

Female 1: This is still a public meeting. And we are gonna hopefully, and I think the microphones will help amplify for the room. But the other piece that I want to let you know is that we are recording this so that it can be transcribed and we'll be able to reference it as we continue with the report activities. So if we can, make sure that you speak into the mic. I think that will be helpful with our transcriptionist.

So I think we're ready to start the working meeting of the task force this afternoon. From the task force staff, from the NCCD staff, there are three agenda items that we have to talk about this afternoon. And then we can see if there's anything else that folks are interested in adding to that agenda. What we'd like to do is get some impressions and feedback from the hearing that we just – from the public testimony, as well – from the public testimony Monday evening, as well as the invited testimony that we heard today.

We'd like to share with those who were not able to participate in person some feedback on Dr. Cooper and General Taguba will share some feedback from the military listening sessions they did at the joint base in Tacoma, Washington. And then we'd like to move in to review and feedback on the draft report outline that the task force members received over the weekend. There's a hard – there should be a hard copy I put at everybody's spot. So if you don't have that, let me know and we have some extras here.

So those are the three agenda items that the NCCD staff had on our list. I don't know if there were other items that folks anticipated talking about this afternoon or want to add to that agenda? No? Everybody's ready to get done and go out in the sunshine. I love the dark shades behind us. They don't even let us see the sunshine out there. It's _____. Just so we know exactly what we're missing.

Steven Marans: If it makes you feel better, it's still a little overcast.

Female 1: Yeah, actually it doesn't make me feel any better.

Steven Marans: Sorry. I'm trying.

Female 1: So, yeah, I guess I would let the task force and the co-chairs sort of facilitate the conversation about the hearing today and the public testimony that you heard Monday night. If there's any comments.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Let's start with Monday. Just in chronological order _____. Anyone have any comments about that?

Steven Marans: I thought that it was great. I thought it was enormously informative. And the witnesses were just really, really outstanding. You know we, for those of you who didn't know, you know just that whole discussion we had early on about what kind of witnesses and telling stories, etcetera. There was another great example. There was a woman who was talking about her incarcerated son, and also the way that the panelists, the order they went. She told the story, but it was very much as a illustrative of this central idea of how is it that we can – you know it's not about good guys and bad guys. Somebody breaks the law, they break the law, there's accountability. But what kind of accountability.

And then there were content people who were talking about approaches and using Florida as examples, that deepened my understanding about some of the issues about the violence breeding violence kind of deal. I thought it was really quite something.

Joe Torre: Yeah, I got the same impression where, you know we're learning more toward education as opposed to incarceration. I think that's – cause, you know you break the law, you do this. And you're not gonna help anybody that way. Especially the youngsters, how young they were talking about. You know 14 years old, 15 years old. That's a little early to throw somebody away. Not that any age is appropriate to throw somebody away, but that's certainly – they haven't developed yet. You know you're still sort of writing somebody off.

Thea James: _____ to be writing people off, but at the same time, creating a person that may not have even existed when you put did put them away. They seem to come out worse. It seems to be more of a harmful thing than a good thing. And there were a lot of sort of common themes, like you also just said, Steve, that emerged from last night. And things you could actually like put your finger on and being to address.

Steven Marans: If I had to pick one of them, it was this notion that it baseline descriptively. Aside from the inhumanity and the issues about people forgetting these are somebody's child, right? And, again, not ignoring that people who are not able to control themselves may need external controls. But the term developmentally inappropriate I thought was the kind of the line that surprise,

surprise, stood out for me. Because it was just this wonderful descriptive, you know kind of neutral concept. It's just true. And it goes back to what you're saying, Joe. You know 14 year old, 15 year old. I mean 18 year old's not still a kid? So it was powerful.

Anthony Taguba: As we went along I just picked up three more _____ you might say. This one that Joe already mentioned. Literacy, language skills. Literacy, language skills and education was key. One of the hearing members basically said, you know the research is done that if they're not reading or talking at third grade level, then something is wrong. And some of the other folks have testified that says our youth today have their youth speak. You know if we thought we were doing proper English today with syntax, you know you ought to see how they text. I mean my kids will use – you know they often tell me quit telling those old jokes Dad, cause we don't understand them. And if you watch Facebooking and tweeting and whatever have you, they have a different kind of language. And they're not Ebonics, by the way. So that's pretty key in terms of understanding them as far as their issues.

Public safety is public health. The other one, of course, is reaching out to – we talked about community engagement. But what exactly are we talking about community engagement and collaboration? And I think all resource motivation in there somewhere. And whether the corporate side with their corporate social responsibility values. You look at some of the big companies today, they have that. And if you log in to their corporate social responsibility portfolio, they'll tell you who exactly they're supporting in their community. Like Charlotte Mecklenburg community. The headquarters of the Bank of America, right? They may have troubles financially, but they can still give to the community. I just cite that as an example.

Children's rights. I think a few months ago Senate or Congress passed the Domestic Violence Act empowering survivors more in terms of their protection and intervention. And someone brought up the UN convention on children's rights, which the US helped produce and develop but decided not to ratify as a **non-signatory**. They keep doing that, because there's a UN convention on human rights that they also did not sign in Geneva. So I think we probably need to ask them why. And if it's not related internationally, maybe there's some relations or coincidental to what we're doing here as far as our children's rights that may not be relative to the international side of the house.

I've often wondered how come Europe has better programs on preventions and interventions on youth violence. Because it's very minimal. If you ask the Finish, the Norwegians, the Germans, they'll tell ya, "We have minimal problems with youth violence. There's a way to control them." And they have immigrants that are in their countries.

What enamored me was one of our testimony **used Amber** as a trauma service dogs. Veterans – not Veterans Administration. We have a lot of advocate groups in the VA side that use service dogs as part of their treatment program. And having seen those programs myself, and the lead for that is **Bergen University** in Palo Alto, California. They're expensive, but if you talk to a veteran and they say to you, "Sir, help us here cause I can't take anymore pills. I'd rather have a dog with me to help soothe my feelings. And then when they know I'm gonna have an attack or something as opposed to relying on my own body and saying, 'Now I got to take my pills again.'" They take a lot of cocktails in terms of their medication. And I believe them. If you want empirical experience based data, that's it. You don't need anymore data associated with that. In the VA today, the Department of Veterans Affairs, they want more experiments to ensure that they're doing the right thing. You know it's kind of like a hit or miss.

But otherwise um. Leadership development I think for the kids. How do you do that? I offered college students doing that and we talked about that during lunchtime. Those who major in psychology or sociology. They can give them a three credit hour credit for that. And see if they would do some sort of a volunteer program and help out our kids. It's really not a – it's a no-brainer. If they want somebody to play a role model, a part of their community service. Looks good on their résumé when they're looking for a job with NCCD, for example, right? I'm serious. I play that light. But I think we need to do that more as opposed to just looking at it internally. Is ask our academics, our universities, if they're willing to proffer some help with this national problem that we have as opposed to just looking at government to provide them with more money. Maybe they can get incentivized for doing that. We're doing that with the veterans today. Let's do that for the youth. Same principle. So thank you.

D. Tilton Durfee:

I'm having – whoops. I'm having a hard time differentiating my notes from yesterday and today. I didn't have a list of the people who testified yesterday, so I don't know if I have their names all

right. I thought that, just to tag on to the convention on the rights of children. I think the pediatrician who testified as to the importance of that also talked about how it shouldn't be okay to hit a child when it isn't okay to hit another adult. And this ties into something Sharon had brought up at our last meeting about corporal punishment, which is a sticky issue. But on the other hand, when he put it that way it made a lot of sense. That I can be arrested for hitting Jim, but I can hit a kid and it's okay.

I think that the police officer who was so charming and elegant and articulate funny who was supposed to be six two, but he's only five seven. I thought he actually brought up a really good point. And that was that the academies need to be including more training on humanity and on community service. But that the challenge is the veteran officers who have been on the beat for years. It's very hard to change their attitudes and their willingness to get involved in the community or with other agencies. Jim, you know more about that.

Jim McDonnell: Yeah, rewards and punishments and affecting the culture.

D. Tilton Durfee: Right. Right. Exactly. Go ahead. Go ahead.

Jim McDonnell: No, on that piece, and I'm sorry I wasn't there last night to hear. I heard it was a great talk he did. I think as far as changing the police mindset in order to be able to move in the direction we'd all like to move, it comes down to changing the culture. And that consistent rewards, consistent sanctions. What you say is what you expect and then you hold people accountable for getting you there.

When you look at an ideal police officer, when you look at a police officer in American society today, there's not many other more complex jobs. Where you put someone in a car and somebody dials 911 when their life is upside down and that person responds and in a very short period of time tries to fix it as best they can. And so when you look at who we hire, we hire people who are 21 years old. You know generally to 25 or 26. Limited life experience I would say at that age for anybody. And we throw them into this arena. And I think in an ideal sense if we were able to get the pool of people we would need to staff sufficiently, I think an ideal way would be to look at people coming in the door at 30 years old. And they've got that much more higher level of maturity. They've got life experience. And they're in a better position to be able to have a more of a 30,000 foot view than coming in at 21 and all the challenges that go along with that.

But the reality is I think that if we were to wait until 30, we wouldn't get sufficient number of police officers because people would be already be engaged in other professions. They've already started their life, their pension or whatever their issues are. So I think we are, to some degree, working with what we have to work with. But I don't know that it's ideal.

D. Tilton Durfee: So, Jim, do you think a recommendation from this body regarding the academy, the curriculum or the program in the academy, which he was saying is only a small percentage related to community and humanity but mostly related to training as an enforcement officer. Do you think that that's even reasonably feasible?

Jim McDonnell: Yeah. I don't think it's a class you give. I think it's something you integrate into every class you give and every action you take and how you treat people, what your expectations are. I think where we make the mistake in an academy environment is we try and say we have a checklist. You need to do this class, this class, this class. And they're all silos. And they don't integrate as well together as we'd like to see them. It has to be in – the respect, officer safety, integrity, all of those things have to be interwoven throughout the whole curriculum in order to be something that you take away and it doesn't come across then later as, hey, forget everything you learned in the academy, kid. This is how we do it on the street. And I think if it's integrated and woven into the way that you learn to be a police officer, there's less chance of that being successful.

