FAITH ANGLE FORUM

Monday, April 1, 2019

GLOBAL POVERTY AND INJUSTICE: TAKING THE LONG VIEW

JOSH GOOD: We're so grateful this morning to be talking with Gary Haugen and introducing him is a longtime friend of Gary's and a member of the project's Advisory Council, Mike Gerson, linked in multiple ways to today's conversations.

Tied to this afternoon's topic, if you haven't heard Mike's sermon at the National Cathedral from a month or so ago, it's 13 minutes long, it is beautiful and moving, and it's worth your time.

And I hope you read him regularly in The [Washington] Post, and that you know him from his time with PEPFAR, with the ONE Campaign and obviously from the significant role he played in our country's life, [as] George W. Bush's chief speechwriter.

Thanks for being here, Mike, and hopefully kicking off conversation that will follow Gary. Over to you, and then over to Gary Haugen for a conversation about long-term mindset around poverty and global justice.

MICHAEL GERSON: Just a few words on Gary. There are a lot of good and noble ways that have influenced in the world. And I've known some influential people.

But I've known precisely two people who founded global movements of conscious. One of them was Chuck Colson, focused the attention of the country and then the world on the needs of prisoners, ex-prisoners and their families, really regarded the treatment of prisoners as a measure of our commitment to human dignity.

And he had a personal calling that became one of the most important humanitarian causes of the 20th Century. The other person is Gary Haugen whose founding of the international justice mission brought global focus in the issue of modern slavery, both sexual slavery and bonded labor.

He believes that the need for justice is as urgent and even need as for food or water, and that the denial of justice is one of the main sources of poverty and despair in the world.

And his calling has help shaped I think one of the most important humanitarian of causes of the 21st Century.

As many of you know, I'm often a public critic of the type of evangelical social engagement we're seeing. And it's often unwise and discrediting, but it is people like Gary who make the term, evangelical, worth fighting for.

In the 19th Century, a lot of evangelicals were known as malcontents in the cause of even dignity. That's

hardly what mostly are known for today. But it's a perspective, I think, that's reflective in Gary's work, and it gives me hope.

Gary is also a person who performs his work in a certain manner. This is someone who has seen remarkable evil, and pain, and suffering in the world, in brothels and sweat shops.

And I imagine it would be easy to be overwhelmed, kind of worn out by the brokenness of the world. And Gary is consistently hopeful, and engaged, and positive, and forward-looking.

He conducts difficult work with the lightness of spirit. It makes him a joy to be around. And that is clearly, I think, evidence of the transcendent hope which he brings to the world's most hopeless places.

Instead of being pulled down the immense weight of these wrongs, he elevates everyone around him. And I think Gary above all, in malcontent, in the cause of human dignity, I'm really honored by his friendship.

So, Gary.

GARY HAUGEN: So again, good morning. I sometimes say I have the experience as a federal prosecutor for the Department of Justice of doing a three-day trial in Mississippi in federal court in which the judge had a bad back.

He had to lay down behind the bench for three days, and we couldn't see him. And so, I and the two other lawyers of the case we talked for three days to apparently no one at all.

So, to assure you, if you feel sleepy or if you find yourself nodding out, it won't hurt my feelings at all. I will just keep going, so feel very relaxed about that.

I'm grateful for a chance to maybe set the table for a conversation to present a bit of what it is that we've learned at International Justice Mission, over about 22 years of work, attempting to protect the poor from violence in the developing world.

And what I'd like to share specifically today is about some recent data that's now emerging to manifest this hidden ceiling that seems to be setting in in the world on how much progress we can make in addressing global poverty.

And most of this argument has been put forward in our book, the Locust Effect. I have some copies for you later in the day. This started out as a course I was asked to teach at the University of Chicago and then published

this with Oxford University Press.

And so, I'm going to mention some stuff that's in the book. I'm not going to give all of the argument, but hope you get a chance maybe to look at it there.

Also, I want to introduce my colleague, Jeremy Steffens who's sitting over here, and he works with International Justice Mission as well and will be delightful to be engaging with him as well.

Let's back up just a little bit on global poverty and just ask sort of how are we doing on that. Are we making progress?

Hopefully, most of you are in that place where you realize that there's is a really a tremendously happy, encouraging story to be told about the fight against poverty.

And here's sort of the basics of it, if I can get this up here. Amazing fact when I was in, I don't know, high school, 30 years ago or a little more, 50 percent of the world's population lived on less than a dollar a quarter a day.

30 years later, less than 15 percent of the world's population lives on a dollar a quarter a day. This is the basis for the statistics you'll hear quite appropriately that is this tremendous progress that has been in a relatively short amount of time.

If you think about the span of human history where there's this dramatic drop in extreme poverty, and this is testimony to something that is really encouraging with human beings given themselves through in the last half century. And it's seen amazing success.

The challenge, however, is the presence of this phrase which you are always catch it if you look for it. Extreme poverty. This is rendered as either a dollar and a quarter a day where it shifted last couple of years to maybe a dollar-90 a day.

But the interesting thing is if you move that up to $2 to $3 a day, what you see is that actually the same 2 billion people who were in the level of poverty, $2 to $3 a day, are still in excruciating poverty.

It's not given the word, extreme, but this is unbelievably brutal poverty. So we are making some tremendous strides in improving the human condition as it relates to the poverty.

But what I would like to have us talk about this morning for a bit, and then engage questions with you, is a phenomena that is now being identified that seems to be setting a ceiling for about 2 billion people ever being

able to get out of poverty.

