

DISCLAIMER

This text is being provided in a lightly edited draft format and is the work product of the CART captioner. Any reproduction, publication, or other use of this CART file without the express written consent of the captioner is strictly prohibited.

Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility, and this lightly edited CART file may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings, nor should it be considered in any way as a certified document. Due to the live nature of the event, some names and/or terms may be misspelled. This text may also contain phonetic attempts at sounds and words that were spoken, and environmental sounds that occurred during the event.

>> Hi, everyone.

This is Marium Durrani, I'm the policy director at the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence.

Thank you for joining us.

We will give it a few minutes.

I see folks trickling in.

I'll be pasting some call in information in the public chat.

Feel free to let us know who you are, what program you are joining us with, maybe what part of the country you are joining us as well, and then we'll all continue to stare awkwardly at each other for another minute or two until you all make it here and then I'll turn it over to the presenters.

I'm going to give it one more minute.

So good afternoon and welcome, everyone.

This is our webinar, Reducing Violent Behavior, on Thursday December 10th at 2:30 p.m. eastern.

My name is Marium Durrani, I'm the policy director at the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence.

And we have an incredible panel for you here today.

So before I introduce them I just wanted to cover a few basics.

Attendees are going to be muted during the webinar

today, but you can post your questions in the public chat at any time.

We're going to try our best to get them through the conversation, this is a conversation and we're making

3

it as accessible as possible, but we might also save it to the end if it doesn't fit or if our panelists are talking about something fantastic.

And this webinar will be recorded so you're going to receive a link to the recording afterwards if you have to hop off or do something else, don't worry, we will make sure you get this fantastic content in your inbox. So I just wanted to introduce our amazing panelists very quickly.

First we have Jill Davies who's an attorney and deputy director of greater heart for legal aid and directs comprehensive solutions to domestic violence an initiative of NRCDV in collaboration with greater heart legal aid.

Her advocacy on behalf of violence victims spans decades.

One aspect of her work is the conception and continued development of the victim defined approach to advocacy. She has written and consulted extensively on issues of

importance to family violence victims including safety planning, poverty and legal issues.

Among Jill's current efforts are the practice of relational technical assistance, an approach grounded in victim perspective and advocate values.

And I'm going to be posting her, a link to her paper in

4

the chat shortly.

We're having a little bit of a lag on the chat, so just be patient with us.

You'll see them come through, it's just going to take a minute.

So next we also have Jacquie Boggess who's the director of the Nina Collective and has mastered the head, hearts, and hands approach to racial justice work.

Creating space for everyone to engage in the materials safely and bring everyone along in examination of the roots of inequity, manifestations and our shared work in rebuilding new foundations.

She's also a lecturer on diversity and oppression and social justice at the School of Social Work at the University of Wisconsin Madison and in the classroom she challenges students to think about systems -- race more broadly.

And Jacquie, I'm thinking of you as you navigate virtual learning right now.

Juan Carlos Are·n who is an internationally recognized activist, be public speaker, trainer, facilitator and published author.

-- partners and allies and domestic violence and sexual assault and achieve gender equity.

He is currently program director of Futures Without

5

Violence and previously served as director of the National Latino Network at Casa de Esperanza.

And -- at Harvard University has various positions at the men's resource center of western Massachusetts.

He's an ex-if pert in engaging men in media outlets and has many great publications.

Last but not least Lisa Nitsch our director of training and education at House of Ruth Maryland.

She's responsible for House of Ruth Maryland intervention services for partners and the training institute which coordinates professional development of staff, external community education, and professional technical assistance.

She's been with House of Ruth since 1998 and advanced -- a variety of positions including overseeing the

agency's clinical service for survivors and children, the teen initiative and developmental childcare center. So just from that short explanation you can tell we're going to have an amazing discussion here today.

I'm going to leave our panelists to it and disappear. But I'm going to be monitoring the public chat for any questions you may have.

So Jill, I'm going to turn it over to you.

Thanks so much.

6

>> Great.

Thanks, Mariam.

Good morning, everyone on the west coast and good afternoon, everybody else.

Welcome, virtually, to Connecticut.

I know we've all been spending some crazy amount of quality time in front of screens this year so I'm really grateful that you made some time today to join this important conversation.

Thanks to the National Resource Center for sponsoring it and thanks to Jacquie and Juan Carlos and Lisa.

I know this is going to be a lively, informative and change-making discussion.

So, thanks to everybody.

We've got a lot to talk about today.

I'm going to talk just a little bit about a paper on this topic that I wrote.

We will talk about where we are as a field with strategies to reduce violent behavior, and focus quite a bit on our role as advocates, both in systemic or policy level, but also in our work with individual survivors.

A note on language, it's likely we'll talk mostly about intimate partner violence that includes de-- control of battering.

7

When talking about battering it's mostly a man abusing a female partner so that's the gender language we'll use.

Of course there are victims of female partners and nonbinary folks and kids who are experiencing or witnessing violence.

I just want you to know that all of them have our attention.

Turn now to tell you a little bit about the paper -- (indiscernible) beyond leaving, strategies to reduce violent behavior.

I've learned from survivors and their kids that given their risks, families, and circumstances, they need the violence reduced in order to be safer.

Survivors correctly and rationally identify violence as the problem, and -- ask advocates for help to fix the problem.

I mean, really, who hasn't heard, you need help?

This paper is really about how to respond to that survivor priority.

Paper's got four sections.

The first sets the context, the framework of victim-defined advocacy and reminds us that this work to end violence is not new.

It's always been part of our advocacy and central to

8

our mission.

And that much of that work and that innovation has been led by advocates of color, leadership we can all follow.

The next section talks about victims in contact with a partner or parent who's abusive.

It explains why leaving or no contact doesn't work as a safety strategy for so many survivors, the adults and the kids.

With physical separation unavailable, these survivors need the violence reduced.

The third section discusses advocacy when we're working with individuals.

How to connect with survivors in contact to make their priorities truly the focus of our advocacy and ways to build safety plans that include strategies to reduce violent behavior.

There's also in the paper ideas about strengthening our own advocacy, raises up ways to build our knowledge about victims and contact and their priorities, ways to think about violence and behavior change, a section really to think about our approach to teaching advocacy, and supporting advocates, it's a really essential topic I hope we get to talk more about that today.

9

And more broadly to see how people in communities are affected by racism, persecution, violence, deprivation and poverty to ensure that we identify all the gateways to engagement and transformation.

The last section raises up ideas for our systemic advocacy.

Policy considerations along with communications and

messaging.

Ways to more fully integrate the reduction of violent behavior into our policy analysis and advocacy.

There's also a discussion about messaging, our messages around safety, children's needs, people who use violence, accountability, and reducing violent behavior.

I really think of that section as a, it's really an invitation to all of us to rethink how we teach DV 101 or domestic violence 101.

So that gives you a brief look at the paper and in the chat you can see where to get it.

I want to turn now just to share a few thought thoughts to get our conversation going about where we are as a field.

As advocates we're part of a movement and a field that's really accomplished a lot, and our work is continuing to evolve.

10

I believe we're about to see and be part of the next significant innovations.

No doubt many of you on this call are going to lead them.

Because survivors have taught us the violence that

causes the harm and that for some, leaving won't make them safer, this next stage will focus more on reducing violence.

Leaving a relationship is an essential safety strategy, but it's not the answer to domestic violence.

Reducing violent behavior is.

And as advocates we know this.

We work with victims how's only be safer if a partner or parent stops hitting, stops threatening, stops controlling.

And even when leaving is an option, we can't accept helping a survivor to escape only to have the ex-partner move onto his next relationship, his next victim.

Nor can we accept that the adult survivor is now safer, but that same ex-partner continues behavior that's not good for their child.

