgiveness doesn't depend just on the  
22 aggrieved party. It also depends a lot on the responsible  
23 party as well. So what would we think a process would  
24 look like?

25 I think we've got some clues, right -- with --



1 I think, Susan Glisson, in an earlier meeting, is -- you  
2 know, she reminds us that these are often importantly  
3 local processes, in which we're talking about the harms  
4 that have been confronted by specific communities in  
5 specific times and places and so on.

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

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

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

19 MR. WESTERN: Absolutely.

20 MR. TRAVIS: -- between the parties.

21 So you referenced a state-sponsored engagement  
22 that becomes individualized, and that's one model we could  
23 think about. But certainly, forgiveness at an individual  
24 level requires some acknowledgment of harm, and we've seen  
25 that a bit.

1 Kris, you're up next.

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

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

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

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

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

25 So it seems, like, implicit, I think, in a lot

1 of our conversation, is thinking about, like, you know --  
2 this imagining particular sources of infractions, like,  
3 individuals, like interpersonal violence or something like  
4 that.

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

8 MR. TRAVIS: Right, right.

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

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

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

1 in the moment, like, what -- the full nature of harm.

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

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

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

22 So with thanks to Courtney for getting --  
23 highlighting that from last night, let me ask Nicole to  
24 say a few things, and then Susan. And then we'll switch  
25 gears and talk to our bloggers.

1 DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: No. I -- just this  
2 idea of forgiveness, I -- and my first thought, for some  
3 people, it sounded like they were talking about reentry.  
4 So if you create harm, you know, are you welcome back to  
5 society, and what would it take?

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

13 MR. TRAVIS: Right.

14 DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: -- hide it.

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

22 No, it's not. No, it's not. You don't know  
23 what you've seen. You don't know what you heard. You  
24 know, it's, like -- well, I've got it on tape. I have  
25 someone talking about this abuse.

1           And so how do you heal, when the person won't  
2 acknowledge the harm they've done? And it almost reminds  
3 me of, like, domestic violence, like -- admit you're  
4 wrong, admit you're wrong, admit you're wrong. And the  
5 abuser is the one saying that, and they never will own the  
6 violence they're perpetrating.

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

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

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

24           And yet the onus feels like it's those who are  
25 disempowered by the system, for them to forgive. But yet

1 I think if we're talking about stakeholders, I mean, the  
2 word "stakeholders" means you have a stake. You are  
3 holding onto a stake in the existing system that's  
4 creating the violence.

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

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

12 Susan Glisson, and then we'll switch gears.

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

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

24 He was the head of the secret police. You  
25 know, he enforced a lot of the extra-legal measures,

1 violence, that was meted out. And so she's grappling with  
2 the idea of remorse as integral to these processes, and I  
3 think that's something that's worth talking about.

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

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

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



1 family of its victim.

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

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

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

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

19 MR. TRAVIS: Well, thanks go to you, Susan, for  
20 those words and for your work on this topic, which is just  
21 so exciting. I think those of us who were with you in  
22 Durham will remember vividly your contribution at the end  
23 of our time together there, about your work. And it was  
24 really a perfect capstone to that meeting of the  
25 Roundtable, and once again, the perfect ending here.

1           So dear friends, we're going to switch gears  
2 and we're going to do the following. We're going to ask  
3 our three colleagues, who have each written a blog post,  
4 to spend a few minutes, not many -- three to five is what  
5 they've been asked to do. We'll see how well we can keep  
6 to that. To summarize what it is that they've put into  
7 that writing, and just remembering that we're now thinking  
8 about moving towards this -- living in the tension.

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

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

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

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

22           So to start off, I just want to first -- I  
23 don't have sage or cedar or copal. I'm in a totally  
24 different space, but I want to acknowledge the original  
25 people of the land.

1 I'm in Chumash land, and -- but wherever you  
2 are, you know, just acknowledging the original peoples of  
3 that land. And then I have to start by also just kind of  
4 reintroducing myself. My name is Marcia Rincon-  
5 Gallardo.

6 My spirit name is Tlacapansin [phonetic]. And  
7 it took me all the way till almost being 60 years old to  
8 be able to have a traditional ceremony with one of our  
9 elders, who's 90, to actually name me according to our  
10 traditional ways.

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

21 And we have people -- there's usually what  
22 people call the sponsor, who's sitting in the spot, the  
23 revered spot, to actually be there so that we can  
24 intentionally pray for them and for the purpose for which  
25 we were brought to pray for them for. And it could be a

1 happy moment, like a graduation, a birthday, or it could  
2 be a very sad moment, someone who passed or someone's very  
3 sick, or something -- somebody was wronged.

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

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

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

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

24 And so even the comment last night -- maybe we  
25 have to leave America. No, this is our homeland. This is

1 our homeland, and we have -- we are connected and tied to  
2 it. And so, if we are connected and tied to this land,  
3 that we are connected and tied to everything, you know,  
4 whether they be the mountains, whether they be the air.

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

10 We're trying our hardest to show that our  
11 ancestors and the original people didn't use prisons,  
12 didn't use structures of four walls. We're trying to  
13 find -- to make sure, you know, research-wise, to be able  
14 to say, no, our ancestors never even used cages, right?

15 Because we were successful in being able to  
16 handle offenses, and there were restorative practices.  
17 Even the truth and reconciliation -- they are  
18 peacemaking. This land has developed those processes, and  
19 to honor the peoples of this land, we go back to those.

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

23 And so in the reconciliation, or the reckoning  
24 part of it, is to acknowledge how did our people respond  
25 to offenses or misbehavior, to then be able to say,

1 okay. And then the white men came with their values and  
2 were very clear about those values, those Puritan values,  
3 especially on the youth side, the youth justice side, that  
4 they came with values about children being born of sin,  
5 and that you had to beat the sin out of them.

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

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

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

1 are the solutions?

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

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

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

23           But there are some values, such as being  
24 humble, such as, you know, the ones written in the report,  
25 that we honor virtues of honesty and humbleness and

1 integrity. That it isn't just about money, right -- that  
2 being a benefit to society, where success and wealth and a  
3 rich life is not measured just by money.

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

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

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

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

20 DR. SIMON: Well, I'm honored to follow Marcia,  
21 and just to bridge, I'm sitting on the unceded land of the  
22 Ohlone people here in Alameda County, California. And I  
23 have to say that, you know, you can't begin to even seek  
24 forgiveness until you know that you're part of the  
25 problem.



1           And I've lived in California in various ways  
2 for decades. And when I moved out here in '77, probably  
3 to get away from the Chicago police, who you can see  
4 followed me anyway, I loved California and felt this  
5 enormous sense of satisfaction in being an American who  
6 just moved to California at 18, and enjoy its universities  
7 and its fabled parks.

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

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

23           Let me quickly move to a couple of things from  
24 my piece. So I -- first of all, it's an amazing time to  
25 talk about values. I know the arc of this wasn't planned

1 to take place during a global pandemic and a reckoning  
2 with racial justice after the murder of George Floyd, but  
3 what a time to think about values.