Steven Marans: Actually, just to add to that. I mean having been involved I developing trainings for police departments for the last 20 years, I would agree with Jim. However, if you do one without the other, it doesn't go anywhere. In fact, there are curricula that have been developed for increasing the behavioral health perspectives on policing, and they fit right into policing philosophy around problem solving, problem oriented policing. And they're quite successful.

They also go to changing the culture in the way that Jim is describing is necessary. By the way, what everybody forgets about the older officers who may not be inclined to a new regime of approach and culture is number one, they retire and number two, as Jim is saying, leadership sets standards and incentives and disincentives. So this is about how do you weave all this together so it's not just the rookies getting the training but the field training

officers who are getting new training. And it's not just ending with the classroom, it's how you do your work. And these kinds of changes, unfortunately, have been discussed for the last 20 years. And the problem is is that they're good ideas that come up that then are not supported. They don't go anywhere. And here we are having the same discussion what? Fifteen years later, Katherine. I don't know. So I think there are great possibilities.

D. Tilton Durfee:

Okay. I have a couple other related to law enforcement. Well, this one is sort of related to law enforcement. And that is the failure to report. The man who said he was hurt at home, he was hurt in school and nobody ever did anything for him, reminded me of how important it is that we enforce the mandatory reporting laws. Because that is not only enforcing the law, it is protecting the victim. But it is protecting perhaps hundreds of subsequent victims. Because every time there is a child who is discovered as a victim of molestation or abuse in an institutional setting, for example. That could be a school or a church or an organization. That discovery usually ends up with many other previous victims who never told anybody who are then empowered to come forward and say something. Often they are adults. And there's no secrets about the problems within the Catholic Church. Thousands of victims. And the problem wasn't so – was the molestation, but worse is the cover-up. The cover-up in schools. There's a couple of major cases in LA now of elementary school teachers. And as we get into the cases, it turns out that for years there have been kids who have been molested in the same schools. We shouldn't have to wait for an adult or a child to come forward.

The Penn State situation was unique really because it had a witness. There was a witness to a sex crime. And there usually isn't a witness. Usually these are secrets that people hold for the rest of their lives. And I think that the message that it is a crime not to report suspected child abuse should be loud and clear, particularly within institutional settings where people who work or volunteer there have access to children. Usually multiple numbers of children. So I really hope that we'll do something about failure to report, particularly in institutional settings.

And the other one would be with law enforcement response there are so many expectations within that 911 call. But at the very least on a domestic violence call, there should be a protocol or requirement that the responding officer check to see if there are children in the home. And if there are children in the home, to interview them and evaluate whether or not they're injured or at

great emotional risk. And if they are severe risk or injured, they should be reported as abused children. If they are at high risk for emotional abuse or subsequent physical abuse, the family should be referred for counseling and assure that the children feel safe and that the non-offending parent feels they have a resource for not only him or her but for the kids.

So that's my law enforcement.

Joe Torre:

(Away from Microphone). You know about the secretive part of it. I mean in my case growing up, we never shared it with anybody because it was our house. You know I didn't think it was going on anywhere else. The biggest deterrent to this is awareness. You're right. The perpetrators are so dangerous because in the Penn State situation, I know there was a witness. But they're manipulative in the point of making these kids feel that they owe it to them. To do what they're doing. And they don't start coming out until somebody comes out. And maybe the witness really helped that happen.

As I say, it's so manipulative. My wife Allie and I, she was reading a story about this man goes into this town with the idea that he wanted to get connected with the Boy Scouts. And it was a two year plan in his head. And finally, they asked him to be the Scout leader. He becomes the Scout leader and starts abusing the children.

The Penn State thing, it's horrible. Syracuse, the same thing. We learn from the tribal communities don't say anything, even if it happens within your own family. And we were there. This uncle was abusing his nephew and his family, don't talk about it. We've got to make it okay for these kids to come forward and talk about it. You have Ed right back there, **Mashick**, who was talking about being raped and, you know beaten and was told by his guardian, his foster parents, don't say anything. That's what has to change. You know we have to make it okay. In fact, fashionable's probably a bad word, but make it okay for these kids to come forward and talk about it.

D. Tilton Durfee:

And mandatory for adults who know about it to report it.

Male 1:

So there was a question that was asked that Dr. Marans you asked. And I think you and Father Boyle both were getting to this question. Like how do we blow this open. How do we get people really talking about this? I thought there was something

interesting. It came out actually today. But it was – there were two speakers. There was Mr. Martin, who was talking about, you know this is – it's difficult for us to see anything else. This is, you know if you're inside this environment, it's difficult to see anything else. And then on the same panel there was Ms. Green who was saying, you know this is something – she used the word dark. She said it's dark. You know people don't want to look at it. She's saying it's difficult for other people to see it. Not because it can't be seen but because it's hard for them to let themselves see it. It seems like that's two sides of the same coin. It's this awareness point that you're making. You know if we're gonna raise the awareness, we have to find a way to break down that kind of dynamic where one side can't see anything different because they're so deep inside of it. And the other side just doesn't want to look at it cause it's so hard to see.

Steven Marans:

_____, can I just add one other ingredient? And I think maybe we're the test. Cause it's happening here. You see? And the other piece is is that if you feel helpless, which is the sine qua non of trauma, by the way. Loss of control, helplessness. Then it's one of the reasons that we get the, get thee behind me attitude. And one of the things that also doesn't get out there, which is your point, Joe. Which is that, in fact, you don't – nobody gets to find out that, in fact, we can do something and one doesn't have to be helpless.

But what I was trying to get at not so clearly earlier was that we can't get at all of these issues, right? Because they're all important. Right? All of the things that our witnesses have told us about, all their programs, they're all important. And some of them have more evidence, some don't. But they're all promising, if not evidence based. Right? But as we hear the witnesses, they're talking to us as they see their part of the elephant. Which makes all the sense in the world. But in our earliest discussion as a task force, remember? We talked about, and Greg, you've put it best. You said, you know are we gonna be in the weeds or are we gonna take the broader view? And I think you challenged us then, but I think we should all challenge each other to recognize it's not about just one thing. We've got the literacy, illiteracy thing. Well, illiteracy is one amongst many predictors, right? And they're all important.

So the question it seems to me is if we're gonna expand this in the way that you're telling us to do for the broader world, do we have to take the same challenge as a task force and say, "Let's take what

we've learned. Let's appreciate that it's a complex organism we're working with here. And if we keep using the same model of tossing a few bucks here, tossing disparate siloed approaches, we're gonna be stuck. And we're gonna repeat the same old, same old.

Male 1:

Another theme I'm hearing, and I'll just say this very quickly, is that when we talk about evidence based approaches, I hear a lot of folks talking about that. And that has a strong body of information to suggest that it's effective. But we're also talking about, you know partnerships and community involvement. So there's a professional side of this, and there's a nonprofessional. There seems to be a message of we can't just professionalize this. Because by professionalizing it, it's another way of saying, you know someone else will deal with it or they'll let the professionals handle it. And I think that's also been a theme today, last night and in previous.

Georgina Mendoza:

Thank you. You actually stated what I've been thinking. So to say that this is complex is a major understatement. Okay. So it's important to hear from institutions from kind of the people up here, the project director. But if we're really trying to raise national awareness and say that we need to make it okay for every day people to be honest and open about what they're facing, then we have to include them in the process.

I feel that oftentimes it's still seen as a problem here, and we need to raise national awareness and we're still talking amongst ourselves and not really talking so much, or at least not as much, to the people that are actually, I guess for lack of a better term, in the weeds. I think there is a role to look at in the weeds. I think we need to here more from actual residents. We need to do more outreach. And I'm not saying this particular task force. I understand there's certain limitations. But just in general. To really keep in mind that as we're doing awareness campaigns, that we have to remember to make it everyone's problem. Cause like you said, if we stick to it on this level, professionals will take care of it. And you know what? It is dark. And it is ugly. Not everybody wants to look at it. But you have to. I think that's gonna be part of our job. You, all of America, do have to look at it. Guess what? You don't get to look away and say that's somebody else's problem. You know if one of our things that we're saying is that this is everybody's problem, then make sure to remind them that it's their problem. So I think –

Female 1, Steven Marans, Joe Torre, Anthony Taguba, D. Tilton Durfee, Jim McDonnell, Male 1, Georgina Mendoza, Robert Listenbee, Jr., Sharton Cooper, Alicia Lieberman, Robert Macy, Greg Boyle, Jennifer Trone, Thea James, Female 2

[End of Audio]

Georgina Mendoza: - in terms of messaging and really being inclusive in terms of trying to change societal norm, then we have to include everybody in our society.

Steven Marans: Just to be clear. I completely agree with you. What I meant by in the weeds versus at 30,000 feet is in order to do what you're talking about requires an enormous input of real capital resources. And I'm not just talking federal. There have been creative ideas that have been talked about. But in order to move this ahead, it's not a little project.

Male 2: Can I – and I think there is great agreement with those points that have been made here, and I think they're really helpful. I just think in terms of the time we have this afternoon, if we could just sort of talk about what we heard – I mean it's hard, cause everything leads to everything else. I understand the challenge. Don't get me wrong. I have it myself. But if we can talk sort of about – finish up on yesterday afternoon. Sort of talk about what we heard today. And then, cause I think we're beginning to talk about sort of some of the architecture and framing and concrete recommendations, and I think it would be helpful if we sort of get to that as a group and open that up then for that larger conversation. If that's okay, Bob.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: How about if we limit the conversation that we have today to a maximum a half an hour so we finish a little bit before 4:00, and then we have time for the others. And if finish naturally before then, we'll just go on to the other topics that we have. Who wants to talk about hearings today?