And what is that? Well, here's a conclusionary statement from the United Nations of a study that they did a number of years ago that is just the fact that the world hasn't reckoned with and here it is.

Most poor people lived outside the protection of law. Now, I've had a tremendous difficulty especially in the United States, in advanced economies to allow people to understand what that sentence means.

What does it mean to live outside the protection of law? And at least in the United States, the only thing that seems to work is when I tell the story of a young woman living in Oregon not too long ago.

And she was home alone in her house. She was living in this rural area in Oregon, and so her house was kind of isolated. It's a dark Saturday night, and she hears this man are trying to break through the window into her house.

Now, this is terrifying for her because the same guy put her in the hospital two weeks before. So she does what any American does. She goes and picks up the phone and calls 911, only to have this incredibly awkward conversation with the 911 operator who explains that due to the budget cuts in her rural country, there is no law enforcement available on the weekends, only the week days.

And so this is the conversation with the 911 operator about what it's like to not have the law enforcement in your area. Here we go.

(Conversation with 911 operator)

911 OPERATOR: I don't have anybody sent out there.

UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: Ok…

911 OPERATOR: Uh, you know, obviously, if he comes inside the residence and assaults, you can you ask him to go away? Or do you know if he's intoxicated or anything?

UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: I've already asked him. I've already told him I'm calling you. He's spoken before, busted down the door, assaulted me … and so…

911 OPERATOR: Is there any way you can safely leave the residence?

UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: No, I can't because he's blocking pretty much my only way out.

911 OPERATOR: Well, the only thing I can do is give you some advice and call the sheriff's office

tomorrow. Obviously, if he comes in and unfortunately has a weapon or is trying to cause you physical harm, that's a different story. You know, the sheriff's doesn't work up there. I don't have anybody to send.

(End of conversation with 911 Operator)

GARY HAUGEN: Yes, so I find it for a common American audience, this is the only thing that suddenly transports them to the realty for what it is like to live outside of law enforcement.

Of course, the man breaks in, assaults her, rapes her, and strangles her. So the point that we are trying to make is that when the U.N. says that most the world's poor live outside the protection of law, this is where they live every day.

And we would say that there are about 2 billion of the world's poor who live in this place. So we just want to pause and try to understand what the implications of this is.

And what it is, it's unleashed an epidemic of what we call everyday violence amongst the poor. So there has been a good deal of work done on the way conflict violence and mass atrocities impacts the development of systems and poverty alleviation.

And a lot of the poorest countries in the world that are locked in poverty are substantially so because of conflict violence. So mass atrocities, conflict violence, that tends to get a significant amount of attention and rightly so.

In 1994, I was the director of the U.N.'s genocide investigation in Rwanda. So I have some familiarity with the catastrophic impact of mass atrocities and violence.

But what's emerging from the data, of course, is that it's not what undermines the largest number of the poor in the world. It's actually everyday violence.

It has unleashed if you can imagine, if there was no law enforcement actually functioning in your community. And that's the case for the common poor. So what kind of violence had that unleash?

Four overwhelming forms of violence. The first, of course, is gender violence as is the case with the woman in Oregon. It is women and children who are overwhelmingly victims of lawlessness.

It manifests itself in sexual assault and violence that takes place on a massive scale just completely underneath the radar.

I was in a community in Peru, a town of about 70,000 people. And I visited a medical clinic there and spoke to the doctor who said that he had seen 50 cases of rape in the previous five days in a town of 70,000 people, all of them girls 14 and under. 50 cases of rape in five days.

The World Health Organization tells us that gender violence accounts for more death and disability for women and girls between the age of 14 and 44 than malaria, car accidents, and war combined.

Well, this makes sense. If you just imagine global populations, the large numbers having actually no deterrent to violence through the criminal justice systems in their society.

The first category of overwhelming violence is going to be gender violence, sexual assault, an intimate partner of violence, or domestic abuse.

The second category of violence unleashed amongst the poor is the category of violence that makes an enormous amount of money. And that's forced labor or human trafficking.

So the experts tell us now that there are about 40 million people held illegally in slavery in the world today, only make sense because you realize that, oh, slavery takes place at very high rates if it's permitted under law.

And while it's illegal in every country, there are just huge sloughs of the world where those laws are not actually enforced.

So 40 million people in slavery today is more people than were extracted from Africa during 400 years of the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade. Kevin Bales, who's one of the leading experts, will argue that there's more people in slavery today than in any other time in human history.

Huge human population numbers living in places outside the protection of law, and they're extremely vulnerable to the form of violence that makes money which is slavery.

Third form of violence, it is a little bit surprising but it is police abuse. It's an indicator of how upside down and broken these justice systems are.

And we'll talk about that a little bit but they're not only broken, but they turned predatory, which also makes sense because if you give someone a gun, and a badge, and stick, and you don't have law to actually control what it is that they do with it, what do they do with it? They use it to extract.

So that's the fourth overwhelming category. In fact, there are indications that the poor have more stolen

from their own police than any other criminal force in their community.

The last is a land theft, especially for widows, and others who are in a weak situation in their community. For a common poor person of course their ability to survive is going to be the little patch of land where they have a little house, maybe a garden to feed themselves.

But if there's no protection of the law to keep stronger families from stealing that land away, millions and millions of poor people have their land stolen from them every day.

So, the book goes into sort of cataloguing the data that's now emerging on these forms of violence. And sort of the cost in human suffering is very obvious, I think if we just hear these stories and imagine what this experience is like.