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

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

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

23           I think what happens is that the only way you  
24 come to know values is through a moment of political  
25 upheaval in which those values have suddenly, as Bruce put

1 it last week, sort of become a motivation for people to  
2 take extraordinary risks and to do extraordinary things.  
3 And I've mostly been a witness to that from comfortable  
4 spots.

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

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

18 And the reason I think they're interesting, to  
19 think about those two values, is that when we -- when you  
20 ask me to think about the irreducible minimum, I kind of  
21 like that, because it accepted that abolition is the right  
22 horizon. And then the question is, like, well, what  
23 values ought to anchor our sense of what we want left, or  
24 what we want after we transform the system as much as we  
25 can?

1           And it seems to me that while it's the Black  
2 Lives Matter movement that's bringing abolition to the  
3 fore right now, it's also bringing the irreducible minimum  
4 to the fore, which is, to me, anti-violence.

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

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

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

22           And I hear the Black Lives Matter movement  
23 saying our current criminal legal system is incompatible  
24 with human dignity. It's not just that it murders people  
25 with some regularity, Black people, but actually on a

1 daily basis, it's humiliating to people. And humiliation  
2 is the -- much, in some ways, more than death, the kind of  
3 ground-up indignity, or you know, we know dignity when  
4 it's denied us, right?

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

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

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

21 But I do think that one of the lessons maybe,  
22 or one of the values that has come to the fore during the  
23 war on crime, that the Black Lives Matter movement is  
24 radically reinterpreting for us, is anti-violence.  
25 Because if the real value -- if the real thing we want

1 from public safety, what we call public safety, is  
2 protection of human dignity against its most challenging  
3 threats to the human body, to the human life, to -- the  
4 various things that we call, violence, which is not an  
5 easy word to understand in its full ambit.

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

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

25 And if you think about any of them, it's hard

1 to see how they would stop violence. They're just not  
2 well calculated to do that, no disrespect to them in that  
3 regard.

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

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

22 Then it seems to me that, you know, in many  
23 respects, the Black-led leadership of the movement in this  
24 country was taking the lead -- taking its lead from the  
25 anti-colonial independent movements around the world and

1     tried to fashion itself as a kind of revolutionary --  
2     well, when you watch Fred Hampton in the Black -- *Judas*  
3     *and the Black Messiah*, you know, he's offering the Rainbow  
4     Coalition, and then asking the audience to -- are you a  
5     revolutionary? It's a little bit awkward.

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

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

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

17            Nneka?

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

22            And last night when we wrapped up our Square  
23    One Roundtable discussion with Marlon and Daryl, I looked  
24    at my news feed. I'm from North Carolina, and I saw where  
25    police killed another Black man.



1           And as I think about Mr. Andrew Brown, Jr. this  
2 morning, afternoon, I'm sitting here today and I'm  
3 emotional. And it's okay for me to be emotional. And so  
4 I don't apologize if I cry this afternoon, because I  
5 just -- I really need to just grieve. I acknowledge the  
6 role that I played as a system actor, and ultimately, what  
7 impacted the sustainability of carceral systems.

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

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

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

24           When an officer was fired for excessive use of  
25 force, when vile acts were caught on camera and we were

1 able to sleep a little bit better because we removed that  
2 one person from this whole system of toxicity, we  
3 celebrated. But those moments were fleeting, and what was  
4 enduring was a fear that people had.

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

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

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

23 And in every case, not most, but every case,  
24 that person was a person that we as a community failed  
25 over and over again. And as I sit here today, I

1 understand that the American correctional institution does  
2 nothing to correct that damage. It only multiples it.

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

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

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

24 And the two points that I want to end with are  
25 really sparked by my blog, but also sparked by the

1 conversation we had last night with Marlon and Daryl. And  
2 in last night's conversation, we talked about some  
3 individuals being irredeemable. And as I reflected on  
4 that conversation and my experiences working in this  
5 system, I felt compelled to share my reflection that no  
6 person is irredeemable.

7 No person is irredeemable. The system is. The  
8 system is irredeemable.

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

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

19 MR. TRAVIS: Nneka, I think I speak for all of  
20 us when I say that we're really moved by your honesty and  
21 your bravery, your own personal journey that you've  
22 traveled and your reflection on your life and on these  
23 state of affairs in the country, and your willingness to  
24 bring that to this group today, and to provide that as a  
25 testimonial to the work ahead.

1           It was really, really powerful and deeply  
2           impactful. We are in your debt. So thank you, to you and  
3           to Jon and to Marcia.

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

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

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

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

24          And then we'll come back after a break at two  
25          o'clock, Eastern time, for a report out from the breakout

1 sessions at 2:30. So here we go. Magic of Zoom.

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

6 Here we go. See you soon.

7 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

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

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

21 And then we'll have a group discussion about  
22 what we've just heard, and then we'll take another break  
23 at 3:30. And then after that break, come back for  
24 Danielle's discussion with Katharine. So that's where we  
25 are.

1           But before we start that, I just want to  
2 reflect on where we were when we went into our small  
3 breakout sessions. And we had just heard from Nneka about  
4 another, yet another painful episode, this one in her own  
5 state of North Carolina, another reminder of yet another  
6 Black man dying at the hands of law enforcement.

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

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

20           I just want to bring it back to the full group,  
21 and to acknowledge that, to acknowledge that difference,  
22 and to acknowledge that pain and the deep emotions that  
23 come with that, and to say to people, if they feel that  
24 the discussion is just too difficult, too raw, to -- at  
25 the moment, we understand that.

1           And if it means you want to take some time away  
2 from this discussion, please feel absolutely free to do  
3 so. And certainly, if that brings emotions to the fore,  
4 that's a very important part of our time together, and an  
5 important vehicle for communicating precisely what we're  
6 talking about here, which is the deep nature of the harm  
7 that has been carried out, basically, by the way we  
8 approach the issues of justice in the country.

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

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

21           This is also a time to take of ourselves and to  
22 recognize that there is a need for people who are doing  
23 the work to engage in whatever the appropriate for you  
24 forms of self-care and connectivity and solidarity with  
25 others.



1           So I thank those who raised up this issue in  
2 one of the breakout sessions. Thank Nneka for being so  
3 clear and explicit about where she was, but want her to  
4 know that she's not alone, and that we embrace this  
5 challenge precisely because of what it represents -- is  
6 the deep hurt and the deep harm, the need for healing and  
7 justice. So thank you for being who you are, and for  
8 making this part of our Square One conversation.

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

16           So Susan?

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

23           Jeremy is a wonderful facilitator and got us  
24 going, and Courtney really grounded us in the conversation  
25 about how the idea, the concept of the power of humanity

1 keeps coming up. Really, Nneka's idea that -- Nneka's  
2 idea, sorry -- that no one person is irredeemable.

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

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

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

20 Jeremy lifted up the idea from last night's  
21 conversation with Daryl and Marlon about political  
22 education, and potentially political education being a  
23 precondition to abolition. And then Courtney, you know,  
24 noted part of what needs to be understood is that white  
25 supremacy culture is the air in which all of us breathe.

1 It shapes and limits and affects everybody, so that just  
2 bringing Black and Brown folks into a space with a group  
3 doesn't automatically fix things because of what white  
4 supremacy culture has done to dehumanize.