Sharon Cooper: Yeah. I thought that the hearings that we had today were very compelling. I was glad that we had the international perspective, the immigrant perspective, the sexual orientation, gender identity perspective. I think all of those were very important. And when I think of what we've covered so far, the gaps that I see us not yet really touching on is cyberspace. We've not talked very much about violence in cyberspace, although that is a very real and, you know threat to children and some of the more compelling forms that we're seeing today.

I also think that we really haven't touched too much, enough perhaps on sex trafficking victimization. It has been brought up by a couple of the speakers today, but that is another form of victimization that as a country we are becoming more

knowledgeable about and much more proactive about. But we haven't had much as far as testimony in that area.

The gang issues was very well, I think addressed, and I'm very grateful for those who did speak about gang issues. Because that did bring to light the issue of girls and sex trafficking. But I do think that we will need to continue to look at these particular aspects of violence against children to include in our report.

Georgina Mendoza: So I just also want to echo Sharon's comments regarding the testimony that we heard in terms of gang involvement, girls in gangs, etcetera. However, something that we didn't really touch on that I would have liked to hear is about the preventative measures in terms of gang involvement. Such as why do children get involved in gangs in the first place. You know what are those factors that we're looking at. What motivates them to join that? I think we could have reached a little bit more in terms of reason, rationale behind getting into gangs and some of the successful programs and strategies that are out there in terms of prevention. And, again, when you look at prevention, we probably could have been dealing with other issues, not just preventing them from joining gangs but any type of either bullying or other kind of destructive behavior. So I would have liked to hear a little bit more about prevention strategies. Cause it seems like the gang testimony that we got was when kids were already in gangs and already in the system.

D. Tilton Durfee: Can we use our task force members to provide us input on that? I mean we have the nation's most renowned person working with gangsters. I'm sure you know why they join gangs or have a good perspective on that. I don't know who else would be better for prevention.

[Mumbling]

Greg Boyle: Well, I don't think you want testimony right now but.

D. Tilton Durfee: Just a _____.

Greg Boyle: Yeah. Well, yeah, I think there's never been a treatment plan that's been born of a bad diagnosis. So my concern always is that the outsider view is always driving insight of this issue. So you're endlessly standing outside it and you're saying, you know why would a kid join a gang? There must be something positive there. And they go, "Oh, I know what it is. He wants to belong." And so

suddenly, the outsider view has taken over. You'll even ask gang members. They'll say, "Why did you join a gang?" And they'll say, "I wanted to belong." Not because that's why they joined the gang, but because that's become part of the air we breathe in terms of how people present. And they're telling you exactly what you want to hear.

And, of course, the truth about gangs is that no kid is seeking anything when he joins a gang. He's always fleeing something. And that's a good diagnosis it seems to me. And suddenly you're talking about what the kid is fleeing. But we've talked to thousands of gang members who will say, you know, join a gang and see the world and wine, women and song. Attraction language. Luring. And none of that's true. And I mean none of that's true. I've never met a gang member who wasn't fleeing something when he gravitated toward a gang. And that gangs are the places kids go when they've encountered their life is a misery and misery loves company, but we never get at that. Cause it's always the outsider view trying to rationalize why does a kid join a gang.

So it's, you know problematic I think because that will always sort of drive the vehicle. And that gets us into trouble, I think. And then we'll say, "Well, let's hear from gang members." Who, by and large, can't present necessarily. Although today, you know I thought Roy was just so magnificent. Because you have to do much work to get to the place where you can look back on your experience and say, "Oh, okay. Now I've come to terms with what this really was. And now I can speak about it." But that's kind of a rare thing. So.

Alicia Lieberman: One of the speakers today said that the reasons that people join gangs is not necessarily the same reason that they stay in gangs. And she said that gangs become an economic avenue for affluence or support. But some kind of economic component to their lives. I was thinking that the question of poverty that was brought up by the two mayors – I don't have their names right in front of me. And the association between violence and poverty is something that keeps being kind of on the margins of what we speak about. And I'd like us to focus more on what recommendations emerge from these hearings about the overlap between poverty, lack of resources, hopelessness, helplessness and violence.

Greg Boyle: But I think even more than poverty is, you know cause we all know kids who were stuck in poverty and didn't join gangs. So

you don't say all, obviously not all poor kids join gangs. But nobody's met a hopeful kid who joined a gang. That's never happened in the history of kids. It's never happened in the history of gangs. Hopeful kids won't do it. So then suddenly that's the thing that _____, sort of is the common denominator where you say, "Oh, okay, then we have to address a lethal absence of hope in these communities. Not that you don't address poverty and all. So many things, you know that you have to address, and, as Steve was saying, all these things are valid. Every – you can take any single ingredient. See them as ingredients. And they all have to be addressed. I think silos get a bad wrap frankly. Because I think, you know I'll give talks all over the place and people say, "Well, what are you doing about prevention?" Not a single thing. And that's the way it should be. Because I'm doing what I'm doing. I'm doing intervention. Folks who want out of the gang life. I think silos get disparaged in a way that's maybe we need to rethink it.

Steven Marans: Is specialization a better word, Greg?

Greg Boyle: Maybe so.

[Laughter]

You know you do the – you're the clinician that goes with the cop after a traumatic experience. This is good. This is not silo. And you do this. And the way that breaks the thing open is that nobody's disqualifying themselves. Everybody brings their silo or their specialization. Everybody brings it to the table. And that's health in a community I think.

Alicia Lieberman: You know I agree with what you are saying, but helplessness to me is stems from concrete circumstances.

Greg Boyle: I was saying hopelessness.

Alicia Lieberman: Hopelessness.

Greg Boyle: Yeah.

Alicia Lieberman: Hopelessness. My accent got in the way. I'm sorry. But it stems from concrete circumstances. And when we do home visits in some of the most dangerous neighborhoods, the graphic examples that we see of things that should be there that are not there. Starting with food. Starting with safe neighborhoods. It is just –

and the high percentage of adults who can't work, who don't have the resources that equip them to work and who even if they wanted to work and looked for work do not find positions that give them dignity. That is really the root of helplessness it seems to me. I think when you are given resources, hope emerges. And so it just seems to me that poverty is something, and particularly inequality. I mean when one looks internationally, countries that are relatively uniformly poor are not necessarily violent. It's inequality that is associated with violence most often.

And so I think that as our own inequality increases, we really need to look at it and see what it is that we can recommend that addresses that as one of the ways of preventing violence and addressing it.

Anthony Taguba:

I go back to what I described to Ms. Brown earlier about my friend, Rick Williams, who's doing ___ work with his junior ROTC program at Oroyo Valley High School, all 195 of those cadets. And I met all of them fortunately at their military ball. And he's been doing this now for ten years. And he's got gang members in that 195. So when I asked him what exactly do you do, he doesn't have an established program per say. But he does know what – that these kids are very influential in their circle. But then he turned that around and mentioned that if I put them in leadership position as the two leaders or squad leaders or whatever have you and closely supervise that, your leadership talents can also be very influential in leading your fellow students. And it's worked.

When they went through the receiving line in their uniform and able to say, "General, my name is Ricardo Sanchez, and this is my date." Very prim and proper. And they behaved themselves at that ball. You know so I mean if he's doing something right there with staff members and he's operating on a shoestring from the government where he has to get school buses to take them to a military post so they can be engaged somewhere during the summer months. Because some of them are just – they're not employed or their parents are away or whatever have you. To keep them advised and engaged with their friends so they could have some form of a leadership development program. Just some anecdotal data on San Bernardino County. If you haven't been to San Bernardino County, if you think Los Angeles is an economically depressed area, this even in the desert area. Mostly Hispanics, mostly blacks, a sprinkling of Asians in there come where. And I commend them. You know he say you can't do that

very much because he's had two heart attacks now dealing with that program. Cause even the Army is not giving him much resource. So he has to rely on parents and the community to provide donations to do a seven day trip to Fort Irwin, California, which is an Army base. The only Army base that's in California today that's willing to support him for that. So now you have a community engagement between an agency and something that's really pretty successful, at least for him.

The other observation is that what Mr. Samuels provided on his slide. Slide number 11. I'm still troubled by that, because maybe this just reflected what's going on in Chicago. I don't know. But the slides basically speaks volumes to me that you have four different programs that has little or no return of investment. Then I go back to the national and community service, AmeriCorps, something that our leaders stood up. Which is the nation's Peace Corps. And they have a budget between 2 to 4 billion dollars annually. And they get that gratuitously from the government so they can apply that throughout all 50 states. And they do mentoring, scholarships, work associated recovery, nation building and whatever have you.

So I said, "Jeez, you know if it's not successful in Chicago or Illinois, discontinue that and recapitalize those funds to other successful programs along the line." That way we won't have to ask for more money. It's just a matter of realigning the funds that's not operating there into other successful programs and other communities that might need those funds.

I think, you know we have to examine that. Why is it not working? Are the standards too high? Are the standards, you know unrealistic? And what are the standards? Cause somebody spoke about standards. What are those standards and how do we programmatically address them without sinking more money from government, both federal and state? I think Dr. Lieberman, Judge Lieberman mentioned that. We need to have standards. Because some of the standards are pitiful. That's their comment.

And another one said that the community needs to establish those standards. And are they achievable? Instead of just saying, "I need more money. Here's my grant." The grant comes. I need more money next year. But then you cannot express from the community who wanted those grants what's the return of investment and how many kids are being treated properly. Right.

And the other issue is I've never mentioned is that how does mobility affect treatment. When say a family moves from LA County to say San Diego County, does that treatment plan, that prevention, that association, did that follow them? Or will they start all over again? I don't know. That's a comment.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: At this juncture we have about another 15 minutes on topic of the testimony we heard today before we move on to other _____.

Female 1: And can I just – one thing that would be helpful I think from the NCCD staff is if we could hear, and, Georgina, I know you have your hand raise, so we'd be happy to hear your comments. But I also would like to be able to hear from some of the folks that haven't already spoken. Like Dr. James, Dr. Macy, I don't know if you guys have shared your comments on the testimony from the past day.

Anthon Taguba: Dr. Macy.