But what the data is now showing from the World Bank and the U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime is that the impact on poverty alleviation and economic development is massive.

The World Bank has been reiterating the finding that, quote, crime and violence have emerged recent years as major obstacles to the realization of development objectives.

Quote, in many developing countries, high levels of crime and violence not only undermine people's safety on an everyday level, they also undermine broader development efforts to improve governance and reduce poverty, unquote.

Multiple studies by the U.N. Office on drugs and Crime have concluded that restraining violence is a precondition to poverty alleviation and economic development.

Plainly stating that, quote, a foundational level of order must be established before development objectives can be realized, unquote.

And this would make sense to all of us, right? If you just imagine like who could move forward economically if they're living in lawless chaos, but how many of us, if we said think, about global poverty, would immediately think of, oh, violence is a problem.

We will think of hunger. We will think of disease. We'll think of the shacks. We'll think of the bad sanitation. And lack of education. But how many of us will immediately think of the vulnerability to violence?

We will need to because the data is manifesting that that is the case. And yet, this is vastly underreported

and underdiscussed. So let's ask the question, well, why are the poor living outside the protection of law?

Interesting, because it turns out not because they don't have actually laws on the books. This is the big distraction. We've spent in many ways half a century putting really great laws on the books, and they're wonderful, and it's hallelujah, and it's awesome.

What has been completely neglected, however, is the delivery system by which law is actually enforced in the communities where about 2 billion poor people live.

So, it is the brokenness of the criminal justice system which is the pipeline that delivers law to the people who need it. And that's the police, the prosecution service, and the courts in these countries.

Do they actually deliver law enforcement to the poor? What this book sort of describes that takes you into the plumbing of that. Very few people have really been into the plumbing of criminal justice systems in the developing world for good reasons.

They're scary, and they are intimidating and dysfunctional. But they're also out of sight and out of mind. If you never spent a day in a court in India or a court in Zambia, or Zimbabwe, or Guatemala, it will be an absolute education, likewise a little bit of time at a police station.

So the book also tries to describe just how completely broken these criminal justice systems are and non-functional.

It'll take a little bit of time for me to actually try to present this, but I'll describe the outcome.

In Bolivia, for example, if someone sexually assaults a child, statistically, they are at greater risk of slipping in the shower and dying than they are of being convicted from that crime.

The Bolivian National Government was able to convict 17 people of child sexual assaults in a seven- year period in a country in which thousands of child sexual assaults take place every year.

In South Asia, if you in enslave a poor person, you're at greater risk statistically of being struck by lightning than you are at ever going to jail for that.

So we just need to think how fearful did we all feel today about being struck by lightning, that's how someone who traffics in poor people in South Asia would feel about their risk of going to jail today.

And this is the incredible brokenness of the criminal justice system. In fact, the World Bank did its largest

study of the poor called Voices of the Poor.

They came to this conclusion. Perhaps one of the most striking revelations of the study is the extent to which the police and official justice system side with the rich, persecute poor people, and make poor people more insecure, fearful, and poor. And of course, there's more about that. So most of the world's poor is living outside the protection of law because the delivery system actually does not work. And when you get into the book and describe that or if you've been in the developing world and experience it, you'll get the point.

So then the question, of course, that arrives as, for heaven's sakes, why are these systems so broken? And the book discusses three surprising reasons and one not-so-surprising reason.

And so I'll just name them. Well, the first quite surprising one is to understand that the functioning or the justice systems in the developing world overwhelmingly were built by colonial powers because most of these countries were colonized.

And so they built things called the police and things called courts. But of course, when the colonial power has established them, they were not set up. They were not set up to protect the common poor person from crime.

They were set up to protect the regime from the common person. And the amazing thing is that while in the West, actually countries like Great Britain, and France, and United State, and other colonial powers were evolving at home quite democratic and responsive criminal justice systems that as the franchise grew in the 19th century, law enforcement had to respond to what was invented in the 19th century. And it was invented to protect the community from crime. And that system had police and courts as they're called.

Now, they transport in something into their colonies that they also called police and courts. But it was not set up for the purpose of actually protecting the common poor person.

It was -- and that it describes the all -- the functions of whether it just protecting the -- the government, and the elites, and economic institutions.

So what happens of course is all the colonial powers go home basically in the '50s and '60s. And what never happens is a reengineering of the delivery system for the actual functioning of protecting the common poor person.

Lots of changes in the laws in the 50-year period after the colonial era but no transformation of the actual delivery system.

So a whole bunch of things that if you go into the courts and police make total sense, like the idea that police in developing world are not actually trained to do criminal investigations.

The largest police force in the world is the Indian Police Force. Your common constable hasn't had a single day of how to do a criminal investigation. If you've been watching Law and Order for a few seasons, you know a whole lot more than the average police officer does in the developing world on a criminal investigation.

They are trained to do crowd control and security for government leaders or elites. So, number one, it's the colonial legacy that was never reengineered largely because the political class stepped into the shoes of the colonial powers afterwards.

And they found, oh, a system that will protect my regime. I will just use it for those purposes.

Secondly, and this is the two words that I gave to the World Bank when we were talking about this the other day. And you might just write them down too because this is the thing that keeps the thing completely hidden, private security.

How is there functioning economic capacity in these countries especially like India, right, where, that—my goodness, that's a booming economy. And there's lots of other places in developing world we have in the aggregate large levels, high levels of economic growth.