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

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

22 And then Eric really just laid it out, lifting  
23 up this really powerful question of, what if we start with  
24 de-gunning the police? How might that affect how we are  
25 policed? He suggested that law enforcement needs to have

1 healing as much as communities do in order to repair and  
2 restore balance and harmony, that the trauma that police  
3 officers have is being reflected back onto the communities  
4 in more harm.

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

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

12 I hope that was okay.

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

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

20 And she shared that what it always goes back to  
21 her is organizing, and while that work is laborious and  
22 unglamorous and sometimes even boring, that's what we  
23 have to do. And then she also underscored a point, that  
24 really was a theme of this conversation, around history.  
25 If you don't know the history, then it's easier for us to

1 deny the truth, which is then what led folks into the  
2 political education conversation.

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

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

11 MR. TRAVIS: Great.

12 DR. GLISSON: You're welcome.

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

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

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

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

25 So I, you know, in having this conversation

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

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

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

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

23           And we talked about how redemption needs to be  
24 consistent, and accountability on all levels is something  
25 that we should all lean into, no matter how hard or

1 uncomfortable that can be, particularly as we were talking  
2 about the results of the Chauvin case and the verdict  
3 there.

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

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

20           And then Danielle also mentioned that in order  
21 to do that, we have to be able to connect all levels of  
22 government and systems, from the city to the state to the  
23 feds, to create national, meaningful, and permanent  
24 change. And towards the end, we talked about ambiguity  
25 and how changes needed, moving towards abolition, is

1 critical, but that we need to lean into that ambiguity.  
2 And it's okay if we don't know what it's going to look  
3 like, but the importance of putting your weight forward  
4 and continuing to charge in and agitate and capitalize on  
5 all of the momentum, hopefully, will add to the constancy.

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

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

13 (Pause.)

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

16 And Madison, what would you like to add?

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

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

25 So we talked about the concrete steps to get us



1 there and the different modes and keeping consistency and  
2 making sure or ensuring that people are in -- within --  
3 brought into the process of moving towards abolition. So  
4 that's just one point I want to underscore.

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

7 MR. TRAVIS: And thank you, Madison.

8 And then, Kris, to be supported by Evie.

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

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

23 We kind of started with the question of what  
24 would be, you know -- what are the identifiable,  
25 irreducible minimums? And our group quickly didn't even

1 really entertain that question and went straight to  
2 abolition as the goal.

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

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

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

21 Emily very quickly came in and talked quite  
22 extensively and comprehensively about the need to focus on  
23 process. And in essence, she said that outcomes will  
24 never be any different so long as the process is not  
25 changed, and that if we really want to get to where we

1 need to be, the focus really ought to be on establishing  
2 the process. We spent a great deal of time talking about  
3 how process matters.

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

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

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

25 So we spent a great deal of time talking about

1 the power structure and the resources that would allow a  
2 new system to come into being, and how we can create  
3 that. And the statement was made that we're going to have  
4 to uproot, un-root the current power structure to allow  
5 for a better process. We're just going to have to  
6 ultimately get to that point, and that money that is  
7 appropriated -- if the rules aren't written correctly, the  
8 money is going to go to the same entities who are going to  
9 find a way to capture it and continue the same work that's  
10 happening right now.

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

18 And at the end of the day, it's time to start  
19 over. I mean, it's really time to acknowledge that what  
20 we have in place is just not working. It's time to  
21 reimagine the work that we're doing and make sure that we  
22 have a power structure in place that allows people to lead  
23 who need to be leading, and it's people -- it's the Black  
24 community, it's the Latino community that needs to be  
25 leading in establishing the system, and that there will be

1 a struggle in shifting these resources from systems that  
2 embody structural racism to individuals and communities  
3 that can help reduce violence.

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

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

17 And Nicole reminded us, rather than saying that  
18 we're going to invest in the most violent communities,  
19 that that's not fair. We should be saying that we're  
20 going to invest in communities that are most victimized or  
21 that are most under-resourced. And we talked about how we  
22 can be intentional about making sure that we are not  
23 including, but replacing the current structure with Black-  
24 led, Latino-led individuals to determine how these  
25 resources will be invested and how they will be utilized.

1           And that it's also important to look long term  
2 and not just short term, and not just think of -- not just  
3 settle for investments to be made in a two-year or a  
4 three-year or a five-year period of time, but really begin  
5 to look at longevity in investment.

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

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

20           And Jon offered up that it's time to call for a  
21 moratorium on police stops, on auto stops, until we can,  
22 you know, stop the tragic events that are happening. We  
23 just need to stop what we're doing, so that we don't  
24 continue to see the same thing play out over and over  
25 again.

1           MR. TRAVIS: Thanks so much, Kris. You covered  
2 a lot of ground.

3           Evie, what would you like to add to that?

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

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

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

20           You know, Kris mentioned that recidivism is  
21 often way too overemphasized. But also, you know, who is  
22 eligible for receiving these kinds of finances? And a lot  
23 of times, those people who have worked with system actors  
24 in the past, and Nicole mentioned this specifically, are  
25 those that are immediately thought of to be the first

1 people to receive funding for future research.

2           So those people that have been involved,  
3 working in, you know, police offices or organizations  
4 often are the first people that this money -- you know,  
5 gravitate towards this money. So thinking about new and  
6 creative ways that resource allocation can happen was  
7 something that I thought was super interesting about the  
8 conversation.

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

17           So thank you.

18           MR. TRAVIS: Thanks, Evie. So just a  
19 listener. I want this entire screen to just recognize  
20 that Bruce and Katharine and I have the great privilege  
21 every two weeks of having a meeting of something called  
22 the Square One Steering Committee, I think we call  
23 ourselves, where we get to sit with Anamika and Madison  
24 and Evie and talk about the future of the Square One  
25 Project.



1           We learn from them. They are driving this  
2 work. They are the hope for the future, and even though  
3 they don't show up physically, because their videos are  
4 off right now, they show up in lots of other ways. So  
5 we're grateful to them, and this gives me a chance to say  
6 thank you to our colleagues, who are just spectacular.  
7 Oh, look at all those hearts and applause and everything.

8           So, look at the ground that's been covered in  
9 the breakout groups. And I said this morning that the  
10 breakout group experience for me last time was so rich and  
11 so just iterative, and the communication was so easy and  
12 back and forth and back forth, that it really helped me  
13 think about what we've done in the morning. And I hoped  
14 that you've had that experience as well.

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

22           So just to respect the work done in the other  
23 breakout groups, when you were hearing the reports back  
24 from Susan and Katharine -- sorry -- Susan and Kris and  
25 Abbey and the supporting work by the Square One team, did

1 something hit you, and you say that's new, and I want to  
2 work it a little bit? I want to work it within this  
3 group.

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

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

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

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

17 DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: -- I think the idea  
18 that I'm -- you know, I am an academic researcher.  
19 Right? I'm an empiricist. I, you know, apply for grants.

20 I don't -- but I've also kind of pushed back  
21 from some of that because I feel like it requires you to,  
22 in some ways, create research that will allow the police  
23 to keep wanting to work with you. And I've never been --  
24 I don't -- I have a standard that would say I won't do  
25 that.