Female 1: Dr. Macy.

Robert Macy: I yield to Georgina.

Georgina Mendoza: Although I'm loud enough you guys could probably hear me. I just wanted to bring back to something that Judge Lieberman said that I really appreciated. Just considering the fact that we have such limited resources we need to really be strategic on how we use it and smart. So I really appreciated the testimony about children in the welfare system. We hadn't heard that testimony before, so I'm glad we were able to hear it. And the statistics and percentages that she provided. Eighty-nine percent of moms in domestic violence. Talk about being worthwhile investing in. Ninety-three percent of them accepted services. So it made me wonder, how often do we actually, one, make people aware that such resources are available, and two, make them accessible. Just a simple fact that they were asked they accepted. It just brings to me on every level, are people aware of resources and service programs that are out there for them? And if they're aware, do they really have access to it? So I just wanted to bring up that if we do have to decide where to invest strategically that domestic violence and the issue of awareness and accessibility of services be highlighted.

Female 2: I'll just comment. Georgina, in that particular instance with that program, the way that women became aware was because the

judge made them aware. And she referred them to advocacy services and to services that helped them stay with their children. So it can be – it just depends where they get it. Where they learn.

Male 1:

Which highlights the importance of thinking about points of intervention. There are these sort of points of leverage that where people are more susceptible to information. And it might be interfaced with the system, but it doesn't have to be there. There's probably numerous points. I mean this is the principle behind nurse home visitation. You know this is a point in the person's life when that young woman will be more receptive. So we can think about that more generally.

Georgina Mendoza:

I appreciate that. I understand it. It also has to be someone that I think that they – has some level of authority, but also that they respect and trust that they want what's best for them. So I think that can come from different people. Thank you.

Robert Macy:

Thea, do you have something yet? Okay. Well, I think it's been a very rich discussion, and I think a very strong day. If we were to try and distill what all our subject matter experts testified, I would distill it down to, you know boots on the ground, getting the feet muddy. Cause all of them presented without any ego what was working and how hard it was to get it working, but how proud they were, without saying I'm proud. You can see it through the love of their clients. The love they have for their clients.

I think today was about we've got programs that actually work. And it hearkens back to Dr. Finklehore's research. At the end of which, at our very first meeting. At the end of which he says, "Hey, we already have all the technology. We don't need to invent one more evidence based practice." Now obviously he was being dramatic, but I thought it was a great statement cause he said we have the technology and we're not using it.

So I think we need to hold our own feet to the fire around that mirror for the nation and to see how we can actualize that in the report. I think we saw example of it today with all the different presentations. There's technologies out there that are working quite well. With a hard question at the end that this young lady answered. Here's how I took an OJJDB grant and ten years later I'm still doing it. You know social enterprise has been mentioned a number of times today. So the issue obviously is bringing this to scale. And we talk about capacity building and sustainability, but I think we need to deconstruct those concepts for our report in order

to help the reader of the report understand what we really mean. And I don't think we know yet. And it may not be a magic answer. We may have to offer them a methodological process by which they can look at it.

So that's my first thought. It was a rich day, and I think we had doers in the field telling us, here's how I'm doing it. And, you know wonderful examples, not only of people – I love Roy's, the metaphor basically of, I can't let that kid go in there to try and get that job or to get that court date when his pants are falling down. I'm gonna give him my belt. But if I give him my belt, that's totally breaking boundaries. But I think most of the testimony today really said that's how we do it. We play by the rules, but we can't just look at the grant and the federal government to continue supporting us.

In the interest for myself anyway and the team transferring to discussion of today into the report writing, what struck me from all the comments, and it's just so wonderful to have the back and forth. I want to see Greg's bet, which is the mythology is I need to belong to a gang, and I want to raise it. And say that from my experience, and I don't have the experience you have, it sort of comes from different trajectories. But I would say one thing further. It's absolutely kids killing kids fleeing from something. And I can tell you I think nine times out of ten what they're fleeing from. Which is why this task force was convened by the right body. They're fleeing from injustice. What Alicia would call inequality or inequity. How the seeds of rap music were born.

So here I am in my apartment and I ain't got no food. Two, three blocks down there's a lot of food. I'm gonna go ask for some. They won't give it to me. All right. I'm gonna knock harder on the door. They won't give it to me. All right, I'm gonna knock down the door, I'm gonna take some of mine so I have some of my own. It's not that I'm against them, it's just I got to feed my baby. And they get in trouble for that. You get in trouble from being abused. So you flee from that. You get in trouble from being sanctioned as a 12 year old like you're an 18 year old. It's the ultimate injustice. The ultimate injustice, as Steve would say, is being immobilized. Being held down by a system. That's really the kernel of trauma within which lie the seeds of resiliency. But beating that helplessness, or I would say even deeper, the immobilization, you know the high six in trauma, combat, rape, torture, being buried alive. They all share that immobilization

scenario. You can't get up. You can't get against that which is doing it to you. And you have to sit there and take it.

And so you add the inequalities to that, and we're looking at an **injust** system. The injustice is what one flees from. And we know this from all of the studies done during, well, after Vietnam on how they got the Vietnam soldiers to actually shoot at the combatants, enemy combatants and kill them. It was all conditioning effect. They had to believe in an authority that was just.

So if the authority that's supposed to house you and soothe you and give you organized attachment is raping you and beating you and stabbing your mother, you will look for some other authority to give your precious permission to do what you need to do. And I think that's a piece and a paradigm. And we've got great literature on that in terms of how kids shift their permission from one authority to another to stay safe that will allow us to maybe look at offender based sanctioning versus offense based sanctioning.

My other thought with respect to methodological frameworks, so this is probably – I'm probably gonna commit social change and humanitarian aid hypocrisy when I say this. But I think prevention as we discussed it and have been trying to discuss it and force it into the paradigm, prevention is an artificial concept in the world we're living in. I'll try to explain why.

You can't really do prevention at this point on Tran generational enslavement and impoverishment. It doesn't mean all hope is lost. But if we don't start with **postvention** with an eye towards prevention mechanisms that are very community based and highly, highly, highly customized, you're never gonna do prevention. But it's a really false sense of security.

So you said it best, Greg. You said, "I'm not doing prevention. I'm doing essentially postvention and intervention." And the methodological framework I'd like to offer us to think about writing in our report at probably near the beginning is, look, let's be honest about this. You can't have prevention and a social change paradigm unless you have a proven inoculation or immunization protocol, which we don't have. We don't have immunization right now against trauma or against poverty. And _____ we're not gonna talk about poverty in the report because it's an endless black hole unfortunately.

You can do prevention with apparently there's gonna be a measles outbreak somewhere in the United States. So we've got, you know pretty good protocols to prevent a very large outbreak. But the outbreak of gang violence, the newest outbreak of girls joining gangs, it's great to think about prevention, but I think we waste dollar and huge IQ and emotional capital by forcing providers and think tanks to think prevention, unless they're thinking prevention as a phase oriented approach, starting with postvention. So you do postvention. You stop the bleeding. You figure out a lot of things. One of the things you figure out is how to talk to the people that are hurting the most. And then you gain trust. From that you start to develop the interventions, which we have, as Finklehore said, we've got hundreds of interventions that really work right now, we're just not using them.

From the interventions, it's actually simple at that point. And now you've spent a third of your dollar instead of two-thirds of your dollar on prevention. You've spent a third of it to get through intervention. Then you've got some bank left. And I'm talking about social capital as much as I am cash. To really develop some prevention mechanisms. And they're gonna work in one part of Dade County and one zip code over they're not gonna work that way. You're gonna have to customize that prevention technique just for –

[End of Audio]

Robert Macy: - so the good news is it works. The hard news is it's hard work to get it done. So I think framing our reporting and framing discussions to go forward, and I'm not really doing the _____. This is sort of thinking outside the box, so we can go 100 ways with this. But giving the reader of the report a methodological, a sound methodological approach to look at the things we're gonna be suggesting. Because, again, I go back to our very first conversation. I think if we mention dollars, we're lost. I think we need the people that are reading the report, including the Oval Office, to be able to say, "I got an idea." They own it. By us giving them the tools to look at the recommendations in a way where they have the power and they have the sphere of influence, we don't have to say, "You know what? If I put this and this together I could do what these guys are talking about if we don't waste money on let's say prevention programs." Just had to let it out there I guess.

Greg Boyle: Can I just add one thing?

Robert Macy: Oh, by the way. You know I know we're in open testimony. I am proud and honored and have been very excited over the last five years to work with AmeriCorps and to consult for them. So I want to be diplomatic. But I'll tell you the reason that they struggle, no matter how much money they have, is exactly what our expert testimony said today. Cause I consult with these people in the field. They're in all these schools around the United States. They're called corps members. And then there's senior corps members. And then there's senior corps member advisors. So they have a very patriarchal _____, hierarchical incident command.

When those 21 and 22 year old senior advisors are – excuse me. When a corps member who's struggling with a kid who's afraid to leave school because he's gonna get shot, come to their senior advisor and say, "What do I do?" The senior advisor doesn't know what to say. They don't know what to say. But they care so much. And there's been three shootings in this one school already. And I'm working with AmeriCorps all over the country. They all come to Boston to the headquarters to do their thing. I do these seminars and workshops with them.

But these young people who care so much don't have the tools to even do the consultation that they have to do. And what they run into is the same situation that our expert testimony talked about today. These silos. So you get a principal of a school saying,

“You don’t say anything at all. If a kid is traumatized and worried about his safety, that’s not AmeriCorps’ job. You’re supposed to be classroom aides and you’re supposed to be teaching them hand signs and dancing and doing other stuff. Don’t deal with the trauma.” So right there they’re in a double bind. And there’s a 2.8 billion dollar double bind. It’s not AmeriCorps’ fault, but it has never been addressed properly.

Shifting the funding would be interesting. I think it’d cause some trouble.

Anthony Taguba: Just need to be empowered them. Otherwise we’re gonna keep sinking billions and billions of dollars.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: We have about four minutes. Maybe two minutes _____.