How does that happen? I was at World Economic Forum which I get to go to a number of times, and I'm there with the big corporate leaders in the conversation about they are operating in these countries with tremendous levels of violence.

I'm like, well how do you guys protect all of your people and your property? They look at each other and say, we buy it.

So in India, for example, the private security forces are four times larger than the public police force. In the developing world, private security forces are between five and seven times larger than the public police force.

The largest employer on the continent of Africa now is Private Security. This suddenly makes us understand, oh, this is how this all stays below the radar and doesn't get better because the people of wealth and power have abandoned the public system.

It's sort of what happens to schools or transportation systems when the people of wealth and influence leave

the public system. They don't even know that it's broken. They don't even know that it's not working.

This is a massively underreported and underdiscussed phenomenal in the last 50 years where advanced economies in the Western world business invested in public institutions of criminal justice.

In the developing world, that is not the historical arc. It was actually an investment in private security. So, there's two tiers, a collection of people who can afford to move forward economically because they're safe in private security, then all those who cannot afford private security who are living in lawless chaos.

The third reason is not so surprising and that is that powerful elites within these countries have figured out how to succeed economically and politically in the absence of functioning criminal justice systems, and they don't want that to change.

Fourth, and this is surprising, is that the lawless chaos in the developing world from broken justice systems has not been addressed by traditional poverty alleviation efforts.

The book does quite a thorough audit of the last 40, 50 years of development assistance and aid and can't find one percent going to address the problem of broken criminal justice systems in the developing world.

And again, there's a whole lot of reasons for that which we can discuss which are fascinating, huge problem. It really undermines all of the development in the system; why isn't it being solved?

It clearly has not been the focus of traditional systems. So, with all that in the last two minutes maybe of despair, we are going to take 90 minutes to pivot to hope.

So that's the question, can this actually be addressed? And it is true that after 22 years of this, I'm actually more hopeful and excited than I've been ever before.

So, there's a couple of things. One of the things the book tries to do is try to recover the history of how it is that any of us get to live in functioning law enforcement.

Most Americans and most Westerners have no idea what it was like to live in their country in even the mid to early 19th Century or even in most countries and the United States in the late 1800's.

There's a section of the book in which I just read out or describe scenarios and people can just try to guess what city this is.

And I can just read one of them to you briefly, in this town experts have documented rampant forced

prostitution and the commercial sexual exploitation of children.

We also find that brothel keepers and sex traffickers regularly pay bribes to judges to obtain bogus arrest warrants against sex trafficking victims who've run away. And pay bribes to the police to chase down the escapees and return them to the brothel people or sex trafficker.

In this one town of economic boom and bust was also much communal violence directed against one particular ethnic minority group. One night, the mayor and the police chief deputized the mob and supervised a pogrom in the minority neighborhood that resulted in the public massacre of 19 citizens, 17 by hanging and two by butchering with knives including a doctor, one woman, and a 14-year-old boy.

In full view of the police chief and mayor, the mob then pillaged through the minority neighborhood and stripped the community of anything of value. Eight men out of the mob of hundreds were eventually arrested. That's good.

But their convictions were overturned by the nation's highest court, the nation's highest court. Not a single person was brought to justice for these atrocities.

In this city's country, there's a public mob lynching approximately once every third day. That's Los Angeles, 1870.

It goes through it over and over again. So, the question, is how did we get to live in places with a functioning law enforcement?

You'll find that all law enforcement everywhere in the world starts out broken and corrupt because that's just power, and they get seized and misused.

And so, then there is a fight that takes place in the community to make law enforcement actually serve the common people. That's a fierce fight that the United States went through and other advanced economies did basically from the 1870's to about the 1930's and '40's.

And that's just the era of development that the developing world needs to be going through and they're going through now. And the question is, can we actually have a positive impact on that?

This also what the book is now showing that IJM has stumbled upon a methodology after almost 25 years of how to actually transform broken criminal justice system.

IJM now has about a thousand full time staff around the world. They are teams of lawyers, criminal investigators, and social workers who are indigenous, they're local. They're Kenyans, and they're Cambodians, and they're Bolivians, and they're Guatemalans and Thais.

And they are transforming their local criminal justice system through a methodology that's actually starting to come together with some clarity.

The Gates Foundation did a project with us in the Philippines about ten years ago that actually began to document with metrics that you can increase the performance of broken and corrupt law enforcement by transformation.

And you can see the violence against the poor drop. So now, there are the first time in the world actually metrics who are measuring this, and we can discuss more of that.

At IJM, we think we actually have an opportunity by 2030 to help protect about half a billion of the poor from violence.

And one of the most powerful reasons this is so hopeful—and I will go through this just kind of quickly for the purposes of time. But huge institutions are starting to recognize this.

We have the sustainable development goals which for the first time now are actually incorporating goals to address violence against the poor. The millennial goals did not.

The sustainable development goals do. But the problem is there's no blueprint for how you actually operationalize this. So, there's waking up for a need to fix criminal justice systems.

Addressing HIV/AIDS has also reached the ceiling if you're not addressing the HIV/AIDS transmissions that happen because of sexual violence. So, there's all the kinds of education, and medical, and public health answers that can help you make good choices. But what about all the people who don't get to make choices about the sexual content?

Likewise, the World Bank now is doing these massive projects in countries where's no functioning justice system like in Uganda. Not long ago, they did a $400-million project of building a road that was going to have transformational impact in a part of Uganda that is quite remote.