1           But what Pastor Mike was kind of saying was  
2 that, you know, it was almost like he was fighting the  
3 academics. And that really is heartbreaking for me, and I  
4 feel like there's enough of us here that are academics  
5 that we should be able to mobilize on his behalf and on  
6 other activists', you know, behalf. Because, you know, I  
7 think there is a way that we can create research that  
8 merely just amplifies the violence that we're seeing, you  
9 know, things like hot spot policing, things that are  
10 solutions, but really just more forms of incarceration.  
11 Body cams, as, you know, a solution for accountability,  
12 when accountability is what police are pushing back on.

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

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

24           Some have actually participated in previous  
25 Square One Projects, but they've been less inclined to say

1 critical things about police, even at this moment. And so  
2 it really is a balancing act. But I think, after hearing  
3 Pastor Mike make this plea, it really does -- to me, there  
4 feels like a sense of urgency, because if the money is  
5 coopted away from experts like Pastor Mike, that would  
6 truly be a tragedy.

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

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

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

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

23 And now, you're applying for a grant for body  
24 cams so you can also get that money, which is about police  
25 accountability? It's not compatible, ethically. And yet

1 it's happening within the academy, and that -- when Pastor  
2 Mike also observed it from another vantage point, I think  
3 that, to me, was powerful.

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

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

15 But there was also another effort to put, or to  
16 open up, up to \$10 billion worth of grants in the -- in 25  
17 agencies across -- 25 programs across five agencies. And  
18 so just part of what we're talking about when we're  
19 talking about the RFP process, is, what does it mean for  
20 us to build into RFPs these kind of -- a safeguard that  
21 the resources are going to Black and Brown community  
22 violence prevention groups on the ground and not being  
23 sucked up by -- and I -- you know, I don't mind mentioning  
24 the names I've mentioned, the Everytowns, the Giffords,  
25 the Bradys, the David Kennedys, the Gary Slutkins, the --

1 you know, Thomas Abts, like the range of scholars,  
2 criminologists, you know, big firms, advocacy groups that  
3 historically have literally been obstructionist to us  
4 trying to replace or at least scale up these efforts that  
5 are Black-/Brown-led in communities across the country, or  
6 even just as body of work.

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

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

25 It impacts people getting black-balled. A lot

1 of this is relationships behind the scenes, with folks at  
2 the federal level, in the White House, in the DOJ, at the  
3 municipality level.

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

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

22 MR. TRAVIS: Well, your best is always pretty  
23 good, so thank you for that, Pastor Mike. We can continue  
24 this theme. You didn't particularly call out the  
25 scholarly community, which Nicole had taken from your

1 earlier conversation. I just want to leave on the table  
2 as well, because I think that's an important challenge.

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

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

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

23 So the floor is open to continue on that  
24 discussion or anything else that people would like to  
25 bring before the group.



1                   Yes, Courtney?

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

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

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

22                   And so while we will see things in our  
23 community about researchers coming in to help, researchers  
24 often come in to help themselves. And I can say that  
25 because I sit on both sides, and I've been able to say to

1 my colleagues, okay, you want to come in with my kids, my  
2 Black and Brown kids, to do A. What are you going to do  
3 for this organization?

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

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

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

20 We had this discussion in Detroit, if you may  
21 recall, where there was some very direct challenges to  
22 some of the academics in the room. And that became as a  
23 parallel conversation where there's hope now at the  
24 Justice Lab at Columbia to actually bring people together  
25 to facilitate that discussion.

1           So Bruce, not to put you on the spot or  
2 Katharine or Anamika, who is working on this, this might  
3 be something that people -- we could engage some of these  
4 folks on, thinking about bringing this conversation into  
5 that -- and that on the table.

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

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

22           So we're trying to figure out, you know, how do  
23 we design that? How do we play a role that's genuinely  
24 supportive and not self-interested, in the way that  
25 Courtney and Pastor Mike have described?

1           And you know, that's what -- and how can there  
2 be a role for community actors and organizations in the  
3 design and conduct of research that we often see with sort  
4 of research practice partnerships, which involves working  
5 with state agencies?

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

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

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

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

22           You know, I think what we're hoping to do is,  
23 kind of, share that research can be values-based, which I  
24 think really comports with this Roundtable. You know, how  
25 can research be designed, conducted and deployed to create

1 a racially just and equitable world? How can it be used  
2 to advance liberation?

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

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

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

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

1                   So that's all I have. Thanks.

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

9                   So when you talk about what federal funding  
10 looks like, you know, that's, you know, really getting  
11 down to brass tacks, and who's "eligible," whatever that  
12 means, to apply for that funding, how is it  
13 distributed. And particularly in this case, which I  
14 really appreciate from Pastor Mike's intervention, is that  
15 this remarkable reality which might in fact be a pivot  
16 point in paradigm-shifting on safety and well-being and  
17 community-led intervention -- ironic, I think, that it  
18 might come from the federal government, but the fact that  
19 that's even a possibility is a tribute to those  
20 organizations that are listed on that poster. And we're  
21 fortunate that two of them are Square One colleagues.

22                   Pastor Mike with his organization and Fatimah  
23 Dreier with HAVI have been at the forefront, and others  
24 that we've been in touch with. So that's a moment to pay  
25 attention to.

1                   So yes, Nicole?

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

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

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

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

24                   MR. TRAVIS: Thanks, Nicole. And thanks,  
25 Monica, for providing it. I just put it on my screen.

1 I'll look at it in the next break.

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

5 So then your thoughts on this?

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

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

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

25 It's just a question of who's in the position



1 to come on campus and say, we need X research done and  
2 we've got grants that we can deliver if you can do this  
3 work on our behalf.

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

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

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

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

23 I want your head to be full and crowded and  
24 messy with lots of neurons bouncing around. So it's not  
25 quite a clear head, but just ready -- just re-energized

1 for a great discussion that's coming up. So we'll see you  
2 in 15 minutes.

3 Is that right, Katharine? Yeah. Okay.

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

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

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

16 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

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

22 It's been a terrific ride and really a lot of  
23 really interesting ground covered thus far. And as we've  
24 dug in on these questions about the principles of -- the  
25 values of justice and what they are and how we can move

1 towards them, we're ready this afternoon to talk about  
2 operationalizing the values of justice, and to consider  
3 what guiding principles might look like.

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

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

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

24 So that will take us through the next couple of  
25 hours, and then we'll have our usual wrap-up with Bruce,

1 and finish our day together. So just wanted to give you  
2 all that little bit of a roadmap.

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

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

15 Danielle, over to you.

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

23 So in that regard, if that's where the energy  
24 takes you, that's completely fine. So I will be, you  
25 know, responsive to you, as we go.

1           I took the question about operationalizing  
2 values quite literally, and understood it to have both a  
3 social science component and a practical, sort of,  
4 application component. So as a social science matter, I  
5 think one of the things that is really hard about working  
6 with values is that so many people in the social sciences  
7 are trained that their work has nothing whatsoever to do  
8 with values.

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

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

22           So I'm going to talk about both things, and  
23 really make the case that the work belongs together,  
24 thinking about values and thinking about the empirical  
25 realities, both in terms of social science and in terms of

1 how you transform them.