Steven Marans: I was waiting to hear from Greg.

Greg Boyle: I just want to add one little. It was fascinating with Roy when – I don’t know if we asked him the question or he volunteered it. About it’s a question that you always ask somebody who’s gotten into a trouble or a gang member. What would have helped you when you were a kid? And do you remember what his answer was? Although nobody asked it, he kind of just said it. Was if somebody had helped my father. So that would have helped all eight sons. Fascinating. You know I think it’s Frederick Douglas who said it’s easier to build strong children than to repair broken men. Yes, but we fall into that trap because we don’t – what he is suggesting is a simultaneity. If you don’t repair broken men, they will continue to inflict harm on children. And so children are in everything we have here. Defending children. Children exposed to violence. And it’s natural for us to focus on children. But if we had somehow simultaneously helped his father, whatever that means, then the damage would have stopped, you know early on and eight sons wouldn’t have had to endure whatever the complexity was there.

So that’s just – I thought that was really important. And as we write – and it doesn’t make the job easier. It’s just something that Steve said earlier about embracing the complexity or really being reverent for how complex this is. Unless we address that stuff, we’re gonna – you know we focus on the child, which feels like what we’re supposed to be doing. And we’re not gonna make that much progress because that father needed to be helped, you know.

- Alicia Lieberman:* (Away from microphone) approach. So one good thing about this conversation I think is that we are returning to answers through different angles. And that the two generation approach of a child imbedded in the context of parents needs to be one of the real angles that we emphasize. Because children do not exist as individuals alone.
- D. Tilton Durfee:* May I say something?
- Georgina Mendoza:* I'm sorry. I just need to jump in there. I've been waiting. Just to respond for or to ask a clarification question to you, Robert. I've never heard, I'm probably the only person in this table, I've never heard the term **provention** before. So I'd like to know what it is.
- Male:* Postvention?
- Georgina Mendoza:* Provention? Postvention.
- Multiple:* Postvention.
- Georgina Mendoza:* Postvention. Yeah. Just what that means. And when you said that we shouldn't talk about prevention. I mean I'm sure there's some sort of clinical definition.
- Robert Macy:* That's a non clinical statement. But we certainly use it in trauma treatment too. So what I mean by postvention is zero hour early intervention or what's called now early intervention is post intervention. So something's already happened. We know the five principles of early intervention make it successful. It's called the safety wheel. Tons and tons of research on that. So basically the mythology that, hey, children are resilient, time heals all wounds, we're here for teaching and learning, everybody will get over it, sweep it under the rug, all stuff. Turns out not to be true. In fact, the opposite is true. So the earlier you get in and the more calm you are. Literally, your heart beats at 60 beats per minute. And the more transdisciplinary you are as a team when you come in to work with survivors, the better chance those folks have of immediate sustained recovery. And I also call that postvention, meaning the event's already happened. So we weren't focusing on trying to stop the terrible event. We're focusing on immediate aftermath response, which is essentially what Steve has been trying to do with his community policing program.

And it's really not artificial. It's what you _____. It's a continuum concept or a parallelness or simultaneous work. As we

develop the postvention, and very good teams do this now. We haven't learned our lesson in disasters. But in general, in more humanitarian aid community crises, teams that go in there that are well trained, they're already looking, for instance, for community leaders who may be crying literally on their knees. But they rise up and they do something extraordinary to being to help calm down the scene. And they live there. And they may be inside the wire and they may know the survivors.

So old adage if they're too close to it they're gonna mess it up, that's actually not true. With sustained support for them, they become the masters of their own universe in terms of the healing. So in postvention, I'm starting to look at someone who may be containing leadership for intervention and eventually prevention.

Georgina Mendoza: Okay. Yeah. I just wanted to make sure that we don't throw out the importance of prevention.

Robert Macy: Not at all.

Georgina Mendoza: Especially given all the service providers and programs –

Robert Macy: It's like **RD Lang**, you know who said, I think he said the sign of a mentally healthy human being is someone that can hold two opposing ideas in their mind at the same time. So we keep postvention and prevention at the same time in there. But if we focus resource and we focus brain trust on prevention when we haven't really nailed down this other piece, we're gonna, I think, end up in the corner, continually in the corner. But Steve's probably gonna try and disprove this.

Steven Marans: No, I'm not. I actually I agree with almost everything you said. But I'm gonna remind us that the interchange that just went on between you and Greg, you're both right. And we always run the risk of separating out, even when we talk about communities. A community is made up of individuals and there are both community level standards, values and ethos and, you know all that stuff. And they're done by – they're created and enacted by individuals. And each individual it's the what for whom that drives any solid approach to problem solving, including diagnosis.

So we always run the risk, and if we're aware of it, that's great. We run the risk of not recognizing, yes, the issues that you, that Alicia was raising around poverty, opportunity, concrete needs,

absolutely if we're not addressing those, we're not being complete in our assessments, right? If we're clinicians. And vice versa.

But I just want us to be aware of the tension. This is not either or. It's about looking at all these multiple levels. Last thing, about money, we're gonna have this till the cows come home, which is okay by me, Robert, cause I'm open to being convinced. I love the idea of reverence. Cause it sure as hell is better than being overwhelmed by complexity. And my only point about the money thing is, I'm not suggesting we're going in with some price tag. I don't have a clue. But I know it's a hell of a lot more than what we're doing right now. I don't want us to be overwhelmed and get stuck in the same old model, right? That if there's a disagreement that's where it is.

D. Tilton Durfee:

May I say something? First of all, Greg, thank you so much for your comment on silos. Because I do think that gets confused with specialties. And I think it's overused. Because then people think, well, everybody has to do everything at the same time and we can't be separate. If I break my arm, I want an orthopedic surgeon. If I have a brain tumor, I want a neurosurgeon. I mean we want people who are really good at doing what they do, whether it's therapy or law enforcement or whatever.

I think the point is they need to work together. And that there are these resources there for families, children, adults, whatever, that connect to each other. So I know when I should refer someone to you. He knows where there's a service he can couple with to help a family. The question of collaboration and coordination, it's my life. I mean it's what I do is bring people together. And I want somebody who's really good and really knowledgeable about what they do, whether it's defense or prosecution or whatever. Or childcare of community, a community program. So I just think that as we go forward with our mindset, we should maybe be careful about harping on these silos and start talking about the importance of expertise and understanding and connections. That doesn't cost any money to connect. To try to change what we do and expand what each of us does I think is expensive. And obviously, if we try to fund all these programs who are coming to us, if we set up something where we're asking for billions of dollars in new funding, it's not going to be worth the time, the paper it's written on.

I do think however, that since this is an attorney general's task force, that it's important that we do deal with justice for kids. And

I think justice has to do with what Joe's talking about, what I'm talking about in terms of kids who are hurt. There should be consequences. Kids should know that they can get help.

We haven't talked about the education system. I think it's profound that if a kid can't read by third grade you can almost be assured that he is going to have an unsuccessful future. I think that those are systems issues that need to be put out there. We're not gonna fund the American education system, but I think that putting out there that the education system needs to pay attention to whether or not kids can read by the third grade as a priority for whatever entity you are is really important. Because it's not just kids becoming violent. These are kids who run away. These kids who may eventually migrate to Father Greg's program.

But the reality is that we have specific things. Domestic violence, child abuse. They're intertwined. I mean it's abusive to have a child in a home with domestic violence emotionally and probably physically. They often die. Our domestic violence deaths and child deaths are like this now in the same families. The education system, the law enforcement system and the health system, those, I think are our responsibility in terms of the recognition of the importance of each, separately, and the need for them to connect to each other.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Task force members. We had set 4:00 as our deadline. We're at 4:08. We can go on with _____. I think one of the things that _____. So that's _____. We're supposed to wrap up at 5:15. But if you decide that you want to go longer, that's a decision that I suppose that we have to make jointly with our colleagues here as well. We need to think about the timing. So if there's someone else who has a comment they really want to make _____. Let's do it. And then we'll go on after the next comment or two and we'll go on to the other phase of our meeting.

Male: Maybe we should get to the draft _____ well.

Female 1: So I would like to ask that we – we have tomorrow afternoon as part of the working meeting as well. And we do want to talk about the draft report outline tonight. So what whatever feedback everyone has, everybody can think about. And then we can come back to the conversation again tomorrow. I don't want to just table that and talk about it only tomorrow. I think it's important that we have sort of a bifurcated conversation about it, so that there can be

some thought put to the comments that your colleagues have at the outline.

And I guess the one thing though that I would like to ask, and Thea, I don't mean to put you on the spot, but I do – you know you're the one person who hasn't had time to really share any feedback to yesterday's comments and today's comments from witnesses. And so I just wonder if there's anything that you want to say about that before we move into the report outline piece.

Thea James:

Well, not really. I mean it would basically be a synopsis of what everything people have said. I think there were, as I said earlier, common themes from yesterday. But one thing that I think is important is that, and I also agree with Dr. Lieberman, is that, you know I don't think, with the exception of very special situations, I don't think that people would choose to suffer. I mean I think every – you know there's a reason why these things happen, and I do agree with inequality type thing. I mean I just think people are sort of looking for a way out, survival, whatever. I mean sometimes people choose to go into these things because they're reacting to something like the loss of a loved one or something like that.

But the one thing I always looked at, and working in the trauma room when people came in injured, is what the difference between me and that person. And I never really shared a lot of that about my growing up except today when I was at lunch with Antoinette. I don't really want to go into all of that. But, you know I wasn't born with all of these barriers, different types of opportunities. I mean I had more than a lot of the people I encounter. But I think the difference is providing opportunities for people to be able to satisfy the natural human needs that we all have. To be important to somebody. To feel self worth. To be able to earn a living for yourself and to be able to make choices for your life. I think those are the most basic things. And I think all the stuff that's boots on the ground, that's what happens. And we see it happen one person at a time. And it's just to provide them with those things. I mean we do things like cut hair in our office, right in the hospital. We do that for people to prepare them to go for a job. And then, you know they get a job. Sometimes they don't get a job, but then to still be there for them to take them to the next step. So it is possible to do these things, and they're not necessarily _____. And I think that's important to remember when we're thinking of this wonderful cheat sheet that I think is the best opportunity for us to make a change in the nation around this whole thing.