We've understandably focused on victim services, but victims need more options for safety, more strategies that will reduce the partner's or parent's violent

11

behavior.

And we need more progress toward our ultimate goal.

I find no comfort in the status quo.

The field will continue to move victims out of harm's way, but we must also find more and better ways to place responsibility on the abusive partner for ending violent behavior.

And we must figure out how to constructively support that change.

Given the harm to families and communities of criminal/legal system responses, this can't all be about the legal system and traditional batterer intervention programs.

Looking ahead, we're advocates, we're not naïve.

We know what we're facing, we know what we're dealing with.

We've embraced the complexity of human behavior and family relationships.

We know there's no simple solution, no easy path.

Changing behavior is difficult.

We've seen the devastation when intervention fails.

We know how some who use violence manipulate.

Will continue to protect their victims.

As we innovate, we'll stay true to our principles that violence is wrong, harmful and those who use it must

change.

I believe that deeper, more authentic and inclusive discussions will strengthen the power of these principles, increase our allies, and broaden our reach.

We're savvy.

We'll proceed strategically.

We'll listen carefully to how survivors talk about their partners, to what they tell us would make things better.

We'll hear and follow the guidance from survivors of color and other marginalized victims, their advocates, and their communities.

This is not about finding a model program to copy, about identifying the answer.

This is about listening and learning and thinking, and together building the multiple options that diverse survivors need.

I think we'll find that in these next steps, sometimes we must lead and at times, humbly follow.

At our core we're an antiviolence movement.

Ending violence is our mission.

For many of us, a calling.

And we know we can't stop violence in our communities, our country, our world if we can't end it in our families.

If women are not safe.

I've seen the innovation, the wisdom, the skill, the power that we bring to our advocacy.

I know we can do this.

We can reduce violence and offer new paths to safety.

And I just have to tell you, I would not be feeling or sounding anywhere near as confident if it weren't for folks like all of you on this panel and all of you on this call.

I'm grateful to all of you.

So let's talk.

Let's listen and learn together and I'm going to throw it over to you, Juan Carlos.

Where what are your thoughts about where we are as a field and as a movement?

>> Hmm, Jill.

Well, first of all, thank you for NRCDV for inviting me and to my colleagues here and for you, Jill, I just reread the paper.

I had red read it maybe a year ago and reread it and I think you just articulate things in such clear ways, that I'm really appreciative of your clarity around this.

And it's interesting because even though you wrote the

paper more than a year ago, I think it's more relevant now than in some ways it has been ever, right?

We are as a nation reckoning with racial injustice.

I mean, of course we have all along, but it has come to the surface.

And as a movement I think we are paying more attention to that for sure, at least on the advocacy side.

I will say battering intervention, still lagging on that, although other interventions with people who use violence have been looking at that all along, as you mentioned, of course the leadership of people of color has been central.

And we're, I think, coming at a time where also because of covid we have the opportunity to reexamine some paradigms that we have had all along.

And of course the one that you're putting out there is central to this, right, the importance of reducing violence.

And not only keeping people not only safe, but you use the word "safer" which makes sense to me, right?

Because absolutely absolute safety is very hard to achieve, whether, even though that's what we would like

to do.

So I think in addition to that central paradigm, some things have become clear to me and I've written some

about this during the covid era, which is that we cannot just say that the interventions that exist for people who use violence don't work, which is something that I continue to hear in all different kinds of fields, right?

Not only in advocacy, but from judges, from other people.

There were some studies in the 1990s that, experimental studies, that actually had a lot of methodological problems but kind of established that in the mind of the field that these programs didn't work.

However, in some way we have been frozen in that time, because there's a lot of research that has happened since the 1990s that has shown actually that battering intervention programs as well as other interventions, I hear about expanding beyond traditional programs, do work.

So I think this paradigm of programs don't work and this message you write in the paper, the generalizations of telling survivors, you know,

programs don't work, people who are violent will never change.

We are at a time in which we have to challenge those things, right?

And another paradigm that I think has been clearly

16

challenged, at least in my mind by covid is that people who use violence, men who use violence will not seek help.

And because programs at least at the beginning of covid could not operate in the normal way, right?

Everything went online or was canceled, and what I hear and Lisa maybe can speak more about this because I don't do groups and haven't done groups under these conditions, but what I hear is that a lot of men showed up to groups, were very grateful that these groups were happening, even if there was no -- even if the requirement that they would show up was removed, if you will.

So in my mind they came without a requirement to come, and we're grateful for these groups.

I think like a hotline in the UK for people who use violence doubled the number of calls during covid.

And their e-mails tripled.

There were a lot of people asking for help.

And I think one of the challenges in this country, not necessarily in other countries, is that we, because we have only used coercive systems to get people to services, we have assumed that it can happen through other channels.

And I actually believe strongly that it does, because

17

I've seen it happening in other ways.

So I think this is such an opportunity to in some way reexamine some of the paradigms, some of the tenants that we have had in this movement, and of course always putting the safety of survivors at the center and their voices at the center, to start to really listen deeply and started to not substitute some of the things that have worked, but to expand and really to be able to serve everybody, not only certain survivors.

So I'll stop there.

>> That's great.

Thanks, Juan Carlos.

How about you, Jacquie?

>> So, ask me the question again, Jill.

>> Well, we're just trying to get a sense of your initial thoughts about where we are as a field.

>> So, thank you so much for inviting me.

Happy to see you all.

I haven't seen you in a long time.

It's good to be having these conversations.

Honestly, I do continue to have the conversations, as

18

you can imagine.

I guess I want to expand it not just to this field but to fields.

>> Right.

>> To families and families who are under stress and anxiety and dis -- you know, disjunction.

I'd like to expand it out because what I find when I was doing work, and I'll say that my work started out as looking at mostly Black men is what we were studying and their families and how they survived, how they make it.

And this is how I came to center safety for women and

children and those men also.

How I came to turn to folks, so talk more about safety is and from violence.

As I was doing that really, really focused on economic security and those kinds of things.

And so I think we're talking about, talking to, responding to the needs of the same families.

And so I guess I want us to continue to look at how are we responding to families and their needs, especially as one of the needs is safety from violence.

Each of the individual people in those families and

19

their safety from violence.

And how are we doing?

I think -- I think the conversation about, that you brought up, Juan Carlos, about this moment, about the racial reckoning and the economic reckonings and the health reckonings are doing two things, actually.

They are making folks like us and all of the folks on this, in this conversation with us double down on what we believe needed to be done.

Folks like the three of you and other folks who have always kind of come up with ideas that were a little -- it took people awhile to come to terms with.

I think, and I guess I would add myself into that group.

I think those kinds of folks like us are doubling and tripling and quadrupling down, because if not now, right, if not now, when?

And so I do think that there's more, that this is spreading.

I started doing work where I was focused on low income men and their families in 1995.

And I can, if you asked me to plot out a grid of the change in the idea about those men and how they fit into families and how they impact whether or not the women and children in those families would be safe or

20

subjects to violence, I think the conversation from 1995 to now has absolutely changed.

Of course when you're in a thing, it feels like it's not changing, but if you look at the graph, you will see and I could plot that graph.

So I believe the change is here and that this moment right now that you described, Juan Carlos, this moment that if we don't take this moment and really get the work done and bring, and come to some kind of agreement with each other about what we're doing, I'm going to

tell you this honestly -- I can't see anybody's face anymore, all of a sudden on my screen.

>> The chat window -- where we go.

>> There we go

>> .

We love technology!

>> Just a little disconcerting I'm talking to the words.

>> No, it's okay, you're back.

>> That was me.

21

I apologize.

[Laughter]

>> Thanks, Juan Carlos.

>> that's what we get for giving you panelist control.

I'm so sorry, Jacquie.

>> No, it's okay.