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

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

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

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

22 So when I see a data visualization -- I'll show  
23 it to you later in this presentation about -- there is one  
24 in the *New York Times* from 2015 by David Leonhardt and his  
25 colleagues called, "1.5 Million Missing Black Men."

1           Some of you may have seen it or may remember  
2 it. And it was really just a sort of numbers-based  
3 diagnosis of how many African-American men were walking  
4 around in the community compared to numbers of African-  
5 American women, the sort of huge gap between the presence  
6 of women and the presence of men, and a lot of that  
7 reflecting incarceration, reflecting early mortality and  
8 the like.

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

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

25           So again, you know, values are just never

1 absent from any part of the work. So for that reason, I  
2 always like to call values out as their own moment when  
3 I'm talking to people about iterative problem-solving, so  
4 that, you know, instead of just thinking you've got a  
5 problem and you've got to diagnose it, come up with a  
6 prescription, come up with an action strategy, I like to  
7 ask people to take a moment to just stop and work on  
8 values explicitly so they can think about how their values  
9 are factoring into the work of diagnosing a problem, of  
10 coming up with the prescriptions, and the like.

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

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

23 The military has a hard job to do in terms of  
24 trying to train soldiers to make, you know, really quick  
25 decisions in context of uncertainty, and they want those



1 decisions to align with preexisting protocols, including  
2 ethical protocols. But they also recognize that people  
3 are making fast decisions, and as they make those  
4 decisions, they'll be laying down new patterns.

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

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

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

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

1 from a moment of action, actually.

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

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

21 But to the point I was saying before and to the  
22 point of the military example, you -- a person can start  
23 this cycle from any place on it. So I am a philosopher.  
24 I happen to start from working on values. That's just  
25 what I do. That's the business that I'm in.

1           Bruce is a social scientist. You know, he  
2 starts from diagnosis without even necessarily, you  
3 know -- obviously, values are infusing what he's choosing  
4 to work on, but social science -- I'm going to caricature  
5 you a little bit, Bruce, I apologize -- has trained him  
6 just to go ahead and start from diagnosis without  
7 necessarily taking a lot of time to stop and think about  
8 values.

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

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

21           That's part of the work, and that's hard. And  
22 so then just -- I mean, this is sort of silly chart that  
23 came out of a workshop. I was just trying to help people  
24 recognize that different parts, different roles in our  
25 society have kind of taken ownership of different aspects

1 of this cycle. And so one of the challenges of really  
2 driving transformation and putting values together with  
3 policy is about building partnerships across different  
4 role categories.

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

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

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

22           Action strategy, politics, advocates, community  
23 organizers. They tend to own that space. And then  
24 citizens, people in the community own the lived outcomes  
25 space.

1           And one of the problems is that often experts  
2 in one of these spaces just plain don't pay attention to  
3 experts in the other space. So you all know this from  
4 your experience, for sure.

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

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

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

1 part of the conversation. They are responsible for the  
2 lived outcomes part of the conversation, et cetera.

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

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

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

19 So when we have a set of diagnostics like that,  
20 I mean, I think a lot of people have come into the issue  
21 of thinking about our criminal legal system from that  
22 space of diagnosis, just registering things that are wrong  
23 or in the space of lived outcomes, feeling the damage in  
24 communities. That's -- certainly my own experience was  
25 just feeling the damage in the community around me.

1           And so then the question is, having, you know,  
2 had those lived outcomes and experience, seeing the  
3 diagnostics starting to emerge, can we clarify the values  
4 that are activating our powerful sense that something is  
5 profoundly wrong? And that's the work you've all been  
6 doing, that Square One has been doing over many years and  
7 has reached an incredibly powerful, cumulative point. And  
8 so then having done that, right, there's an opportunity to  
9 come back to prescriptions and action strategies.

10           So I think of the work that has been underway  
11 in the Square One context as really, in such an important  
12 way, growing out of this 2015 report from Jeremy and Bruce  
13 that you all know, where the group reviews all the  
14 different causes and consequences of the rise of  
15 incarceration. And then in the famous Chapter 12, says,  
16 you know, not only are there all of these empirical things  
17 that we have to consider, but there's this other issue,  
18 which is that, in the demand of justice, empirical  
19 evidence by itself cannot point the way to policy, yet an  
20 explicit and transparent expression of normative  
21 principles has been notably missing as U.S. incarceration  
22 rates dramatically rose over the past four decades.  
23 Normative principles have deep roots in jurisprudence and  
24 theories of governance and are needed to supplement  
25 empirical evidence to guide future policy and research.

1           From my point of view, this is a transformative  
2 moment, the moment when there's a really important public  
3 statement about the necessity of doing work on values and  
4 principles, if we're ever going to transform the legal  
5 system, the justice system. And of course, the team that  
6 produced this report started that work, in that document,  
7 to try to focus on some principles that were sort of  
8 pertinent to the justice system as we've known it.

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

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

25           So a lot of work, as you all know -- you've all



1 contributed -- has gone into rebuilding these core  
2 concepts, giving ourselves a set of new anchoring  
3 definitions. And we can go back to those diagnostics that  
4 I showed you, the missing Black men, incarceration rates  
5 and so forth. And every single one of those diagnostics  
6 can be explained in terms of a failure in relationship to  
7 values of these kinds.

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

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

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

23 Oops, sorry. Now, of course, my Zoom screen is  
24 slightly blocking the text, and so I can't read it. So  
25 I'm going to just quickly go ahead and read it this way.

1           A just system of justice and public safety  
2 starts from recognition of basic human worth, achieves a  
3 movement from a desire for reckoning to a commitment to  
4 repair and healing, and develops human-centered concepts  
5 of accountability, capable of delivering well-being and  
6 safety for all.

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

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

20           Now, there's a lot still to be debated in these  
21 terms and in these definitions. In the document that I  
22 shared with you, there's a sort of paragraph articulating  
23 the kind of policy principle that would flow from each of  
24 these seven human goods. And you know, we really welcome  
25 your feedback and engagement on them.

1           But so the question then, of course, is, how do  
2 you get from this picture of a set of principles to  
3 operationalizing them? And again, taking that to be both  
4 in the terms of thinking about metrics, in terms of  
5 thinking about politics, and in -- or sorry, policies,  
6 rather, and then in terms of bringing new policies into  
7 reality in concrete contexts.

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

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

25           It requires a policy model that really brings

1 those values to life. That's level two. Then you also  
2 need emblematic polices, you know, sort of, concrete  
3 examples of policies that count as realizing the values.  
4 And they need to be emblematic, because that also helps  
5 teach people how to make policy and build organizational  
6 practices that align with the values.

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

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

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

24           So in classical liberalism, for example, the  
25 things that are really valued are order and rule, liberty,

1 autonomy, a sort of anti-paternalistic approach to policy,  
2 whereas in Keynesian social democracy, a sort of early  
3 20th century product, and then really built up in post-war  
4 Britain, the anchor values are things like solidarity and  
5 security and fairness.

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

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

22           And each of these policy model has then had  
23 emblematic policies. Okay? So with classical liberalism,  
24 free trade, anti-monopoly work, complementarity between  
25 state-provided infrastructure and private investments,

1       whereas in the Keynesian world, sort of welfare state,  
2       there's been an emphasis on tax and transfer, public goods  
3       redistribution, and egalitarian, supply-side policies.