But, you know it's not necessarily linear. I mean we can sit here and say things go from A to B to C to D. I made that assumption when we started our program. But it's not. It's tiers. You know people may go from A to B to C and they go back to B and then they go on to D and they come back to A. So you eventually get there. But it's not necessarily a linear type of a deal.

Anyway, I just think it's just those – instilling this whole thing, just this basic principles that I think, you know woven among the other little intricate things that are really important that have come up, you know around like educating police and that type thing. But I think we have to remember the sort of basic principles. It's just, you know that what it's rooted in and what kinds of things people need to go forward. And that would deter them from wanting to do anything other than go forward.

Female 1: Thanks. So I guess what we'd like to do at this point, and Dr. Cooper and General Taguba, if it's okay with you, is if we can get back to the listening session, a description of the listening session tomorrow so that we can have time to talk about the draft report outline. Is that okay?

Sharon Cooper: Mm hmm. Yes.

Anthony Taguba: Yeah. We're flexible.

Female 1: Okay. That's what we like about our task force members. But we don't want you to be so flexible about giving us your feedback about the report. Jennifer, and you all had a chance to meet briefly, I think, in Albuquerque. Or for those that were in Albuquerque, you had a chance to meet **Jennifer Trone** who has joined us as the lead editor of the report. Since Albuquerque we have spent, NCCD staff have spent a significant amount of time combing through the transcripts of the last, of the Albuquerque hearing and the Baltimore hearing. Looking at the testimony, the written testimony that was provided. And reading the transcripts, many times to hear what the questions were that you all were asking. Reading the transcripts of the working meetings of both of those meetings. And really hearing the comments, trying to find the comments that rose to the – that generated themes from both of those hearings based on the input that you had. And that's where we got to the report.

So what I'd like to do is let Jennifer spend some time sharing with you the overview and then getting feedback from you I think on the overview.

Jennifer Trone:

So basically what we tried to do here is, in addition to looking at the sort of substance of the first two hearings and the agendas for the third and fourth hearings, is we also looked at the conversation that you all had about what you envision this report to be. And in particular, we were focused on the fact that you wanted to generate a report that would be, as you said today, you know at the 30,000 foot view. And that would really compel a monumental shift in thinking and practice and then actual change in the world.

So when we started talking as a, you know me with the staff of NCCD, about how we would do that, we basically thought, well, what we need to come up with is in combing through all the sort of rich and complex substance, we need to identify what are the big ideas that really capture the change that you want to see happen in people's hearts, minds and on the ground.

We actually went – just you might be interested in this. We went through an exercise with some of the staff and actually asked people to ask them to go and come up with their own list of what were the big ideas. And I was just whispering to Deirdre, and I said, “Well, let's see how this conversation goes. Because if it seems like we're not all coming together as a group around these ideas, maybe each of you should actually go back this evening and come up with a list of the five or six big ideas.” So we'll table that for now, but it's out there as a possibility as a way to move forward.

And then obviously, I just want to say one other thing. You know it's not enough I don't think to just articulate a big idea. You have to say something about how you operationalize that big idea. So that's where you sort of see in the outline the two tiers. You know there is the idea, and then there are specific point and recommendations that are about, well, how do you make this idea happen. And, of course, you know one of the challenges before you is not only are there probably more than six big ideas that are worthy to talk about, but for any of those ideas you could come up with dozens of recommendations, specific recommendations.

So, you know we feel like to get – for the report to have a tension and traction and for people to feel not overwhelmed by the report, let alone the problem, that you have to actually make tough choices

about what are the recommendations that you think are gonna have the biggest impact. And you can't have dozens. So that's – those were the principles that were in forming the steps that we've taken to date. And I feel like you guys are so into this discussion that I just think it'd be great to hear your overall reactions and specific reactions to the outline as it stands.

Thea James:

I can tell you that I'm impressed. Seriously, I really am. I mean I know we're far from the final thing. But I mean the ability of you to capture and to kind of get in terms of the basic stuff that we're talking about that the people who have testified have talked about I think is pretty amazing. I just have to start out by saying that. I was really kind of surprised.

[Laughter]

I was impressed.

Georgina Mendoza: Yeah, I'd just like to echo that. No, it was so amazing.

[Cross Talk]

You can tell that you guys have spent a lot of hours doing this. I think it was beautifully captured. Easy to understand. Logical outline. Really got the important points. So I'm very impressed with this. I like the approach and style. A lot. I think it's very important not to make it so big where it's like, I don't even want to read it. You know I'm sure it's good, but somebody else will read it. Hundred and fifty is very manageable. The way you broke it down I think is very good. And this may sound bored line superficial, but I think it's very important that you do include these fresh pictures of actually, you know actual people and actual quotations from those that testified. And I'm not talking those pretty little glossy staged pictures. Ones that maybe can be submitted by certain groups. Actual people doing actual work I think would add just that touch of humanity and realism.

So I think the context, the wording, very good. I think, Jennifer, the only thing I shared with you was the use of cynicism in terms of like the objective, break through the cynicism that nothing works. I can understand maybe some sectors feel like that, but I think the majority of people just feel overwhelmed by it. And so cynicism sounds a little bit like, well, we know about it and we don't really want to do anything about it. It's more like, one, either I don't really know that much about it or two, I do know about it,

but I don't feel like I can do anything to help and I'm just overwhelmed. So maybe just that would be the only thing I would change.

Alicia Lieberman: Maybe that's the place where hopelessness belongs. Right? Because cynicism stems from hopelessness. It's a self-protection. So maybe that's what you are describing.

Thea James: What are those things about pictures that I just might want to just be offer, and I don't know, you can take it or not. But one of the things I learned over time, I mean I do photography, but as just a thing I do. Photojournalism. One of the things I learned, it gave me a lot of insight, because I started collecting pictures of tattoos of my clients. And I really got some insight into it. Like some of them actually submitted some to BU art days. And it's pictures that say things like, born to be hated, dying to be loved. You know tattooed across a chest. Born to be hated, dying to be loved. Living is hard, dying is easy. And another one that says, to live – something about to be in despair but to live every day in despair is to die every day or something like that. But it just gives you a mind into when we talk about why people join gangs or why people do whatever. It just shows you where they're you know where they're coming from. And Alex, it's not a lack of confidence. It's just that I've never seen anybody do it, so you guys are the first.

Greg Boyle: Can I just – remember when we began this process the model for this task force a little bit was what happened with – I don't know if I got this right. But sort of the victims –

Male: OBC.

Greg Boyle: Yeah. And so this is meant to be a report not a slogan. But, you know if you look back on that, there was sort of a victims matter. Although we would say survivors maybe now. But and then you can go from five, six big ideas. But I think there's something – you know like what would the slogan be? It wouldn't be children matter. Because that's just sort of duh, you know. And that's not that – when you're talking about changing norms, I don't know how to get at this. But I think that that's – even as I look at this, you know my guess is that you guys didn't – that some PR person came in probably. And said –

Male 1: Yes. You should see how horrible our first ideas were that the actual bureaucrats came up with.

Greg Boyle:

But I think there's something to that, because in order to shift – you know talking about seatbelts and smoking. There's something. And, again, that's not the most important thing, cause you do have to have a report. But that's the kind of view that none of us really can bring in a sense. Cause it's about marketing, it's about messaging, it's about PR. You brought somebody in and said, protect, heal, thrive. That's excellent actually. But that's a whole other kind of lens that isn't here kind of. I mean I don't know what I'm suggesting except that you want it to be something that really does change the norm as opposed to a report that people won't read.

Anthony Taguba:

When Anna Martinez called me in September I think it was, and she says, "I'm Anna Martinez. And the Attorney General is interested in whether you want to be selected to be on this task force." Remember that Anna? And so I said, "Gee, you know –

[End of Audio]

Anthony Taguba: - think about it. And I said, “Who gave you my number?” And she said, “Well, your good friend, Katherine Pierce.” So I said, “All right.” So the reason why I say that, I start that as a preamble is because I’ve sat – Katherine and I for two years, 2 ½ years sat –

Female 2: Four years.

Anthony Taguba: Four years. Sat on the domestic violence task force and produced three reports to Congress and to the Department of Defense. Then I was selected later on to be the Veterans Advisory Committee on minority veterans, which you produced for two years. I just got aggravated. For two years produced two annual reports that went to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and gets reported back to Congress.

So here we are. So I may sound a little bit skeptical here. But I think the body of work as a start is good. An old mentor told me that here we are. We roll up our sleeves producing this stuff. And then present it to the other body that’s supposed to be advocating it. And then they ring their hands. Because they say, “How much is the – bottom line is always how much will this cost and how long will this take. Right? So, you know those are two lessons learned for me personally. If we’re gonna invest all this time gathering all this data, listening to all these great Americans because we have a national problem, and then we print this and we kill a lot of trees and create more concrete in Washington, DC, somebody will have to do some sort of a strategic approach to say, “Before we have a final report, let’s perhaps do a leap ahead to somebody that’s going to be acting on this.” Called either the president or Congress. And says, “Hey, we got this great body of work here. And I know there’s an election process going on, but we really want you to consider ahead of time. And we want to give you a draft executive summary.” Because what Katherine and I went through producing that, it ended in what? Two thousand and two. And the great senator from Vermont finally advocated for passing the Domestic Violence Act last year.

So what I’m saying is, if we really want to be impressive and advocating for our children, all 75 million of them, and from all the things that all of these presentation – because there’s great expectations from those who presented their testimonies to us that says, “So what? So what?” Right? And so the so what would be we give them a product that they could be expecting something in return. Otherwise, we’re gonna hear it again and again and again. I mean this is an enduring problem.