But I guess I'm just generally saying as the thing I was doing all along in that work for 25 years is this us all recognizing that all the work is all the work. And then if we're not figuring out how all of the other parts of people's lives are intersecting and interacting with the issue of survivors and their safety and what they want and what they need and all of those things are being impacted generally.

If we can get to that point when we make sure we know that part for sure, I think, and I think we're moving in that direction.

So, in answer to that question, I think we're moving in that direction.

>> so Lisa, we'll get to you in a second.

Jacquie, you know, I just wanted to say all the work is all the work, but also we also see all those folks

22

doing all that work, those are our potential allies.

Those are our potential broader coalition.

I mean, there's just so much potential there, you know, because you could see all the work and there's poverty and all the incredible need and housing and all these issues, but we have the opportunity to connect them in

meaningful ways and then also embrace all of those folks that are doing that work.

So I just wanted to raise that up.

It seemed like such a hopeful message.

So thank you.

Lisa, what do you think?

What's going on?

>> Man, this is a tough crowd to follow.

I'm definitely experiencing some imposter syndrome being on this panel with all of.

>> No.

>> And I really appreciate being able to participate. You're just all fantastic and kind of part of sort of what I've been seeing in the state of the state.

I remember in I would say early 2000s about 2002 when we started talking about redesigning our intervention

23

program at House of Ruth Maryland, we are a survivor centered organization and we have an intervention program.

And we are redesigning the program to incorporate

elements of adult learning principles.

Respecting clients, acknowledge they show up with important experiences, giving them space to disagree. All of those things that frankly weren't regular, they weren't standard procedure in the traditional intervention programs.

And, man, I took a lot of flack.

As Juan Carlos said I joke about the quote is you're coddling batterers, you're hand-holding, you're not holding people accountable.

All those kinds of things and I really appreciate the question about attendance that was in the chat somebody asked, and let me tell you, without changing the policy, without changing our curriculum, without changing anything we saw an increase just being more respectful and kind to our participants, being more engaging, asking them how their day was, telling them we genuinely cared about them, engaging around their struggles, we saw a 25% increase in attendance.

And we allow absences so we don't expect 100% attendance but that's the kind of shift we're seeing

24

that's really exciting.

There's great research out there, and some of the best

high quality research as Juan Carlos was saying really is showing promise.

You've got probably one of the best well structured studies by Ed Gondof in 2002 that showed positive benefits, Etiony who I see on the panelists, my buddy. I think one of the most incredibly structured studies is Project Maribal out of the UK in 2015 that used survivor defined measures of success showed that upon every intervention survivors laid out programs were successful.

And I don't want to short change traditional programs like DIAP and Duluth and emerge and Massachusetts, they're doing amazing things in their communities, but I'm seeing like real innovation is in communities of color and we're getting creative about how do we engage people around that intersectional complex experience of oppression.

You know, part of the reason I'm, I get to be on this panel is because I was fortunate enough to stumble into the fatherhood, the responsible fatherhood field, not the father's rights field.

Dr. Oliver Williams, Dr. Johnny rice are dear friends and mentors of mine and that's how I got to to know

Jacque back in the early 2000s and just learning about that unique experience, that I'm saying to my fatherhood partners, we're seeing women die every day and them saying back to me, yeah, we're seeing fathers die every day.

That there's an urgency in these low income communities of color, I serve in Baltimore city, so as a middle aged white woman there's a lot of cultural humility that has to happen.

There's a lot of cultural considerations that I need to make in sort of how do I walk into a room full of almost exclusively low income Black men, because of the way our legal system is structured because we're not seeing everybody who abuses, we're seeing the people who get convicted and mandated and sentences.

So overrepresented with low income men of color and talking to them about having too much power and control just doesn't compute if you're coming at it from a traditional singular oppression model.

And really trying to understand those complex ways, helping people tap into their own sense of victimization and I know you talk about this in the paper, Jill, about their own sense of disenfranchisement, if you don't create space for that, you're irrelevant.

You're just totally irrelevant and they're not going to listen to anything you have to say.

And so in that sense I've seen tremendous evolution in our field about how do we engage abusive partners, both sort of applying really traditional basic, you know, adult learning principles, getting creative in our engagement strategies, approaching them with more compassion than ever, understanding how to engage people in a thoughtful and meaningful way, and that has happened, at the same time we are building bigger shelters, we are hiring more therapists, hiring more attorneys and our services are still completely overwhelmed.

Build a bigger shelter and it will be full tomorrow.

We literally tripled the size of our shelter and it was filled in a week.

I mean, we're not going to hide -- we're not going to hide our way out of this problem.

We're not going to hide survivors away, like we really got to get to the root cause.

>> Lisa, can I just jump in a second?

>> Yeah, please.

>> I know you're talking about the -- but also we hear

so much from survivors of violence that this is what they want.

I mean, not everybody.

I mean, some survivors, they want out.

>> Absolutely.

Absolutely.

>> Some of them -- want the criminal legal system punitive thing hatching, but so many that's not what they want, they're telling us that's not what they want, he needs help, he needs a job

[talking overlapping]

>> But to your point, Jill, every single one of the most long-standing well respected intervention programs in this country was started by advocates who were serving survivors because survivors were asking for it, one of the most survivor defined services we offer, but they want the abuse to stop and we're starting to see it as like a twin jet engineer.

We have to provide healing services for survivors and

we need to be engaging people doing harm.

And to your point in your paper, violence is well funded in this country.

And our antiviolence needs to be just as well funded

and we're starting to see that we're not fighting over the same pie, we can make a bigger pie.

>> may I add, Jill.

>> Of course.

>> To Lisa's point about if you build more shelters you'll get people to go into shelters, I'm just going to go back to my point about the work is the work. Sometimes those shelters are filled with people who need shelter.

>> Right.

>> Right?

Just regular shelter.

Because of the all the other economic security issues that are going on on.

So if we weave that issue into survivors' lives you

have to also add this is the thing that when I talk to advocates back, you know, in the past and they would say, well, she needs to leave.

Leave where?

It's her apartment.

Right?

29

He doesn't -- right?

She's not leaving like in the driveway with his car and burning his stuff in the driveway.

This is her house.

So she needs to get him to leave, which is a whole 'nother additional thing for a survivor to do in that situation, which is the thing the survivor honestly understands she can't do, sometimes wants him to have someplace to live to keep other people safe, so she wants him to stay there while she goes to the shelter, so the -- these, because these issues are so enmeshed for him, for her, for everyone in the family, for the children, child welfare situation, which is not about, if you ask me, neglect and abuse mostly, it's often about economic security.

You know, except to the extent that there's physical abuse.

So I'm just going to say again that these things blend together.

And when I think about that I go back to what I think you said it, Juan Carlos, and then you repeated it, Lisa, about the men show up, they were showing up because they want to be there.

Well, when I walked into the room to have conversations with advocates and to try to explain what a fatherhood

30

program was, you know, that it wasn't a batterers' intervention program and it wasn't a place where we were coddling or sheltering or helping abusers to get jobs, so when I explained and said, no, they come here on purpose, they come here, they want to be here. Like they've never been ordered in, like that was the thing I didn't even know about until I started hearing about sort of batterers' intervention programs and how people were starting to blend fatherhood and batterers' intervention.

Those men were showing up, I would say if you told me they weren't showing up to attend to their own issues of use of violence, I would agree with you, that's not why they were showing up and in fact often they did not want to have that conversation.

So I will also add that the men that ran those programs often forced them to have those conversations after they talked to advocates and learned how to figure out how to have those conversations.

But that was where we could see that men were showing up because they were caught in the web that I'm talking about, along with their partners, along with their, the folks that they were using violence against, and they knew that their children were caught in that same web. And that they couldn't respond to the needs of the

31

children and in the meantime you have, yes, the criminal justice system, broadly, generally, you were walking down the street.