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

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

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

23               And then more recently, for the neoliberalism  
24       paradigm, ideas like that the government that governs best  
25       governs least, that labor unions are nothing other than

1 special interest groups, that there's no such thing as  
2 society, and you get what you pay for. Okay?

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

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

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

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

25 So the normative foundations of this new

1 approach to the economy focus on the value of non-  
2 domination in the first instance, or un-dominated social  
3 relations. On the value of voice, that is, of empowering  
4 people to set directions for themselves, and on the value  
5 of sustainability.

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

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

23           And so what are some vernacular narratives that  
24 have come into being? One is that cooperation works, and  
25 that there is complementarity between moral



1 sentiments -- again, the things that we care about coming  
2 out of our communities and our material interests.

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

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

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

23 And so what are some vernacular narratives that  
24 capture this paradigm? Human beings are fundamentally  
25 social. There's no excuse for wanton police violence.

1 The biggest obstacle to successful reentry is  
2 incarceration itself. Our job is the politics of care.  
3 We're building a school-to-voting-booth pipeline. Get our  
4 people healthy.

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

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

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

23 And the package, put together, starts to teach  
24 people, decision-makers in all kinds of levels, as well as  
25 public opinion, in ways that can drive transformation. So

1 there's more to be said here.

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

6           MS. HUFFMAN: Great.

7           DR. ALLEN: That was a lot.

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

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

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

22           That then brought us back around to, like --  
23 wait, what about that value? And it was -- it's just  
24 really, really telling, really powerful, how this can help  
25 us structure our thinking.

1           So I want to open it up for folks. Danielle  
2 prompted us with a question there at the end, of what are  
3 some of the examples of policies? But -- so feel free to  
4 answer that question, but also invite folks' reactions and  
5 thoughts to this.

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

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

15           Dona, go ahead.

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

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

25           DR. ALLEN: I mean, it's definitely not

1 linear. And so I want to -- I mean, it -- however, I  
2 think -- so the reason I go ahead and leave it in a circle  
3 that looks linear is as a kind of mode of discipline,  
4 really. So that people remind themselves, what am I doing  
5 on values?

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

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

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

23 It's also okay to go backwards. You don't  
24 always have to go forwards. You can go -- values,  
25 diagnosis, values, diagnosis, values, diagnosis, before

1 you sort of start moving on to prescriptions as well.

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

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

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

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

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

25 And you know, I couldn't agree more, which is,

1 you know, early in the pandemic when everything shut down,  
2 I put some of this text -- I wrote an article for *Context*,  
3 which is our magazine in sociology. And I wrote this in  
4 my book, *Crook County*, you know, our pursuit of  
5 objectivity in our research scares us into incorporating  
6 considerations of compassion, morality, humanity and grace  
7 into our research, despite the overwhelming evidence that  
8 it may be the antidote for the pain and loss we are  
9 experiencing in this moment.

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

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

22 And so I'd love to hear your perspective on  
23 harm creation, in that we also have the capacity to create  
24 harm, either by doing nothing or sometimes doing  
25 something.

1 DR. ALLEN: Yeah, yeah. No. Absolutely. I  
2 mean, I think that's where, for me, the lived outcomes  
3 piece is so important, right. That is, it's not enough to  
4 just sort of do your piece of research and leave it at  
5 that.

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

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

20 And it's important to recognize that that sort  
21 of different approach to research and to policymaking  
22 itself flows out of values, right, as a sort of  
23 recognition that if we are trying to move towards securing  
24 well-being for all, the only sound foundation for doing  
25 that epistemologically is one that includes all who are



1 affected by the research and the policy in setting the  
2 direction for it.

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

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

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

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

24 MR. TRAVIS: Yeah, if I could? I see other  
25 hands up. Just if I could, quickly?

1           Danielle, in our Square One discussions, we've  
2 mentioned two other realities. And I wonder how they fit  
3 into your really elegant schematic here?

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

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

16           So organizing and prospect for change, given --

17           DR. ALLEN: Yeah.

18           MR. TRAVIS: -- the status quo.

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

25           So we were talking about this in our breakout

1 group earlier, which is, you know, we -- in this country  
2 in particular, we have a really unusual level of  
3 complexity in our jurisdictional structures, with all the  
4 layers of our federal system, and then even at the local  
5 level, you've got city governments. You've got county  
6 governments. You've got kinds of regional governments, et  
7 cetera, and then they're all working in a context of sort  
8 of state government, where all the different state  
9 governments have -- they're all completely different,  
10 basically.

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

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

24 So what you really do have to do is figure out  
25 at the local level what could work in our community. What

1 do we want to build in our community? And then ask  
2 questions.

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

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

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

22 But I would say, like, in that order, whereas  
23 very often we go the other way round. We sort of start --  
24 we think we need to organize from the federal level  
25 first. I think it really is important to go from this

1 level up, but to have people, like, working together.

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

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

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

25 Marcia, your hand is raised.

1 MS. RINCON-GALLARDO: Thank you, Danielle. I  
2 really appreciated the -- I'm an audio-visual learner, and  
3 definitely the layout was very, very helpful.

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

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

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

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

23 DR. ALLEN: Yeah.

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

25 So then we go to the next question, which is,

1 okay -- does these structures -- are you talking about --  
2 when we say, everybody, it's, like, really everybody? Or  
3 is it -- you know, because in honoring that people have  
4 come at these things with different values, then where  
5 does that live?

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

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

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

23 And this is only partial, but -- so the short  
24 answer is yes. I think, for the first time, we have  
25 decolonized foundations to work from, and does that mean

1 that they have no flaws?

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

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

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

21 So the point is just that we do, for the first  
22 time, in philosophy -- okay, this sounds kind of crazy.  
23 This seems like it doesn't -- like, most people think  
24 philosophy doesn't matter. But nonetheless, for the first  
25 time in the history of the world, okay, we actually have a



1 huge body of really impactful philosophy being produced by  
2 people of color and recognized by others.

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

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

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

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

1 works for everybody.

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

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

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

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

22 Angela Davis, Dorothy Roberts, Kim Crenshaw --  
23 I mean, there's so many. So I just want to put -- I have  
24 to give them a shout-out, because they've been doing it  
25 right. And it would be -- it would probably just obscure

1 their work if we didn't put that big caveat in the front  
2 of the presentation, so --

3 DR. ALLEN: One hundred percent.

4 DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: Yeah.

5 DR. ALLEN: One hundred --

6 DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: Yeah.

7 DR. ALLEN: -- percent. And I should say --  
8 when I say it's the first time in the world, I --  
9 because -- this is embarrassing. I think of, like,  
10 millennia-length scale.

11 DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: Yes.

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

18 So there --

19 DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: Oh, yeah. Du Bois.  
20 Hello. Yeah.

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

23 DR. GONZALEZ VAN CLEVE: Yeah.

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

1 additional point.

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

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

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

11 DR. ALLEN: Right. Yeah.

12 MS. HUFFMAN: Great.

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

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

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

23 I mean, Gary Becker wrote an influential  
24 article about crime from an economic perspective. The  
25 whole idea of prices -- remember the era of "use a gun, go

1 to prison," or you know, 10, 20, life, that you're really  
2 setting out a price signal. And it had enormous appeal,  
3 as recently as a quarter century ago.