What happens when you build a massive road? You send massive numbers of men to go build it. What do

massive numbers of men do in an area where there's no law enforcement? They sexually assault the women and children.

This $400-million project has had to be stopped now. And now, we're working at partnership with the Ugandan government to figure out how they can bring actual functioning law enforcement to those communities.

The World Bank will have these projects all around the world where there will be a need to actually have functioning justice systems in order to be safe context for these projects to actually go forward.

As you all would know, the immigration pressures coming up from Central America. If you look at what it is pushing, much of that pressure out of those countries, Central America has some of the lawless and most violent countries in the world.

Honduras is I think now the murder capital of the world. So of course, by the thousand's families are fleeing these communities because there's no functioning justice systems.

The State Department is trying to do antiterrorism efforts in aiding communities where they're trying to lead the community to participate and trust the police to tell them about terrorism activities going on.

They can't get the communities to trust that communication report because they don't see the police as actually functioning and serving them at all. So, counterterrorism efforts are tremendously hampered.

And in the World Economic Forum, we're part of an alliance that, of course, is trying to address the fact that the entire green economy—everything is going to be wonderful in our much greener economy if it's built almost entirely on lithium batteries.

The growth of lithium batteries, of course, is going to skyrocket. All of them have cobalt in them. Cobalt is basically coming from one place in the world which is the Democratic Republic of the Congo, a place of just complete lawlessness, substantial lawlessness where women, and children, and the poor are being abused in very difficult circumstances.

All these are just examples in my mind in the last five years where these very massive institutions are waking up to how unsustainable it is to actually make progress in these areas if you don't address the brokenness of basic justice systems.

And so, I do think we have an opportunity though because it's possible to actually fix broken criminal

justice systems to protect half a billion people by 2030. So that's that. Thank you.

(Applause)

JOSH GOOD: Well, just knowing a little bit about the intellect and capacity of the journalist in the room, I suspect there will be some strong pushing in and sort of kicking the tires as they say with respect to that sort of the solution part, and I look forward to that conversation.

First up is John Ward, followed by Will Saletan, and then a few others on the list.

JON WARD: Thank you, Gary. That was a great presentation. I had one quick question and one more involved one.

The quick question for you, just how do you maintain the hope that Mike talked about? At the beginning of his remarks it does strike me that—like any person who absorbs a lot of trauma. That is traumatic.

And then second—I know you're focused on the international picture. I'm curious what we have on issues here in the U.S. as it relates to poverty, as it relates to race.

You mentioned Rwanda. I know they went through a process there of reconciliation somewhat like South Africa. As you listen to the conversation here in the U.S., there's talk—for example, I talked to a guy named Tom Perriello in Virginia who ran for governor.

He talked about the need to discuss Confederate monuments, reparations and other things like that as a process of having a reckoning in the U.S. about our racial history.

You're dealing with things that are different than what's going on here. But there's still the conversation here. I'm curious what your perspective is on that.

GARY HAUGEN: Thanks for asking. Yeah, my first perspective in a sense is that my first career before working with International Justice Mission was, I served as a prosecutor with the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice and adjusting primarily police abuse in the United States in the 1990's.

And apparently, we didn't solve it. We were working really hard, and we didn't end it. That is to say there's nothing taking place in the developing world as it relates to police abuse that does not take place somewhere here in the United States in the hidden corners of our own community because again, if you give people coercive power and you don't very carefully police how they use it, they're going to misuse it.

And if you invite human beings into, which is what we ask of with law enforcement, to engage coercively with violence, that impacts the human being.

And unless it is addressed very proactively, they will end up abusing that power. So, we have an ongoing struggle with that nonstop in the United States which we will never solve entirely because it's just part of the human problem you'll have to attend to.

So, my perspective is in the United States is that I am, I think, more familiar maybe than most of what's broken in our own criminal justice system in many ways.

But also, we should not be sometimes transporting the diagnostic of the problems here in the United States into the developing world because in many respects, they are actually facing sort of opposite problems.

One way to think about it is this. Obesity and starvation are both nutrition problems, but they really different nutrition problems.

In the United States, I would say we a long time ago reached a lot of the limits of what law enforcement can achieve, just further criminal punitive and deterrence because we're dealing now with very complicated social problems that are not easily addressed or well addressed by sort of the hammer of law enforcement.

But we should not be confused that the common poor live in communities where they will have never met a law enforcement officer that is not corrupt or abusive.

And in the United States too where we have sort of an abundant, you know, you can't imagine the United States not having too many lawyers. There are buildings in the United States that have more lawyers in the building than there are in an entire nation.

There are more lawyers in buildings in the United States than the nation of Cambodia. There are less than a dozen prosecutors in all over the country of Malawi.

Anyway, those are just very different problems and so I do think there's common issues that if you give power without regulation of law, it will be abused, and it will be abused against those who have the least power.

And who are marginalized. In the United States that is substantially the African- American community.

And I do not think that we have had that kind of reckoning with the actual experience of the abuse of police power in the United States throughout its history.

So that's my perspective on that. But there's another first question—

JOSH GOOD: Giving hope.

GARY HAUGEN: Hope, yeah. For me the most important things in some ways are doing this kind of work in community with other people.

And if you are doing this as a lone ranger, you will just be completely burned out and crushed very, very quickly. So, finding a community with whom you can engage these struggles over the long haul. And that's what we've developed in these teams around the world, local Kenyans, Ugandans, Indians, Bolivians who have a formed a local team.