But also the child support system.

So systems that were taking money out of their pockets that they could be giving to their children.

So that web, that thing was sticking them all in the same place and even if she needed, wanted to be separated for a time or for good, those things pulled them back together.

>> Jill, can I make one point at the risk of you not being able to ask any other questions?

>> Uh-oh.

>> I wanted to -- I did answer a question in the chat, that's why I screwed up -- which was about research. And in particular, I would highly recommend, I put there a link to a webinar, I don't know if you saw that, Lisa, with Dr. Eric Mankovski from the University of Portland.

It's two hours long, it's a little long.

>> Thorough.

32

Yeah.

>> But it's really an amazing, thorough examination of what has been happening including two recent meta studies which show very promising results.

And the other thing I just want to say is that actually Lisa in House of Ruth has been involved in some of the most interesting research recently, which is about hope.

And, you know, it emerged on talking to African American men from Baltimore, what was a central issue

of their lives was the lack of hope.

And based on that, some people have started to really pay attention to that because, you know, there's a science of hope that shows that in order to be able to change our behaviors, we have to have hope.

So how do we work with them to develop that.

So I just want to mention that, Lisa.

You're too modest to mention it, I know.

Really --

>> No, that's actually good.

We did a concept, a brilliant young researcher out of Johns Hopkins university, Dr. Holiday really deserves all the credit.

But she did a concept mapping listening session with

33

our participants.

And I think just that innovation, the idea of asking abusive partners why they think they abuse and what may have kept them from even -- right?

Like that's innovative in and of itself.

But what Dr. Holiday found was they were very clear in understanding sort of what kind of things could have maybe prevented them from becoming violent and things we would stereotypically expect, like having less

violence in my community, all those kinds of things. But one of the number things that they recognized was an overall loss of hope, that they didn't feel they could live up to their role as a parent, as a partner, as there was no jobs.

We're here in Baltimore city, things are looking pretty bleak right now.

We've already had over 300 murders and we're still quite far from the end of the year.

It's a tough, you know, it's a tough place to be.

And listening to the pain, like genuine pain and it really informs how do we engage them.

And how, you know, making sure that that part of what we're doing is supplying them hope that they can do this, you can be a big part of, an important part of the community.

34

And that really has helped inform our decision and I think this is what I'm most proud of here at House of Ruth is that we're now providing wraparound support services.

And I want to be clear, again, anyone thinks I'm coddling and hand holding.

We, House of Ruth Maryland is not providing the

services, we're engaged in partners.

so we have people coming in and helping with employment, people coming in and helping with substance abuse, people coming in and helping with mental illness, but don't get it twisted, we're here to talk to you about violence.

But we're screening these things and care about these things and we're asking about symptoms of depression and we're asking you about bipolar disorder and we're suggesting you talk to your doctor.

That is a holistic approach to this work that I think is just, the response we're seeing in participants, the reduced resistance, the, you know, showing up, they know that we genuinely care about them, it's just so powerful.

Really powerful.

>> And I think if you talk to survivors, you're going

35

to hear that.

When you ask them what would help, what's going on, if you really, ask you ask about their partners in more ways than just, you know, kind of cataloging all the violence and what's the worst thing that happened, the

first thing that happened, all that kind of thing that we do spend a lot of time on which is important, but obviously violence is only one of the risks that survivors and families and the kids are facing. Jacquie, you talk about this whole range of poverty and racism and all these things that are happening when survivors are making decisions and so many folks are staying in the relationship or in contact for a whole lot of really reasons. Often it's because leaving is going to make things worse because of life generated kind of risks. You know, you're going to hear that this kind of help is really what folks need. And I just want to say to the advocates, like I kind of when I started to think of it as explanations as opposed to excuses, it sort of helped me. Because it's not like, you know, understanding like what gets a person to a point where they're using violence in their relationship, understanding why is important, and I think sometimes we've just kind of

36

dismissed that because we, you know, as soon as we start understanding why we think it's an excuse. But it's not an excuse, and I hear you, Lisa, saying

that's not at all what you're saying or how you engage with folks, it's just sort of like, okay, we need to understand all the reasons.

And there's a whole lot of reasons, there's a whole lot that we don't understand about violence, and the range of it also I think, you know, sometimes we respond to violence always as if it's all life threatening, as if it's all severe and that's just not what people are facing and different survivors are experiencing the violence in different ways.

Like you could have fairly what you might call low level physical violence but for a particular survivor it might be life terrifying and so traumatic.

So that -- advocates' understanding.

>> and what you taught me years ago is what I'm doing is removing the excuses, right?

There's no sense getting caught up in whether employment causes violence or not, I don't believe it's causal, however, if an abusive partner has their victim convinced that their unemployment justifies their violence, well, then how much does it help saying guess what, they can get help with that here too and they can

get help with that here too, and I'm just ticking off

the excuses, although we're finding as you engage people, on the the other thing, we call them excuses, Dr. Jackie Campbell calls lethality indicators.

We tried to play two sides of the coin.

We try to say this side of my mouth -- I'm being mindful of my pace because we're being closed-captioned.

On one side of our mouths we're saying this is all an excuse, people are unemployed and don't hurt anybody, but when we're doing -- with survivors we know that's a lethality indicator.

What harm are we doing to provide that supportive service to this family.

And let me pull in Jacquie's great research that says (indiscernible) saying if nothing else you're giving me some teeth.

If he's bringing in income and helping me support my children and, Jacquie, I don't want to speak to your research but that's what you've found.

>> That is what I found.

That is what I found.

But what I wanted to add to this whole thing, I guess I'm just kind of drawing on one point, but the other

point I want to add too is Jill, you said sometimes she doesn't leave for a whole lot of good reasons.

And sometimes the reason is because he's a human being that she cares about, right?

>> Right.

>> And not she wants to be partner with necessarily or she thinks he's the greatest father there ever was in the whole wide world or any of that, but because she cares about him.

And sometimes it has to do with particularly if she's a Black woman and he's a Black man, she knows what his life is going to be, she knows what his life has been.

>> Right.

>> And so it is important for her and for her children to not turn their back on -- so these things that we do with our research and the things we learn like what you were talking about, fascinating research about hope, so what I learned from my research, Lisa, is that survivors know all of this, they just don't have the fancy words or the computer paper to put it on.

They know all of these things, they know about hope,

they know about the lack of hope, they know about racial injustice and discrimination.

They may not be able to -- may not have time to articulate it to you, though I did sit down with mostly Black women survivors and ask them first what do you need, but then second, what do you think the men in your community need?

And the answer was what people need, they need love and joy and hope and a job and time and space and privacy and all of those things.

That's really what their answers were.

And so I think that so often we're not looking at -- sometimes they're parents, parents, maybe step parents or -- parents, and their family, their children, that's who we're looking at.

And we often go from that perspective of, you know, the guy who used violence or the woman who's getting food stamps or the, you know, person who showed up at my shelter, but if you pull back your view, you'll see two parents, sometimes three parents, whatever the situation is, trying to take care of some group of children, and whether they live together in the same

house or not, it's still that.

You know, this morning my daughter told me about a childhood friend who was in Madison, Wisconsin, in a

shootout police, and he was killed by the police.

And he was shooting a gun at them and they shot back.

So that's violence, right?

So there's something to learn there between the way we looked this past summer about the violence of Black men who are killed and, you know, they have no weapon themselves, that kind of thing.

And we all go oh, my God, this is horrible.

Oh, this is so terrible, we need to respond to this, this shows racism, all those kinds of things.

Then we look at the Black man who was using violence, who was dangerous to someone, who likely was killed in self-defense, that you're still a story of the harm and the trauma in that person too.