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

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

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

23           So I have shared some of this sort of justice  
24 work with them in the hopes that their own interest in  
25 non-domination -- they could come to see the justice realm

1 as being one where working that idea through here too is  
2 really, really important. So I think there's a lot of  
3 potential.

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

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

21 That debate is the debate between the  
22 neoliberal paradigm and this new paradigm, the shrinking  
23 capitalism paradigm. But that is exactly it. Like,  
24 that -- these are the paradigms fighting with each other  
25 right now, and we should all hope that the new paradigm,

1 the economy of care and the like, wins.

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

6 DR. ALLEN: Sure. Okay. No. Glad to.

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

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

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

22 So a few years ago, I co-chaired a task force  
23 at Harvard on inclusion and belonging, and as, you know,  
24 every university is trying to figure this out. And we did  
25 proceed in a fashion similar to what I articulated here,

1 with working through values, diagnosis, prescription,  
2 action strategies, lived outcomes and the like.

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

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

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

24           And so then, once we had those goals and some  
25 clarity about, you know, in effect, hypotheses about



1 supporting factors, we combed the existing literature for  
2 measurement constructs that could be used to trace both  
3 the supporting factors and the goals. And again --  
4 because there was nothing out there that had exactly the  
5 sort of survey shape or research shape of what we were now  
6 interested in.

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

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

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

1 recommendations, and we developed political strategies in  
2 relationship to each.

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

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

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

24           "If we succeed in cultivating and sustaining  
25 such a campus, members of the University, regardless of

1 background, identity and role" -- we really wanted to  
2 include staff, who'd always been left out before in this  
3 work on inclusion and belonging -- so "regardless of  
4 background, identity and role, will enjoy full and genuine  
5 membership in our community.

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

13 So we ended up boiling that down into wanting  
14 to have the outcomes of academic achievement for all. In  
15 other words, everybody came to campus with a certain set  
16 of academic goals, and everybody deserved to be able to  
17 achieve in relationship to the goals they came with.

18 Satisfied professional development -- making  
19 sure we were including staff in that picture of  
20 development and well-being, and the sense of belonging.  
21 Those were sort of three overarching goals. We thought  
22 the supporting factors involved academic and social  
23 integration, knowledge of skill development, support and  
24 motivation, monitoring and advising. So you know, it gets  
25 pretty granular pretty quickly.

1           And so we then did the work I just described of  
2           combing through literature to find constructs. We looked  
3           at a whole lot of diversity and inclusion surveys from a  
4           lot of different universities, and didn't find any that  
5           actually aligned with the values that we had laid out.

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

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

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

24          "The academic goals or professional goals I  
25          have for myself are being met at Harvard. I know what

1 constitutes good performance in my role. I receive  
2 meaningful recognition for doing good work. I feel  
3 comfortable giving opinions and feedback to people at  
4 Harvard who have more decision-making authority than I do.

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

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

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

25 MS. HUFFMAN: Thanks, Danielle. Thanks for

1 that. Yeah. It really does -- just harkening back to our  
2 discussion about research and about what are we asking,  
3 and about what we are measuring, and all of that. I mean,  
4 the this topic is right on point.

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

12 Monica, do you want to jump in first?

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

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

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

25 The first stage involved myself and several

1 graduate student research assistants, a diverse group.  
2 Diverse both in terms of personal background and in terms  
3 of department and discipline, and also reaching out -- we  
4 also built a kind of advisory committee so that people  
5 like Jim Sidanius, who's a psychologist who works on  
6 issues of race and diversity, and a whole range of others.

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

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

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

25 So the point of saying all that is just to say

1 a lot of stakeholders were involved, so it didn't just go  
2 from research into, you know -- in use. It went through  
3 decision-makers. It went through focus groups with  
4 students and staff and the like, along the way, and at  
5 each point along the way, we checked the values again.

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

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

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

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



1 MS. HUFFMAN: Jeremy?

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

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

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

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

25 And that's the -- I think many things have

1 changed, but probably the biggest thing is the number of  
2 just academic committees that now have students on them,  
3 when they never did, number of, kind of, faculty  
4 committees that now include lecturers when they -- you  
5 know, lecturers were not included previously. They were  
6 sort of limited to tenured faculty, and the like.

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

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

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

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

1 design principles.

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

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

8 DR. ALLEN: Yeah, exactly.

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

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

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

16 DR. MURPHEY: You mentioned --

17 MS. HUFFMAN: Next questions?

18 DR. MURPHEY: Oh, sorry.

19 MS. HUFFMAN: Oh, go ahead. No, no. Go ahead.

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

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

24 DR. MURPHEY: Right.

25 DR. ALLEN: -- data that we were working with?

1 DR. MURPHEY: Well, I guess, all of the above,  
2 but yeah.

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

8 And we did in our overall recommendations  
9 recommend data transparency and establishing a norm of  
10 that. This survey data is transparent, I believe.  
11 Actually, honestly, I have to admit, I have not been close  
12 to it for the last year, so I would have to go back and  
13 actually check, but it's supposed to be transparent and  
14 broadly accessible for use.

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

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

21 MR. WESTERN: This isn't specifically about the  
22 data piece, but includes it. This is also thinking about  
23 the whole model of, sort of, ethically guided problem-  
24 solving that you've described. And I'm trying to bring  
25 your perspective and approach in the work you've done in

1 conversation with how we were talking about it in the  
2 earlier part of the afternoon.

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

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

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

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

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

24 MR. WESTERN: Nothing like Elizabeth Warren,  
25 Danielle, you know, I have a --

1 DR. ALLEN: So I have a framework for that.  
2 The framework I have for that is called, the "Ten  
3 Questions for Young Change-Makers." Because I actually  
4 developed it for young people. So no offense to all of  
5 you, but you can use it too. It's all right.

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

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

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

24 And I think, you know, for me, I also spend a  
25 lot of time when I do workshops with young people around

1 that -- well, all kinds of people, but we do talk a lot  
2 about the different roles that are available. You know,  
3 not everybody has to be, you know, an activist, or not  
4 everybody has to be, you know, a sort of hard-charging  
5 reformer.

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

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

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

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

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

1 with whom?

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

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

8 MR. WESTERN: That's great.

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

12 MR. WESTERN: That's great.

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

15 MS. HUFFMAN: Other --

16 DR. ALLEN: I'll put it here.

17 MS. HUFFMAN: Oh, great. Thanks. Okay. Now  
18 it's in the chat.

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



1 anything else you'd like to share.

2 Oh, Abbey, over to you.

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

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

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

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

25 And I think if we had had the values, the

1 diagnosis, the prescription, the strategies, and the lived  
2 outcomes as a framework beforehand, that we could have  
3 understood what some of the challenges and problems were,  
4 and in the iterative space, made some improvements before  
5 it kind of got a little crazy, and you know, kind of took  
6 some time and energy to do that.