And they are going to transform their criminal justice system. But they're doing it together in community.

Secondly, they engage tremendous disciplines of joy. That is to say, if you remain or if you jump into the darkness to this kind of abuse, and horror, and violence, and hurt, and feel like it's your job to stay immersed in that darkness and pain all the time, you will likewise burnout and be crushed.

So, we actually presumed disciplines of coming back up for air, the air of joy, of laughter, of love, of goodness of art, of beauty, absolutely essential. And then for me, the hope of history, if you look back over how much things have changed.

When I lived in South Africa and worked with church leaders in the anti-apartheid movement in 1986, no one ever thought that there was any way that Nelson Mandela would get out of prison alive or that that problem would be addressed, the apartheid system, without a bloodbath.

I saw in my lifetime Nelson Mandela walk out of prison, become President of South Africa, and become a beloved global statesman instead of a Communist terrorist. Things can change. Yeah.

JOSH GOOD: Will Saletan.

WILL SALETAN: Gary, thank you for that—for that very interesting and powerful presentation.

I have two questions so general one, a specific one. Feel free to answer whichever one interests you. If you want to answer both, that's fine. But you can just move on.

The general question is, I was struck by what you said about private security, that that's a matter where people can simply buy if they have power to buy it as well.

GARY HAUGEN: Yes.

WILL SALETAN: And I wonder if there are models—maybe you talked about this in the book—around the world where empowerment of people, through the political system, or through economic growth, or distribution gives those communities the power to be able to get law enforcement through the public system rather than not having the power to buy it privately.

So, I mean you talk about law enforcement being foundational. And I'm wondering whether there are foundations of development in that locally, if we were just talking about—we try to introduce this in the outset that we need local people working on it.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

WILL SALETAN: Are there conditions in the country that that you helped the country itself develop these kinds of systems as we did in this country over the last 150 years?

The specific question is about immigration. I think at the end, you spoke about people fleeing from Honduras because of the criminal justice system there is broken.

GARY HAUGEN: Yes.

WILL SALETAN: A lot of them are coming through Mexico, coming here. We have a lot of people in this country. We have a political force being built about against the problem of illegal immigration.

A lot of this—and against—frankly, people are against asylum-seekers. There's a lot of concern about this on the political right. People who keep Americans who might not think of themselves as interested in social justice, but they're concerned about this, quote, invasion of people.

Are you finding that there is a political base on the right of this country to engage some of the issues that you care about for these reasons, for the social justice reasons?

Are you finding any immigration-concerned people, and including people in power, who are interested in trying to solve this problem at the roots in places like Honduras?

GARY HAUGEN: I would say not yet because I don't think people are putting the connection, the causal connections quite together yet. But I think this is actually an argument which should be highly understandable to Conservatives, notions of rule of law, sort of the fundamentals of social order, prerequisites being necessary for

economic development.

Unless there are distorting political or tribal incentives for contorting these arguments to other ends, I think Conservatives should be able to readily appreciate these values of freedom, individual dignity, and that these had been foundations for what contributions, market capitalism is made to sort of human flourishing.

And if those conditions just did not exist for about 2 billion of the world's poor, and so there's a temptation, of course, to a—then cynicism about development in general and poverty alleviation.

But I think that's unnecessary and a mistake. And so, I am hoping that a sort of rational understanding that, do what you want with the border, if you did not address the underlying circumstances of lawless chaos in countries that border you and have access to that border, you will never build anything sufficient enough to address those pressures.

So no, I don't think it's there yet because I think the sense of awareness to these things is not even established. But I think that's what our work together can be.

There was another question. Yeah, the conditions. Yes, the conditions that allow law enforcement actually to serve the community. That comes from a struggle of political economy, right? Of the community actually building the social demand and the political will to make provision for this.

One of the things that unleashes that from our experience is allowing people to see what a functioning criminal justice system can do because most have never seen it actually function.

The common poor person in the developing world will have never sensed that there's any problem that the police or a court can solve for them.

Sexual violence, for instance, it would never occur that you could reduce that problem by the police and courts because they are seen as oppressive.

So, one of the things, the magic of what we have been able to do, and the book describes some of these efforts.

In the Philippines, as I address child sex trafficking, in Guatemala as it addresses sexual violence against kids, in Uganda as it relates to stealing widows' land, in South Asia as it relates to slavery, that if you demonstrate in the community with a vetted unit of police that are actually effective, and trained, and not corrupt, and a court

that actually processes cases with some speed, and you allow the community to see a powerful person actually brought to justice under the law like, wow, that's a good idea.

But they've never seen it. So, it's the same way as if you showed someone a vaccination needle, and the only thing people know about a needle is that it hurts. It pricks you, right?

So, there's actually the experience of if they see their kid has not died because they have to prick needles, like okay, I will. The importance for us is building a local movement.

The coalition of forces that will demand and pursue transformation of their criminal justice system but that is aided tremendously by efforts that do a demonstration project if it's possible, if that makes sense.

JOSH GOOD: The list for the moment is Kelsey Dallas, Ramesh Ponnuru, Ana Cox, Mike Gerson, Melinda Henneberger, Napp Nazworth, and Jerome Socolovsky—so get in as you can. And Kelsey, you're up.

KELSEY DALLAS: So, when you talked about failures to sort of see this as the problem and take it head on and how many of us think of lack of education or lack of sanitation, maybe those are boutique projects. We buy Toms Shoes and they send shoes to other countries.