And we're declining to learn from that person's life.

We're declining to learn about violence, about violence against everyone in that person's life.

We're declining to learn about violence from that person.

We only want to learn about violence from this other

person who didn't do anything wrong.

>> Absolutely.

>> We got to learn it all.

41

>> Right.

Right.

>> Yeah.

Yeah.

Do you want to say something, Juan Carlos?

>> Well, I just want to say that that point and a lot of your work I know, Jacquie, was reflected in -- that was reflective in Jill's paper, and, again, I think you have such a talent to put things with such clarity is this idea of seeing perpetrates through the eyes of their survivors, right?

And we think we do that, but that's hard to do.

Right?

I think, wasn't it -- we don't see the world as it is, we see the world as we are.

And so part of the work and, you know, I will of course include myself there, is to really are we really seeing that person through that survivor's eyes?

Whether it is like I don't want anything to do with this guy for the rest of my life, or the opposite.

You know, I want the violence to stop.

But I think we're, often we go to, well, she's in

denial, you know, she doesn't see reality, we need to educate her about the dynamic.

But you were saying, Jacquie, we need to educate the survivor about their own life?

You know, that's one of the things that really gets me going, that particular word, yeah.

So I think that's part of the work, right?

>> Yeah.

>> You know, even if --

>> Historical structure issue as well and I think we have to kind of acknowledge the history of white feminism in this movement and the idea of services that were built.

And I know here in my own agency the survivors that are

legal clinic sees, they're done, they're fed up, they're like get me separated, get me a protective order, I want no contact, I want a divorce, whatever you can help me with.

And that's a different person than the person -- and like literally a different person, we're seeing distinct survivors, when you're talking about who's accessing our traditional, our traditional mainstream services versus who are connected to the men in our

43

intervention programs, those folks aren't reaching out for traditional mainstream services and when we look at fatality review teams across the country and seeing how few of those folks connected with or interested in traditional services it also has to do with sort of the perception of what we believe based on the survivors that we've historically served, but by nature of the definition of our menu we're not reaching those other survivors who would tell us that maybe what we're offering doesn't meet their needs.

>> You know, I want to jump in too, Juan Carlos, I think getting to know him is such an essential aspect of safety planning.

Even if the focus is on leaving and physical violence. Like we need to know everything about him, what makes him tick, what's going on, what's the level of violence, are we talking about just sort of immature behavior?

Or are we talking about lethal scary violent behavior? What's the range, and, you know, sort of we've been exploring just changing up the questions that we ask. I think we have these intakes that just get longer and longer and longer that add more and more physical violence focus but I think one of the questions I think

44

it's really interesting to ask folks is how did you meet.

I mean, you just -- you just go down, you learn a lot about the violence, you learn a lot about a lot of things but it just sets such a different conversation. And I think as we're trying to sort of talk about like whole families I want to make sure we start talking about the kids a little bit.

So anybody want to start us off?

I'm looking at you, Juan Carlos.

But anybody.

I'll just say kids are so central, obviously we want

them to be safe, they need to be safe, they need to be safer.

Again, they're not going to get the ideal version of safety, most folks don't have the opportunity to have that.

Kids need different things than adults depending on where they are developmentally and of course when we're working with parents who are survivors of violence, you know, their decision making is so central around the kids.

I mean, so many victim parents put their own physical safety way down on the list of priorities because they're doing what they have to do to keep their kids

45

fed and to keep them in a place to live.

So and just kind of with that as a sort of start, let's talk about this aspect of reducing violence when it comes sort of to the parenting aspect of it?

Anybody.

>> Well, you want to get me started, you know a lot of my work has been on this overlap of fatherhood and domestic violence.

And of course we have learned a lot about the negative,

you know, there's hundreds of studies about the negative effects of domestic violence on children, even if they are not directly abused.

We know that and we in the last maybe 20 years have been paying more attention to that, which I think is very important.

It's also very important that we also understand how resilience and protective factors work, right?

Otherwise going back to the hope, we can take all hope out of survivors sometimes if we don't balance those two things.

But the other part of it is that even when partners don't want to do anything to do with this person, if they have children in common, you know, the children will in the majority of cases, right?

46

And often, you know, we have done research, focus groups around this, often survivors actually do say that they do want the children to have contact with this person, even -- I mean, if it can be done safely, right, that if not fatherhood -- it's not fatherhood at all costs and sometimes there's some tension around that.

But Betsy McCallister from the child witness to

violence project in Boston used to say fathers will always be there.

They might be in jail, they might be dead, right?

They are there, they're in the children's lives.

So I think it's, and sometimes, sure, they have to be in jail, sometimes there's some men who should not be seeing their children.

But the other side of is that many men do want to be good fathers, do see themselves as aspirationally as good fathers, we might not agree on what that looks like, that's part of the work, but my experience and now research is backing that up and I'm sure my colleagues can talk about this.

And Jacquie's work is also around fatherhood is that that's a very powerful point of entry for some men. When they start to understand the damage that they're doing to their children, that for us is obvious, but

47

for them it's not, when they start understanding that, that could be the motivation for some men, it's not universal, but for some of them to start making changes.

So it's both things, we are understanding more how damaging it is, these behaviors, right, but we also are

understanding more how it can be a point of entry in working with people who use violence.

>> Thank you.

>> I would just add quickly that, back to economic security that, you know, it's not just knowing how to do things with children and how far to go, because some people don't know how to do those things, and so sort of practicing parenting is part of it.

But also another part of it is having the wherewithal to do the things for children that you know they need. And I'm not saying that that will stop the violence, but -- obviously, and of course, but one of the things about, you know, can the child go to school, is the parent going off to work, is there some kind of routine set up around the house where they're connected to -- I mean, people feel more, feel like better parents when they're doing the things that they see folks do on TV,

48

when doing the things that they think regular families do, get up in the morning, get the kids ready, the alarm clock goes off.

But those things can't happen if you're in dire

financial straits.

Of course, you know, we've always have to append almost everything I've said to this in this conversation to of course that, violence does not happen because men don't have any money or because they don't have a job or because they feel emasculated, that's not what I'm suggesting.

But it is about feeling like full human beings that they feel like in my conversations with men when I did the safety and services work, I talked to mostly Black women survivors, I also talked to advocates, but I also went to a batterers' intervention program in Texas and one in Milwaukee.

And all the answers that I got from the women and the advocates, I got the exact same answers from the men, answers about what people need.

And the way I asked it was what do mothers need what, do women need.

Well, they need jobs and to be able to get the services, safety net services, exact same answers, and then I asked them what do men need, and the same thing.

49

We need jobs and we need -- so they're in agreement on the things that are necessary.

And I just think that in a society like the United States in this meritocracy kind of society that people have been taught to be that to be a good parent, to really be considered a good parent, you need to have all of these sort of American dream kind of trappings or at least something that approximates those trappings to make people feel like they're doing the job that they're supposed to do.

>> But it's also recognizing what happens happened for them and talking to them about how have you been parented and one of the most powerful pieces of group work we do is we're talking to them, and it's hard even for the facilitators to sit through this session and I've learned this through Dr. Fernando Maderos asking people what is your best memory from childhood and unfortunately what is your most painful memory from childhood and using that to identify what children need and what were you not given.

And we do a great exercise where we use a mask and say what did you need and we -- group members like what would you tell your younger self?

What would you need, if you could gift your younger

self something and it's incredibly insightful and powerful and helps them understand how do they stop the generational cycle, to your point, Juan Carlos, lots of these folks, you know, some of these folks, I shouldn't say lots, some of the participants frankly don't care if they're good partners, at least when they enter the program, hopefully by the time they leave they care, but in the beginning they don't really care, they're ready to move on, they're still blaming their victim, but they really do care whether or not they're good parents.