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

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

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

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

17 So if you can send those --

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

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

21 DR. ALLEN: Yeah.

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

24 DR. ALLEN: I'll send them to you. Yes. Sam's  
25 slides. Yeah.

1           REV. NIXON: But what I think about your  
2 line/circle diagram is -- I have been really sitting here  
3 thinking of the numbers of areas of my life with -- that  
4 thinking pattern is helpful. It's unbelievable how almost  
5 in a way generic and simple it is, but yet so complex.

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

9           Is it the fourth?

10          DR. ALLEN: Exactly.

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

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

21          If they were just more accessible, like, if  
22 more people could understand that the outcomes of the  
23 research that you do, in language that people really can  
24 relate to, I think whole communities would behave  
25 differently, would invest in their own lives differently,

1 would access the power that they have differently, which  
2 is why I really love the column that uses colloquialisms  
3 to match the theory.

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

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

12 REVEREND NIXON: Yeah.

13 DR. ALLEN: That's thanks --

14 REV. NIXON: I did.

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

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

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

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

1 occurred.

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

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

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

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

1           Yeah.

2           REV. NIXON: Yeah. I think every --

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

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

12           Like, here it is in regular language.

13           DR. ALLEN: Right.

14           REV. NIXON: Yeah. But --

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

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

25           REV. NIXON: Yeah. But it's a function too of

1 how you get where you need to go as an academic. So I get  
2 it, that you're trained in a certain way. And in order to  
3 move up that ladder, you've got to do it.

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

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

9 So the -- we have a couple more raised hands.  
10 If folks would like to get in the queue, we -- I'm sensing  
11 we may finish a little early on this Friday afternoon, but  
12 folks should definitely jump in the queue if you have  
13 other questions or thoughts you'd like to raise.

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

19 Susan. Yes.

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

23 I'm thinking -- the conversation that you and  
24 Reverend Nixon just had was really rich. And I'm -- it's  
25 reminding me of, you know, when Ella Baker called all the

1 students together, to Shaw University, to create SNCC.  
2 For them to create SNCC, she encouraged them to stay  
3 separate, right, from the SCLC. And she deliberately kept  
4 the northern students out of the organizing conversations  
5 with the southern students, because of the ways that white  
6 supremacy had prevented, you know, access to some of the  
7 things that the northern students had.

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

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

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

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

20 DR. GLISSON: That is awesome. Fast forward to  
21 when we were trying to -- we tried really hard for a  
22 little while to create a Truth Commission in  
23 Mississippi. And it -- we had the -- we were doing oral  
24 histories, you know, to help lift up people's stories, and  
25 we also had academics who were coming in to do research,



1 right -- to document patterns of abuse and that sort of  
2 thing. And we were really kind of more excited about the  
3 oral histories, you know, just because those stories just  
4 haven't been told.

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

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

17 And so I'm really appreciative.

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

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

24 I mean, by people who need to know, they need  
25 to -- I mean, the legislators too --

1 DR. GLISSON: The legislators.

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

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

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

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

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

13 Dona, over to you.

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

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

22 And I think it is important to not have people  
23 who have those platforms actually speak for those other  
24 individuals, but really to know when it's appropriate to  
25 actually use those platforms and that leverage to step

1 back and to allow somebody else to step into that position  
2 to speak for themselves. I think that's actually really,  
3 really important.

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

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

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

25 Like, this dynamic, I think, historically,

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

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

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

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

12 Katharine, you wanted me to --

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

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

21 I learned a lot today about things that you are  
22 all working on that I didn't know about previously, and  
23 that really lifts my heart. It has been a pretty intense  
24 time, and a really hard week in particular. So a couple  
25 of you have made reference to that.

1           It's true for me too. I was pretty tired, I  
2 have to admit, before this, and I'm leaving this session  
3 actually less tired than I was at the beginning. That's  
4 saying something. That's not usually the dynamic of  
5 attendance at an academic event.

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

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

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

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

20           So we began the day reflecting on the  
21 conversation from the night before between Daryl Atkinson  
22 and Marlon Peterson, and we began by talking about  
23 forgiveness, which was an important theme. And I think in  
24 our group -- today was so interesting for me because I  
25 think in our group we've developed over this Roundtable,

1 over earlier work from Square One, a way of thinking about  
2 the process of building justice in the country.

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

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

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

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

23 And behind that problem is the emotional and  
24 physical toll that's taken by violence. And that's what  
25 we're trying to heal, all of the damage that's done

1 emotionally and physically by violence. And healing, I  
2 think, has two dimensions in the way we've been talking  
3 about it.

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

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

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

25           No one is irredeemable. Right? So in a world

1 in which -- in the justice that we're conceiving, no one  
2 is irredeemable.

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

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

20 The second thing is, right, suffering harm  
21 is -- it's an emotional event. It brings our emotions to  
22 the surface. And I wonder if part of the emotions that we  
23 experience as a consequence of suffering harm and living  
24 close to harm in this work -- I wonder if part of that  
25 emotion is also a wellspring of retributive sentiment?



1           And I'm not sure we've fully grappled with that  
2 because, you know, people have also expressed anger in  
3 this conversation. I think this very vexed discussion we  
4 have of system actors -- what is the relationship of  
5 system actors to the justice process -- reflects that  
6 we're kind of mad at people, you know.

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

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

18           I thought she was describing in the diagrams,  
19 values, diagnosis, prescription, action plan -- this was a  
20 paradigm. This was an interlocking set of ideas and  
21 practices and roles that operated systemically together to  
22 create a whole variety of effects that create racial  
23 inequality in the system, that create enduring  
24 inequalities and injustices that persist across  
25 generations and over historical time.

1           Making change is paradigm-shifting work, is  
2           disrupting the logic of all of these interlocking  
3           pieces. So this is not -- in this framework, change is  
4           not tinkering at the margins. It's re-conceiving of a new  
5           logic.

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

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

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

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

25           And so I want to think about, in this circle of

1 values, diagnosis, prescription and action plan, you know,  
2 what would that look like if lived experience was somehow  
3 centered in that process? Because I think that's often  
4 the case for us.

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

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

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

23 MS. HUFFMAN: You have the close-out, Bruce.  
24 Yes. Thank you. Thanks for that.

25 MR. WESTERN: Okay. So we're going to meet

1 again, and it's in a week's time on April 30. And we will  
2 start -- the livestream will start at noon, and we can --  
3 the Zoom room will be open at 11:30 for people who want to  
4 check in then.

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

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

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

24 Boy. That was a pretty amazing day. I'm just  
25 constantly -- like, I'm searching for the word. I don't

1 want to say amazed, because -- inspired, I think, by how  
2 much people bring of themselves to this conversation, and  
3 you know, people bring all of their life experience and  
4 intelligence and wisdom and their emotional selves.

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

9 MS. HUFFMAN: Thanks, everyone.

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

C E R T I F I C A T E

MEETING OF:       The Square One Project  
LOCATION:            via Zoom  
DATE:               April 23, 2021

I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages,  
numbers 1 through 166, inclusive, are the true, accurate,  
and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording  
made by electronic recording by Latrice Porter.

DATE: May 3, 2021

/s/ Adrienne Evans-Stark  
(Transcriber)

On the Record Reporting  
7703 N. Lamar Blvd., #515  
Austin, Texas 78752