So I just hate to pontificate that way, but, you know three volumes, three reports. I have copies of those. And they finally did something about it, cause they did something with domestic violence, suicide, sexual assault. Remember that? There were 24 of us. Twelve military, generals and admirals, and 12 experts from the federal government and the community.

Steven Marans:

I'm not having post traumatic stress reactions, Tony, but I guess it came to mind for a reason. Because, you know we've all had experiences of being on report writing tasks that don't go anywhere. I don't question for a minute the issue that you're suggesting about strategy or finding the voice in the marketing. I think that's great.

But you know there's a truism in working clinical in psychotherapy or analysis whatever. Which is, and any of us who have been in those processes as patients know this truism. You got to have enough conflict about what's going on with you in order to do the hard work that's required. Right? And I think about that in terms of the shape of the report and the content. I think it's a great start in terms of being able, again, thinking ahead. But thinking about how we address each other, let alone the rest of the country. Which is we have to not only go in not with a sense of hopelessness. Right? Which is, I'm not a PR guy, but it would be, we're not helpless. We're not helpless. But it is identifying a problem that people better start getting more anxious about. And that's then a jumping off point for, at least in my mind, to talking about, you know how to approach recommendations.

So just for starters, and I'm not gonna get really specific, but in the list, just in terms of the format. In the list, which I think is wonderful. I was reviewing it again and I thought, "Gosh, they said it. Excellent. That's a good start." But what isn't in the list is, you know we can't assume that people actually know what's so bad about exposure to violence. And that needs to be up front. And it's not just about the sense of humanity and it's not good for children to suffer, etcetera, etcetera. It's about the costs. You know across the board. It's about somehow being able to address the false economy of the short term intervention strategy. You know?

So I think that if we – and it sort of goes to what you're saying, Tony, about strategy. There's got to be – we have to discover what's the mutual self interest as we're thinking down the road to,

you know policymakers, cabinet agencies, etcetera. Politicians on Capitol Hill. So that's one issue.

I also, last thing I wanted to say is that the discussion we had today I found enormously useful. I mean clarifying for me. And being able to somehow articulate what we got to. Which is, and not everything's everything. But the notion of the complexity. And not saying, you know not making it sound academic. But saying, "It's really complicated. The good news is, we've tried a lot of solutions to address these different aspects that work. That are really successful."

It's also about being able to address, like the community level. You know the multiple layers. And instead of saying, "Wow," you know and having the reader say, "Oh, my god, you're making it so complicated. There's no way." Right? No, we're saying, "It is complicated. We're breaking it down. We're actually helping to look at it systematically." And at each level we're able to say there are things that as this country has developed to respond. Which also taps into an American spirit. I hope it's a human spirit. But not just the reverential but the call to action when we're troubled by something.

Joe Torre:

I have – obviously I'm not a clinician, and you guys, most of you here have spent a great deal of your lives researching and coming up with information on, you know how to approach it. The only thing I know is that we have an angry society out there right now. The kids just seem to think it's okay to behave badly. And we may not be able to solve everybody's problems here. But I think we owe it to the youngsters to get a message to them. And I certainly believe that children have to be part of the solution in finding that way. Because, you know what we do in society and media especially, we love to glorify stuff that isn't, in my mind – I mean I'm 71 years old and I've gone from watching all the movies where there was smoking in every scene and never using the word hell to, you know where we are now. I don't like where we are now. And I've got a 16 year old daughter. And you can only protect so much in your own household. I think we have to do something, as it says in here. And I thought this was terrific. You know make it cool to be nice. I mean that's – you know maybe nice isn't the right word, but I think respectful needs to be. I think respectful and respect just needs to be dragged back into our vocabulary.

Jim McDonnell:

How about healing America through respect? Or with respect. As like kind of a side tagline, a subtitle or something. Cause I think it

captures what you were saying and, Steve, it kind of jumps off what you were saying. But we are looking at healing America. And I think if we have to get the lowest common denominator of what brings all of these thoughts together, it's respect. At every level. The individual. The family. The neighborhood. The nation.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: If I could just add one thing. In reading the report and thinking about this issue for a long time, one of the things that has really struck me is that law enforcement, the role of law enforcement in dealing with children across the board needs to be redefined. I think law enforcement is striving for looking for a way of dealing with kids differently in all the interactions I've had with them. The discussions we've had about protocols for law enforcement dealing with children when they meet them at the point where there is a domestic violence is one aspect of it. Protocols for dealing with children when they are arrested. Protocols for dealing with children when they encounter them in situations where there's violence in terms of how those children are gonna be treated, how they're gonna be – services provided to them. That's something I think is really important.

We've talked a great deal about training and retraining law enforcement, both recruits. My experience with that is that law enforcement, particularly recruits, very open to being trained about how to interact with youth out on the streets. Very open to having youth come into the academies to do training. We have a curriculum that we've developed that has worked extremely well and is being adopted by other counties throughout Pennsylvania and other states now.

So I think that that is something that needs to be a part of the report. Thinking about exactly where you put it in or whether it's, you know sort of sprinkled throughout is something that needs to be given some thought.

I think that one other thing that struck me in our discussions today that may need to find its way into the report is this. We've talked about the fact that there are just some people out there that are special. That no matter what organization they're a part of, they seem to be able to impact their communities in major ways. The General talked about leaders. They are leaders. And whatever they do, they seem to be able to do just impact issues of violence considerably, both in a positive way and sometimes in a negative way.

I don't think we've actually talked a lot about how we need to encourage those kind of people. I don't think we've talked about developing any protocols for interacting with those kinds of people. And I don't think we've figured out, you know when we see them what we ought to do with them other than have them be a part of a program that is either evidence based or a program that's working. But I think we need to think a little bit about how those people can be important instruments of change in their community and how we can possibly encourage them, either as we were referring to them, they're either in the weeds or they're in the mud. But they are down there, up close and personal, with issues of violence in our community. And they can do an awful lot. But I'm not sure exactly how we reach out to them or talk about them or deal with them or fund them or whatever. But they have a big role to play in changing the community norms. And it's the norms we're ultimately talking about.

On the use of language, I'd just like to also emphasize what Joe said about respect. The word that we've found that works well with kids on the street and with law enforcement is respect. Just that one word. That seems to carry more – it has a currency. It has a meaning that is both automatic, seems to be understood on both sides to be the same thing. And it's what they trade in when they encounter one another on the street. It's about who respects whom, who has respect whom first, who deals with kids in a respectful way or the kids deal with law enforcement in a respectful way. If that happens in the right way, then their interactions between law enforcement and youth changes immediately right there on the spot. And the interaction becomes something different. It deescalates or we avoid a lot of problems.

So I think somewhere in our report we need to think about addressing somehow the issue of respect and maybe even taking more testimony on it in Detroit in terms of the issues that we might talk about. Because it seems to just have tremendous currency. Kind doesn't have as much currency with kids as respect. Just simple respect.

Joe Torre:

Let me just – I'm sorry, Alicia. Just as long as we're right here. You know if you give it, you're not gonna get it until you give it. Respect. And, you know my feeling in my career as a manager, I always told my players, "First, you have to respect yourselves. I mean that's important. Then you have to respect your teammates.

And in order not to take your opposition for granted, you have to respect your opposition.”

So just to me it – if you do, as Robert said, carry that word with you and the meaning of that word, you know I just think it will really make everything seem to work a little bit better. You know we’re in a society now where shock is wonderful. People want to get your attention. They don’t care how they do it.

Alicia Lieberman:

You know as I listen to the last few comments, I’ve wondered whether we could think of organizing part of the report along development lines. Because it occurs to me that you’ve been talking about the kids that are in the juvenile system who are dealing with the police. And I was thinking of the zero to five year olds who nobody respects and who are being abused and witnessing abuse and who, from being the recipients of violence, become the perpetrators of violence because they enact what they lived.

And so I’m wondering about that developmental line from having been disrespected as creatures that were being helpless and totally at the mercy of how adults treated them to saying, now I’m the one that is going to protect myself before anybody attacks me by attacking first. I’m wondering whether that could be something that can unify the different facets that we will be needing to address because we want to address the kids in gangs and in the juvenile system, but we don’t want to forget prenatal domestic violence, domestic violence in the first five years of life or abuse in the schools, etcetera.

Sharon Cooper:

And if I could tack on to what you just said, Alicia. In the very beginning when you say the way forward, you talk about the fact that we’re gonna treat violence as a public health problem. I agree. We should look at it as a public health problem. I think though that if we’re gonna talk about it as a public health problem and we’re talking about prevention, we should be using public health prevention jargon and strategies. Usually we would talk about universal or primary, secondary and tertiary prevention as part of our way of writing about it. And we’d also talk about the ecological model, so that we could use that developmental phenomenon that says we will look at what’s happening to the child and the child who becomes a victim then victimizer. And look at the family and that **milieu**. And the whole issue of two generational components. And then the community, which we had a lot of information about today, especially with respect to Dr.

Brian Samuels and his recommendations as far as schools and what works and what doesn't work. And then finally society.

I think one of the things we heard today, which, of course, is not gonna be in the draft yet. We've heard it every time, but we've not paid too much attention to it. Is the exposure of our children to media violence and the taking on of that being reality for them. We don't want to get into the FCC and all those kind of recommendations, but we've heard it every single hearing. And, in fact, the Iman, in his first testimony in Baltimore says, "I tell my young men, what you see is what you get is not what it is. What you see is what gets you." Remember? That was the first statement in that whole beginning of that hearing. Which is very true.

And if we don't talk about the normalization, which was brought up in the hearing today, the normalization of violence in our society, it's gonna be hard for our children not to embrace it and for adults not to embrace it as a means of problem solving. So that falls into that public health initiative.

And the other piece about public health that I didn't see yet was any mention of the **ACE** study, the Adverse Childhood Experiences study. Which is really, you know landmark. I mean that's really landmark research. Because it's not about the money, just about the money as Tony mentioned. But it's about the quality of life and longevity of life and early death if you are exposed to violence in this manner. So that's another public health piece that I think needs to be part of how we're gonna write about it.