And I've been using a tool that Juan Carlos helped create through qualitative analysis about the reparative framework that he's done around parenting where they've seen successful cases where partners who have been abusive have repaired their relationship with their children and it's really powerful and it's a really powerful point of our program.

We interviewed every group member when we were developing our supportive services model, asking them about what they wanted, what kind of supportive services they wanted, we knew we were looking at lethality indicators, we know we were going to provide those services but the number one requested service from our participants being interviewed about 170 men

they wanted parenting support.

We have a drop in peer led parenting program, providing parenting support so that they can go get help there.

And the fact they want to be good parents, and sort of not understand -- you know, you got to, if we really do believe in the generational cycle of what happened we know that many of them grew up in violent homes and experienced it or experienced the same neglect they might be -- to their children.

Sort of helping them see that and taking care of them, the adult, you know, the adult bodied child soul, you know, for them about, you know, what did you need and what you deserved as a child, can you give that that to your child.

It's just really powerful.

>> And I know --

>> Really quick.

I'm sorry, go ahead, Jill.

>> Of course.

No, I was just going to say that the comprehensive advocacy that we want to really be providing survivors.

So the whole range of antipoverty work, housing, food, health care, all those kinds of things and the violence

work, you know, it's just, we just have to not lose sight that the violence is making the antipoverty work more difficult and folks being in poverty makes antiviolence work more difficult.

It's again what you've been saying, Jacquie, it's all involved and obviously the racism and structural racism that really is such a cause of so much of the poverty in our country.

It's sort of and connecting all those things is really kind of an essential thing that we start to talk about. And raise up and hold the complexity of this and not just be looking at sort of these narrow pieces.

But I also sort of, it's also, I just want to raise up I don't see this happening in the criminal/legal system context, this sort of seeing the whole person as a parent, as a man, seeing a survivor as a complex being and a parent and a person who has multiple needs and concerns.

Like I just don't see the legal remedies that are coming out of the criminal/legal system as really meeting the need of this kind of safety that we're

talking about.

And again, there are some survivors who will need criminal/legal system responses and that it's the way to go and they will be safer because of them, but this

is a different conversation I think we're kind of moving into.

>> I think that's really interesting stuff coming out of veterans courts, specialized courts in that sense that we might be able to learn from as years go on, but other than that, I wholeheartedly agree with what you're saying, so, but.

--

>> Jacquie -- I'm sorry, Jacquie.

>> Yeah, what I was going to say, talking about structural everything, structural racism, structural gender stuff, structural oppression, bad stuff, is that this is our setup.

And, again, I'm going to talk specifically about Black families.

This is the setup.

There's a woman and she has some children, and

everything would be better in her life if the big bad wolf was not around.

And that's the Black man in, period, all of them, right?

So everything we do as long as you leave him, as long as he's not around, as long as -- we'll give you your

54

food stamps, we'll give you your childcare, and we don't, we don't.

We say we will, but we don't give her those things, right?

We don't give her all the things she needs.

But the system, the policies set up to provide it for her if she could somehow prove that she was not going to deal with the month at the door.

So he causes the violence in the house, he's the one who brings the drugs in and he's not doing, and he's having more babe -- you know, he's the big bad wolf, he's the creator of the problem.

And she, if she cares for him or responds to him or thinks it's a good idea for her children to understand that that's their parent and they can love him, right, and I'm just talking about the family now, without the element of violence at this moment.

even without that element we still make him the big bad wolf, he causes new pregnancies that the family cap gets her bumped up against so there's no more -- so he's the bad guy.

So of course the place for him, he's supposed to be in a batterer's intervention program or he's supposed to be in jail.

There's noplacel else for this big bad wolf.

55

That's the other thing that I asked in this four state focus group study that I did was what services are there for this parent, right?

This parent over here, the one who doesn't live there, what are the services, and I just ask all the survivors, all the advocates and all the men in the batterers' intervention program and in Milwaukee one guy said the parole office.

That was the answer.

>> Hmm.

Right.

>> those are the services, and so the -- we're assuming his criminality.

Even if he's not in prison right now, he should be.

Or even if he's walking down our street carrying a lollipop, he's done something wrong so it's okay if I shoot him because he's done something wrong, he's going to be the violent one, he's always the violent one. He knows that that and so I think that your question about the reality -- okay, so that's the structure, but the reality is there's a woman and her children and they're not safe from him, right?

That's a real thing.

And in a real person's life.

56

And when she calls the police, then of course their response is not to that guy in her life given when she's telling you about him and about herself and her children, the response is not listening to her tell you here's what's going on, can you help me in the following ways.

The response is he needs to be in jail.

Not because of this, but he just needs to be in jail generally.

So here's a good way to get in there.

>> Mm-hmm.

>> Right.

>> Thanks.

Juan Carlos?

>> I think this is so relevant, again, in the context of this reckoning that is happening in this society and hopefully that will continue happening, that we won't just move to the next topic, right?

Because I will just put it out there, I feel that battering intervention programs, programs that work with people who use violence by and large with some

57

exceptions like House of Ruth don't even pay attention to culture or to racism, right?

They just feel again that this is one more excuse or they are afraid to tackle that.

Decades ago when I was trained I remember being told that if a man of color brought up, oh, you want to talk about oppression?

I can tell you about oppression, like, no, that's not the kind of oppression we're talking about here.

We're talking about women's oppression by you, right?

And you can imagine how that went after that, right?

So I think one of my frustrations in this movement after almost 30 years is that even though advocates in the last decade or so have been really paying more attention to this and I have to say some are really now taking it more seriously, that programs that work with people who use violence, especially battering intervention programs have not.

I will just say that, I think that's the truth.

There's five that do in the country, and there's thousands of programs in the country, by the way, someone was asking if there are programs -- there's thousands of them, right?

It's an industry, right?

But the other thing that you asked, Jill, is how do we

58

do this outside the criminal like legal system?

Because the majority of programs are very, very aligned with the criminal/legal system.

In fact, upwards to 90-something percent of the men that wind up in these programs are referred through criminal court, right?

Because we have set it up that way.

It doesn't have to be that way, we have just set it up that way.

There are cases in which there are programs that, all these are small that have been working under the radar, outside the criminal/legal system, outside child welfare, expanding their interventions to not only what we would traditionally called battering intervention, but incorporating restorative justice and transformative justice approaches.

And maybe I should just say restorative approaches, because it's not a particular model.

Restorative and transformative approaches as well as community accountability.

And I think we have to really start paying more attention to that and how to do that work.

And I think battering intervention programs, if they go through some strong soul searching here, could be well positioned to do that.

59

>> Mm-hmm.

Mm-hmm.

>> One additional problem here that hasn't come up, it did come up in the chat, is that programs who work with people who have used violence are not only underfunded,

they are non-funded.

>> Thank you.

>> There's no funding, okay?

>> Thank you.

>> In fact, you mention in your paper, and you are right that there's actually policy that says that you cannot fund this -- even the Violence Against Women Act until recently basically said you cannot fund programs to reduce violence, and that's what we're talking about.

So I was, I know this is a controversial issue, but I think that until we don't seriously consider funding, whether it's traditional -- or transformative or community accountability approaches, and I'm not

60

talking about taking away money from survivors, we of course need more money there.

>> Right, right.

>> But there's money in other places, right?

So we need to -- we cannot say these things work, these things don't work, this is the way to go, until there are there at least are sufficient funded so that we can know -- Etiony, that's one of his great central points. And I know you don't explicitly say in your paper but you do say that money spent in reducing violence is money saved in -- for survivors and I couldn't agree more.

>> And I think thousand a number one -- to engage people at a community level outside the legal system. All of the intervention programs are dependent on court referrals because that's the only way you can sort of force someone to pay a fee.