Do you feel like those types of efforts should pause as we figure this bigger issue out? Do you feel like we need to channel more of our donations to this in some way? And just sort of put pause on these other maybe more popular charity efforts.

GARY HAUGEN: I don't think so actually because maybe Toms Shoes, I don't want to comment on the Toms Shoes. But other traditional poverty alleviation efforts actually work.

You can actually stop kids from dying from preventable diseases. Not through law enforcement but to really good public health. Likewise, you can deal with food security really effectively through food security programs.

And there is not like too much of that going on in the world for sure. But if you think about how effective that can be in the absence of basic safety in the community, keep doing those things, but let's confront that those things have a ceiling on a what they can do.

For instance, just as a time while we're starting to recognize the girl effect, that the most powerful thing perhaps you can do in many of these communities to advance economic thriving is get the girls educated.

Let's get them through education through the age of 12. This is called the girl effect, and there's data to show this has a massively transformative impact.

At the same time, the studies are also manifesting that the primary reason—now, there's several studies suggesting this. The primary reason girls are not going to school in the developing world is violence. It's not safe to be in the schools. It's not safe to walk to the school, or violence in the home won't let you go to school.

So, this is where we should not slow down education for girls. We should just make it super safe for them to go. And it's possible to do.

RAMESH PONNURU: So how do you provide protection for your local teams and how do you keep the corruption and justice and abuse of these systems from compromising those teams?

GARY HAUGEN: Great question because it is dangerous. So, it's a careful application of security programs, and protocols, and expertise to it. It's also a step by step process of taking on gradually more powerful forces of corruption and violence.

So, you got to sort of know what you're up against and also working with the government. They're always working in—they must find some partnership with the government because the, you know, the government owns the monopoly on the legitimate use of force.

And so there has to be all of this work that is done, by finding those champions who are actually reliable within the justice system.

Helping them actually deal with the corruption, so our teams actually work to run the corruption and the brutal officers out of these systems.

A quick thing discussed on the book is the 15-70-15 rule. It's a rough rule that says especially if you look at a police force, about 15 percent show up every day to beat up, and steal, and hurt people. They just want to do evil every day, and they're having a great time doing it.

15 percent amazingly show up every day. They actually try to do the right thing day after day. And they're amazing and miraculous.

The 70 percent in the middle are just trying to see which 15 percent is winning. And so, if the corrupt and brutal ones have the power and the promotions and the money, they'll participate with all of that.

But if the 15 percent of the abusive ones are getting fired and getting sent to jail, and it's the ones that the doing the right thing that are getting promotions and getting the advancement, that 70 percent, they will just scoot themselves right over.

And so, with surprising speed, a public justice force that looks 85 percent corrupt, and brutal, and helpless can pretty quickly, with surprising speed, turn to one who looks like 85 percent functioning.

I mean for instance, one of our colleagues in Kenya was taking on a case of the police abuse of a taxi driver Josephat who was running a taxi in Nairobi.

And the police who are stealing from them and actually shot him. But he survived and he wanted to seek justice. So, our lawyer, Willy Kimani, there in our office with the Kenyan team took on his case.

And in after one of the hearings involved in that, the police who had been charged abducted Willy, and Josephat, and our driver and murdered them.

So, this is an absolute fight over the fundamentals of power in these societies. But that Kenyan team has rallied now that since that time the movement for addressing police abuse in Kenya has moved forward with the speed that we never saw.

For 25 years, we've never seen a single police officer actually convicted for a murder in police abuse cases. And we had nine convictions last year in a single year.

That police force that was responsible for taking the life of my colleague and others was disbanded and integrated into the proper command structure.

So yes, it is dangerous. And these teams have to know how to apply proper approaches to that. But it is also with aligning yourself with protective power of the state.

ANA MARIE COX: So I'm intrigued by the magic that you're working to get people to trust law enforcement after decades, centuries of abuses, especially considering there are communities in the U.S. that still don't trust law enforcement.

The reason I was distracted, I was looking up numbers. Only 14 percent of black Americans trust the police very much. 37 percent don't trust or don't trust very much.

50 percent of the general population says it's somewhat common for people to be arrested, innocent people

be arrested.

73 percent of the African-American population thinks it's common for innocent people to be arrested. And because of these historic injustices and very real concerns some people, activists in these communities are favoring prison abolition and law enforcement abolition.

And I'm wondering what you think of those movements which may not be applicable in other places, but, you know, communities here in the U.S. that want to police themselves.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

ANA MARIE COX: I have another question after that.

GARY HAUGEN: There's absolute solid basis for the lack of trust. That's the historical experience. And it's not an abstraction. It's a family matter, a community matter.

But the answer to bad law enforcement, never in the history of modern human beings has been no law enforcement. And so, it must be good law enforcement.

But it's also possible for people to experience that and to realize there's this amazing thing that happens when you don't actually have to stop every bad inclination or every bad person that might do something wrong.

You just need to establish a credible criminal justice deterrent from people who had otherwise commit violence. That impunity unleashes this incredible terrible thing amongst human beings.

So, all I have to say, anybody wants to demonstrate ever in history where violent human beings didn't have to be restrained, that would be marvelous. But there's just no evidence to suggest that that's the case.

Now, there's ranges of violence and offenders. And so, a good deal in America is again is the sort of obesity of coercive law enforcement for were trying to solve everything.

And that's not going to work. But it's a different problem than with just absence of even functioning reasonable law enforcement and developing them.