Anthony Taguba: You may want to expand just a couple of things. There's some good items on here about for the recommendation. Expanding on those programs that are actually working. Like who you are, Big Brothers and whatever have you. And just kind of briefly expand on why that is worth reviewing and why is it worth supporting.

And the second one – and just kind of expand that. Cause, after all of this is done, 150 pages, then you'll have an executive summary of some sort. And most people just read the executive summary anyway. But just to follow with what Robert said about inspiring, right? I keep going back to Colorado's Mongos. Remember? The 17 year old from Ruidoso, New Mexico who says, "I can't wait anymore. You know I see this, my relatives and whatever have you that are going through this whole process of American Indian dilemma of, you know thousands of years of abuse." So he

mobilizes his compatriots. And basically said, “We got to take matters into our own hands.” That’s my words.

But, you know you have somebody like that, and you ask them, “How did you do that? How were you able to influence your friends, your classmates, the community to support you in your community in Ruidoso? And how can we help you do that?” That’s very inspiring. Because you have a young kid that actually took it and not have to wait for government or community to do it for them. Because we talked about the grassroots approach. So that would be a good grassroots approach that works. And I think, as somebody said, the community could best understand what their problems are. Just give us some awareness and give us some visibility and just give us some support.

Male; *[Inaudible Comment]*

Male 1: Thanks for the opportunity. I just wanted to make a comment on the points that I heard a number of people make about respect. And I think it’s a fascinating idea of treating that as a theme that we come back to throughout the report. And one of the points I was gonna make is it can be applied to almost any of the dynamics we’ve discussed. And because I have a history on the gang issue, the flip side, which I completely agree with what you said about the issue of respect between law enforcement and gang involved or associated youth or just young people in general. The flip side is that gang members themselves and the code of the street has sort of flipped respect on its head, right? I get respect through my violence, through my intimidation. It’s distorted the whole idea of respect. So by reclaiming it in this report I think, you know there’s ways we can use that as a theme and reclaim it as well as a topic.

D. Tilton Durfee: I think respect between and among service providers is also important. Respect between law enforcement and social services and doctors, etcetera. I was gonna say that I believe **Dr. Felitti’s** coming to Detroit to give testimony on the ACE study. I also wanted to say, because I can’t be here tomorrow afternoon, that on the first page where we say epidemic numbers of children in America grow up literally surrounded by violence, eventually becoming victims and/or perpetrators. I would rather say the majority of perpetrators of violence were victims themselves. Although not all victims become perpetrators as adults, they are far more likely to become depressed, addicted to alcohol or drugs or suffer serious medical problems, such as heart failure, liver and kidney disease, cancer and early death.

- Female:* That's the ACE.
- Female 1:* You're talking about the bullet on the overview page?
- D. Tilton Durfee:* I'm talking about – now later on you say it differently.
- Female 1:* So we – that type of detailed feedback is very hopeful, and we will certainly keep that in mind. This document is not a verbatim document that we're looking – so it's helpful for us to hear that that's how you would like to have that particular characteristic sort of framed.
- D. Tilton Durfee:* Right. That's why I'm saying it, cause I won't be here tomorrow.
- Female 1:* Right. But even for tomorrow, this document isn't gonna – this is a draft outline. So we aren't using these words verbatim in the report itself when we're drafting the report. But your feedback was helpful.
- D. Tilton Durfee:* I just didn't want the impression that all victims are going to become violent criminals.
- Female 1:* Right. Yeah, that's a good one.
- Jennifer Trone:* Yes, **substantively** that's a really good point. I think it's also important to remember the things like these main messages, which this is not a complete list. It's a, I don't know how far it is along, 75 percent, 65 percent. I'm not sure. But is that it's important to remember that these messages will need to be able to be captured very briefly. And then also to be discussed at length. And you're gonna find as we go along further in this process that it's a challenge, but it's one that we have to meet.
- Alicia Lieberman:* I want to thank you for the children's budget. I think that's fabulous.
- Sharon Cooper:* Yes.
- Steven Marans:* Really quickly, and if I'm just dealing with my own anxiety, forgive me. But everybody, you know so I'll just shoot it out here.
- Female 1:* Shoot. Shoot.
- Male:* Go ahead, Steve. We'll still love you.

Steven Marans: The idea that –

[Cross Talk]

Well, you know we're steeped in it. It's good to be immersed, you know. Part of the challenge of writing a report is so much – I mean this conversation alone can fill way more than 150 pages, right? So part of it's about organizing. And it seems to me the other thing is about theme, which is why we got into the whole kind of respect and looking for a central theme. The other one is thinking about the theme that's gonna resonate with the readership. And there's something that keeps coming up about, and we don't want to get into the politicization of this issue, cause we've had enough of that. You know liberal, conservative. This is an American issue.

And the issue that I think we can grab hold of is, and I'm not sure what the words are. But it's a constant pairing of risk and danger with opportunity. It's the overwhelming versus taking control. And if one took that as sort of a general theme that you're presenting, and then moved into all the areas that people are talking about in terms of types of risk. And I'm just throwing this out here. But which is better than shooting it. But the idea of what are the points of entry. Where do we see kids and where do we see the problems? And one could see it as crosscutting. I'm just throwing schools out as an example. Well, schools are both a place where we see problems, it's also a source of opportunity. Criminal justice, juvenile justice system is a point where we see kids. It's also an opportunity. The police. You know it's the same thing.

And by the way, the issue of standards. You know there's certain things that are overarching concepts. But if you think about police and opportunities, it's not just about the work that Sarah and Eddie were describing. It's about how the police set standards by upholding the law, by having resources that are not just about therapy but sometimes about age appropriate, developmentally appropriate probation, external controls, etcetera. And it goes to the point that you're raising, Joe, about what are our values? You know and this goes to your point about, you know we're not talking about censorship if we raise the issue of saying, what happened to respecting each other? What happened to these values and standards?

So I guess I'm wondering organizationally whether there's a way of thinking about points of entry, sources of contact. We had **Cindy Liederman's** work. We have, you know Alicia's work. It spans developmental arenas. And it set up this idea of, at least an organizational model that helps me sort of not be overwhelmed.

Sharon Cooper:

And, Steve, if I could also add with what you just said. When we talked about respect in the way of organization, perhaps this opportunity of intervention, if you will, would bring us to mind to perhaps include opportunities to counter messages that cause our children harm. Many of the things that our children see today are harmful, and many of them are violent. These messages. Sometimes the messages are in the neighborhood and might is right in the neighborhood. That's one of the messages. And do we, as communities, counter those messages.

But the most common messages that our children are exposed to, the Academy of Pediatrics has testified before on the Hill, is what they see in media. That's the most common and most frequent type of negative messaging that –

[End of Audio]

Sharon Cooper: - interferes with choosing respect. Because they just hear constant messages of disrespect. So how do you get – how do communities provide the counter message instead. Since we aren't going to be able to censor, since we aren't gonna be able to change that part. The American Psychological Association has given us, gosh, 110 pages on how to counter messages that sexualize girls. That's an example. And they give us concrete recommendations on how to counter those messages that girls receive every day that say they should be a sexual object instead of a person deserving of respect. In this report we ought to talk about how to counter those messages that propagate disrespect and propagate violent responses.

Greg Boyle: Just doubling up on the respect thing. I mean respect means to just to see again. And so – and I agree absolutely that the gang members have sort of turned respect inside out. But you want to be able to see something different in a different way. You know that's the change of the norm. So a 17 year old boy opens up fire in Ohio at a school, and we have our kind of ways of seeing this, you know. People will say, "Well, law enforcement's trying to find the motive." Well, I don't think anybody in this room thought there was a motive. I mean you don't have to interview the kid. Healthy kids don't open up fire. There is no motive. And yet that's how we always see things. What would have motivated this kid to do this? Cause it has to be reasonable. He has to be a rational actor. And it has to be a rational action. *Newsweek* started an article with a big picture of that kid and talked for one paragraph about what happened. And then the whole piece was on bullying. Which was odd to me. Because this was – I think sensible people, frankly, the very next day talked about guns and mental illness. Period.

But then you had, excuse me, I don't mean to be polarizing. But Fox News is talking about morality and stricter sentences. And the prosecutor says of the kid, "This kid is not well." And then there was the counter thing that said, "Well, three people are forever not well." That was the kind of – and you go, "Yikes."

We so need to be able to see something differently. And it's astounding almost that we would want to talk about morality when you're talking about a 17 year old who opens up fire on his classmates. And yet that could be, you know, again, this is not 30,000 feet. Maybe it's 50,000 feet. You know if there's any way that this report could somehow just respect, see completely in a different way the things that we've just come to discuss in the same old tired ways that never gets at why people are violent. Or

why crime – that’s what the mayor was saying earlier about I still don’t get how where crime is from. Well, we need to something in a whole new way I think.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: May I add to that, we have not had much of a discussion about the United States Supreme Court’s view on children and the importance of using development science in making legal decisions. But the United States Supreme Court has in the last three major decisions which have occurred over the last five years, *Roper v. Simons*, *Grand v. Florida*, *JDB*. Basically set a course saying that you must, in considering actions of children, take into consideration the development sciences. You have to look at brain development. You have to take that into consideration. That is a dramatic departure from what was in existence before.

It’s not political. It is just constitutionally mandated. So I think somewhere if we’re talking about development science, we need to also have a reference to the fact that our Supreme Court has headed in a different direction. And by the time this report comes out, there will be a fourth decision. Because that’s being argued today before the US Supreme Court on whether juvenile life without parole for any kind of an offense is cruel and unusual punishment. So there will be a fourth decision. And we’ll have a better articulation, an even great articulation of the role of development science in making legal decisions and justice, which is what we’re looking at in a broader sense. So somehow that has to be a part of this report. Because it is a major departure from the past. And we have to make some reference to it in terms of how that impacts children exposed to violence. I think. So I’m not sure exactly what direction.

Greg Boyle: You mentioned that, you know trying juveniles as adults, which I thought was good.

Female 1: And I think it’s the state of Georgia who said that like this –

[End of Audio]