We can't afford to perform these services for free and so we are dependent on the fee model because we have not been embraced by the traditional victims services field.

61

>> So I just want to say like when we are thinking about the fee model especially because in this paper we're talking about survivors who are in contact and a

lot of them they're still in the family, but even if they've left they're still supporting the family and the kids, taking money from him is taking money from the family and from her and the kids, and so we do need to think about that and preserving and expanding the strategies and funding and services and advocacy we already have for survivors and for survivors who are leaving, but this is like a both/and kind of situation. And I would just say, Juan Carlos, I don't think it's controversial if you listen to survivors of violence.

>> Right.

>> Because, you know, if we truly are survivor defined, victim defined, you know, this is what folks are asking for, and it's a good chunk of people.

And I think in this last year with covid, with so many survivors pulling him in because there was nowhere else for him to be quarantined and he was going to be there for a period of time.

I mean, and the courts were hampered or closed or not really working and the advocates were struggling.

I mean, they were doing incredible work, particularly

in the early stages of the pandemic to kind of keep the remedies going that were there, but, you know, we really learned we needed other options.

I guess the other thing I wanted to say just from listening to survivors is that reducing violent behavior can't all be about these sort of programs and services and interventions and groups.

I mean, there's also this whole incredible range of thing that's I've heard from survivors that are very informal things.

Family members, faith leaders, other people intervening, social awareness, things happening, substance abuse treatment, AA, like whatever it is, there's things that help people make a shift or a pivot in their lives.

And, you know, some of them are quite informal, and I think that's just when we're engaging in safety planning, we need to make sure we're talking about all the things, and not only just going down the list of the service that's might be in the community or might not be in the community.

But, you know, what's out there, like what possible resource, I mean, that's what we do as advocates, we do the best we can with not enough too frequently.

But I just, I'm just noticing we're like 15 minutes before the end.

I just want to make sure we touch a little bit on policy or systemic issues.

And I think in the paper I was really talking about paying attention, you know, we've gone, we've looked at every form, every intake, every policy, every regulation with such great scrutiny and effect around victim safety and I just wonder if we look at things in that same way about increasing opportunities to really support the reduction of violent behavior and, again, we're not talking about punishment, we're talking about reducing violent behavior.

And also I was very moved by there was a judge, I won't say what state but there was a judge who was very intent on making sure and questioning the survivor to make sure that she had a safety plan.

It was a criminal matter.

And I thought, well, that was all in good faith, it made sense and I just thought to myself why isn't that judge asking the person who is accused of the crime or, you know, obviously still innocent under the law, but like what's your plan to reduce your violent behavior? Like, I just wonder what folks are thinking about how

we might approach some of those policy questions.

>> Can I do a quick bridge to that question, Jill?

>> Please.

Please.

>> When I first started doing the work I was talking about men's services, you can call it fatherhood if you need to, but, you know, if you need to attach it to children, but I was talking about men's services.

The things you listed, drug addiction, you know, all those things you just listed that men need.

And so, yes, it can be a way of reducing the violent behavior, it can also be preventative, all of those things on that list, can be preventative in their lives.

And so the way it was being talked about at that time was always you're taking money away from victims and survivors if you give any kind of money to services for men, to your point, Lisa, about men need something, they need to pay for it.

So I guess I'm just agreeing with you about those, what

is he going to do, but where can he go to do those things?

65

And, and you all will remember that when I kept trying

to explain to folks is that in a fatherhood program, we have not decided, we have not heard, we haven't heard yet whether or not this is a man who uses violence.

So how do we provide services in a way that recognizes if you have 50 people in a program, you need violence prevention response, services, right?

You just don't know who specifically needs them.

And so then what do those services look like, both for, with regard to policy and systems.

What does look like to be preventative in this way around the issue of men's services, which is I think what survivors were asking when I spoke with them.

>> Okay.

>> But then also not just prevention but then also what does look like to intentionally build services that will help men reduce the violence.

>> Yeah.

>> What you were saying, Jacquie, earlier about the meritocracy, for some reason we believe adults who aren't attached to children aren't worthy of support and services and can ration.

66

Regardless of gender, really, childless women, there's nowhere for them to go to get supportive services, that everything's tied to a child and for some reason, you know, -- same thing of teen dating violence curricula aren't going to solve the problem as long as these children are going home to violent communities and violent homes and -- got these role models in front of them.

But we can give up on a whole generation of adults that are worthy of compassion and support.

To your point, Jill, about policy.

I love that did part of your paper where you said that we need our lobbyists, our advocates and all these folks to be equally asking about is this system going to decrease violence as much it's going to promote victim safety, is it also going to equally decrease violence and holding these systems accountable.

Because we know our traditional systems we have now to

work with people who use violence are really just perpetuating violence and we need some accountability within those systems.

We're looking at for profit prisons and systems that people get into and have a hard time getting out of, we are not holding them accountable in any way, certainly not to the level we're holding victim services to

67

account for their outcomes.

>> I mean, part of that too is I think the safety equals leaving.

I think a lot of folks see the role of advocates as leaving.

So we're talking about survivors in contact, survivors who are still in their relationships and that's just such a barrier.

I mean, the way that we even talk about our advocacy, the way we do, the way we have 911 so forward in you are messaging, there's a lot of things we need to think about as we're trying to reach this particular set of survivors and think about things.

What about some of the messaging things, you know, I just talked about Juan about what we see as safety in

the role of advocates, but what about this phrase
offender accountability?

I always found it way too grounded in the criminal
legal system.

Offenders are people who have are folks who have been
convicted of crimes.

I mean, what do you think about that?

Do you have alternatives?

68

>> I think some of us have been struggling with
language, right?

But I certainly call that calling people offenders,
batters, or perpetrators is not helpful, especially
when you're talking either to them or to their
partners, right?

And, you know, I still hear a lot of people using, for
instance, the word "batterer" and I understand, you
want to, this is a person that has battered, yes.

And yet we know that language is powerful and sometimes
it masks or maybe not masks, it's clear that there's
some beliefs behind the way that we use language.

So I believe that some people who use the word
"batterer" partly like, okay, what we said before, this

person will never change.

Once a batterer, always a batterer.

I think some of us have been trying to experiment with people first language, you know, including you in your paper, Jill, right?

So a person who uses violence or like Fernando Maderos' men who batter.

So naming the behavior, not sugar coating it, right?

That's where we get tripped sometimes, still like of course this person has done really terrible things.

But even in the language for me that opens the

69

possibility of like, okay, there might be change, there might be hope, right?

And I think especially talking directly with the families, if you're talking with the survivor and say, well, your batterer, blah, blah, blah, your abuser, blah, blah, blah, I don't think that goes very well in general, right?

>> Most survivors don't respond to that, and it's just such an odd phrase.

>> What does it mean?

>> I'm not sure even what that means, I mean, you know, I always say like call him what she calls him, although sometimes that does involve bad language, I have to be honest.

[Laughter]

>> But, you know, her boyfriend, it's, you know, whatever his name is, or her name is or, yeah. Yeah.

>> I remember the late Julia Perilla with it was -- with love, she would say what do we call the men in our

70

programs?

We call them Jose, Pedro, Pablo, whatever we call them, right?

When you're writing a paper it's a little more challenging.

[Laughter]

>> Yeah.

Yeah.

Lisa, you look like you had something to say.

>> Well, I think in messaging, a messaging change is, one, what I meant to say is I mean I've been doing this work for over two decades and I still don't know what it means to hold an abusive partner, I don't know what that means.

>> Well, if you don't know, we're in trouble, Lisa.

>> I know, I have no idea what that means.

[Laughter]

>> It's just some dogma that I'm not lo willing to adopt.

The other thing is this idea of men being allies in our

71

work.

We interviewed, we did qualitative research with men in Baltimore City with the intention of informing a PSA about intimate partner violence.

The thing we learn asked they don't need a PSA, they know it's happening and they wish they could do something.

How do we enable men to have these conversations.

We started with this whole bystander training vision and all kind of stuff we were going to build for the community and this a-ha moment was the conversation is the intervention.

Having men in a room together saying, yeah, violence is happening, I wish I could do more about it, I don't know how to do something about it and keep myself safe and I'm concerned and I'm frustrated that when I try to do something it seems like it doesn't make a difference.

And, you know, I mean, that's real stuff so we've got to figure out how to empower men at our allies I think is really important.

>> I wanted to raise up something you're saying too, Lisa.

I think this can all feel big and overwhelming and

we're underfunded and under-resourced and all those kinds of things, I mean, this is about us engaging in conversation and learning and listening.

What you're saying, we think it's so complicated and we think we have an answer but it's like really, we have to ask people and they're going to give us a loft

answers and they're going to be different -- there's not one answer, there's a lot of different answers, there's different answers for different community. We have to sort of move from a place where a movement with dogma to a place where we're a movement with process and learning and a mindset of continually changing and learning and growing because that's what it's going to take because violence is, as I try to say in the paper, it's so ingrained, it's so, we're so saturated with it and all kinds of violence, not just violence against women and family violence, but all kinds of violence.

we're going to have to kind of figure out how to sustain ourselves for the long haul on this and be engaged with folks in having the conversation.

You know, but sometimes we just have to ask.

Like folks know stuff, survivors know stuff.

We're like we don't know what to do, we don't know how to help you.

73

But if we ask certain questions we might know how to do something.

If my mind it's always like find a way to help, often tell you what they need, sometimes it's often quite

simple.

I need money for a bus so I don't miss work so I don't miss this.

Sometimes it's a very immediate practical need.

I see that we're coming towards the end and we have been horrible I think about responding to the chat, so I'm really sorry about that.

>> I think, Jill, like folks have been posting resources as we go.

>> Okay, great.

>> But I can, what I will do is post my e-mail in the chat, so someone has, like they didn't get answered, I'll make sure to get it directly to you.

Yeah, I would love to close with any thoughts about the -- future or what you all hope to see for the future.

>> Anybody want to start?

74

>> I'll just start -- I was going to say.

Go ahead, Jacquie.

Yeah, go ahead.

>> I didn't hear again what the question was.

>> Oh, it was just kind of closing thoughts, I think.
We're kind of coming up to about 5 minutes left.

>> I guess I'll close with something that you spurred in me, Jill, when you talked about accountability. And I think that we're going to have to recognize the accountability of systems and the state and figuring out how to not give people a pass because they're a part of a system, but to also recognize where we live, you know, looking at the world around us. Where do we live, where do are these families actually living.

Not just in Baltimore or where they are, but where in -- world (indiscernible) in this country.

I know the accountability, I think we need to be wagging fingers about accountability, but not just on the person who uses violence.

>> Okay.

Thanks.

>> Lisa or Juan Carlos?

>> I'll let Juan Carlos.

Oh, go ahead.

>> you can have the last word, Lisa.

I think one of the things that I have been saying about covid and living in this strange world is that it would be a tragedy if we came out the same as we were before. If we haven't used this opportunity to really learn, right?

One of my favorite questions that I have asked people is like, well, a couple, and I've heard other people asking them is like what has surprised you about this time?

And in terms of your work and maybe in terms of your life maybe, but in terms of your work.

And what would you like to keep from this time?

You know, because we see all of like, oh, my God, everything is terrible, but, no, some things, you know, some things have been revealed, right?

That I think are worth keeping.

So my big hope is that as we start going back to some normalcy hopefully next year, that we just keep this

alive.

You know, that keep things like the racial reckoning alive, that's obviously not only about covid, it's beyond that, but we keep this idea of how can we help everybody in the family, how can we expand the definition of accountability, going back to what Lisa was saying.

I used your comment as a rhetorical kind of thing, Lisa, like what do we mean by that, people?

What does really accountability mean.

Often people use that as a punitive approach, right?

Often people think about sending someone to jail, that's accountability.

Well, I'm not sure about that.

For me it's really about taking responsibility and positive change.

So how can we really support that rather than sending people to jail and wanting to do that, right?

So I think we have a great opportunity to really expand the work and really, really deeply listen to survivors of violence, all survivors, not only the survivors that we like, the survivors that we dislike too, or not only the survivors that look like us, the ones that don't

look like us.

77

>> And the ones who don't like us.

>> Exactly.

Enormous opportunity.

And one more thing that I want to talk about that you mentioned in your paper, we are all in this thing together.

You mention about everybody who works to reduce violence and poverty and racism and climate change, for that matter, we are all activists working towards the same end of nonviolence.

We're not enemies, right?

We're not allies -- we are allies.

We have to work together.

So I think expanding that vision and who is in this boat with all of us, how can we include everybody.

That's how for me the next stage of this work is.

You know, we have done things that work for some survivors, right?

And we have done a lot of things that don't work, so what's next, you know, those are the questions to be

asked.

Lisa.

78

>> I didn't want to follow you because you always have

such a beautiful -- but just to reiterate, I think, Jill, what you were kind of saying here at the end and Juan Carlos, you reiterated, it doesn't matter what your skin color is, doesn't matter what your income is, it doesn't matter where you're working if you're genuinely listening to communities you're meant to serve.

I just want to raise up a resource that Juan Carlos, you shared with me many years ago, the -- resource of course Casa de Esperanza is a framework for these listening sessions in your community and how do you engage people and authentically listen, and not just listen to them about their -- but what are their goals and the barriers to their goals and extend those listening sessions to the abusive partners as well. And you might be floored by how much insight they have into what can engage them in a change process. Really that authentic listening process is an important step no matter where you're serving.

>> I just wanted to thank everyone, NRC, Jacquie, Lisa, Juan Carlos.

Just terrific conversation, thank you.

And I'm also really grateful, you were all reviewers of the paper and each one of you made it better, so I'm

grateful for that as well.

And all I want to say is there were a thousand people signed up for this, we got capped out at 500.

There's interest in this, we have to keep these conversations, we have to listen to survivors, we have to listen to communities, we have to listen to folks who use violence, the kids, we learn, we got to talk more, we're in this next stage, and I just want to say I'm all in.

I am all in this.

And, you know, we'll figure out how to help each other do it, we'll do it carefully and I do really believe that we can do this.

So that's my final thoughts and thank everybody.

We're right at 4:00 and Marium, I'll turn it back to you.

>> Thank you so much, Jill, thank you so much, Jacquie, Lisa, Juan Carlos, thank you to everyone who joined us today.

We think you are so wonderful.

We just have one tiny ask of you which is please fill out our survey for when you log out of the webinar you'll get an automated pop-up.

We know that there's so much interest in having this

80

conversation again and continuing this conversation and on these important topics.

My promise to you from NRCDV is we will continue to make these spaces, hopefully as our panelists make time for us we'll continue to keep them on for using some more of their wisdom and their time and invite others who have great knowledge on these issues.

But thanks again to everyone.

Feel free to join us and follow us on all our social media at NRCDV.org.

That's it for today.

Thank you, everybody.

>> Bye.

Be well.

>> Bye-bye.

Wonderful to see you.

DISCLAIMER

81

This text is being provided in a lightly edited draft

format and is the work product of the CART captioner. Any reproduction, publication, or other use of this CART file without the express written consent of the captioner is strictly prohibited.

Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility, and this lightly edited CART file may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings, nor should it be considered in any way as a certified document. Due to the live nature of the event, some names and/or terms may be misspelled. This text may also contain phonetic attempts at sounds and words that were spoken, and environmental sounds that occurred

during the event.