ANA MARIE COX: I don't want to speak for the Prison Abolition Movement, but I do think one of their arguments is to posit a different end of the spectrum, right?

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

ANA MARIE COX: Let's even just consider the fact that of not having prisons so that we can work

backwards from there.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

ANA MARIE COX: Think about who belongs there.

GARY HAUGEN: Sure, because minimizing that is absolutely a goal worth pursuing. I don't think anybody's going to find that you can let—but minimizing is an appropriate goal.

ANA MARIE COX: And the other reason I think that some people advocate for prison abolition or more radical solutions like that is because again, we're living what is supposedly a developed world with a functioning law enforcement system.

But these communities, I don't see—part of me feels like you can go into a community in a developing country and say, look what happens when you have a just system.

And people are like, oh, wow, it's like introducing vaccine, right?

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

ANA MARIE COX: Here, we have what's supposedly a working vaccine but people still keep dying. So how do you—I mean maybe the U.S. isn't—you don't think about it.

But how do you say to a community that just every day, you know, sees people unjustly harassed or abused?

GARY HAUGEN: I guess it's all on a spectrum, right? And part of it has to do with the relative scale of things.

I'm trying to remember this wonderful book that was written in recent years around the experience in India of a woman that—because I remember she was interviewed on NPR.

Man, it's such a powerful book about the experience in India. And she's written about tremendous police abuse in the United States.

Unidentified Female Speaker: Katherine Boo's book?

Gary Huagen: Yes. Yeah, and you remember the—

Unidentified Female Speaker: Beautiful Tomorrow?

Gary Huagen: Beautiful Tomorrow, yeah. NPR interview and this is a woman who is not a big fan of American criminal justice systems, right? I will never their interview on NPR. She comes back.

What did you notice when you came back? In the United States? It was, wow, functioning law enforcement.

ANA MARIE COX: So is the answer of the send leaders Black Lives Matter Movement to India. I don't think that's—

GARY HAUGEN: No, but I don't know why we have to put these against each other.

ANA MARIE COX: I don't want to put them opposition. I mean maybe I don't think we can solve this question in this conversation.

GARY HAUGEN: But that is I think is one of the unhelpful parts of the conversation sometimes is that if we draw attention to what is broken in other parts of the world of a certain severity that it somehow will undermine the zeal, the commitment, the energy, the attention to address the problems we have in our communities.

And so, I don't want us to be—I would be very eager for those things not to be—I really think we do both things at the same time.

ANA MARIE COX: I don't they're in opposition.

GARY HAUGEN: Okay.

ANA MARIE COX: I think what should be done in the same time. I'm saying what do you—maybe we should have this conversation over lunch. I feel like we're not necessarily going get any kind of place of agreement here.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

ANA MARIE COX: But I feel like what do you tell to the activists in these communities, you know? You think you don't have a functioning justice system, but you do. Look at India, you know?

I don't know how you prove to them that they live in a system that's just when their everyday lived experience is that it's unjust.

GARY HAUGEN: In these developing rural communities?

ANA MARIE COX: No, here.

JOSH GOOD: And I hear Gary right arguing that these are parallel worthy missives, you know, directionally and hopefully that the work you're doing abroad can itself be sort of inspiring for similar such efforts on a different (indiscernible) here in a way. I don't know.

I might suggest turning to Mike. But I hear you on this And the great thing is we can have lunch.

ANA MARIE COX: Yeah, we have lunch and I want to talk to you further about it then. I actually have another question.

GARY HAUGEN: Sorry, if I misunderstood.

ANA MARIE COX: Oh, no, I don't think You're misunderstanding. I think it's tough thing to talk about so—but another question has to do with the private security.

GARY HAUGEN: Yes.

ANA MARIE COX: Which of course has grown here in the U.S.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah, yeah.

ANA MARIE COX: And also in the U.S. even more dramatic has been the growth of for-profit law enforcement and contracting out which is actually used specifically on the border a lot.

Do you have concerns about that?

GARY HAUGEN: Sure.

ANA MARIE COX: Yeah.

GARY HAUGEN: Of course, you combine coercive power which again, as I was saying, if you give someone power and don't pay attention to it, they'll just abuse it.

But then we have coercive power and an economic incentive and you don't pay really careful attention to what is done with that, you will have problems with it.

I'm not saying it's not impossible to have some of those market-driven solutions. But boy, you better pay extra attention because it will head towards abuse for sure. Yeah.

ANA MARIE COX: And of course, that's extended to international relations, as well as we have contractors performing military and police missions in other countries.

Is that something you're seeing abused as well?

GARY HAUGEN: I'm not an expert on that in military or conflict situations. But the equation is—

ANA MARIE COX: Is the same.

GARY HAUGEN: —absolutely the same and relentless everywhere, yeah. If you give people power,

especially coercive or financial, and you're not super attentive to it, it'll be abused, period.

JOSH GOOD: Let's turn to Mike and then Melinda Henneberger, and then Napp Nazworth and then Jerome. I think one more Mike.

MICHAEL GERSON: Maybe to explore the plus of side of markets a little bit.

GARY HAUGEN: Sure.

MICHAEL GERSON: I've heard you talk about reputational exposure of names and corporations as a game changer in these set of issues. I'm interested if you have developed that.

GARY HAUGEN: Yes, I think there's been some very positive movement in the subject of modern slavery and forced labor as it relates to the supply chains for the global brands, that an era seems to be emerging where customers really care whether or not forced labor has been involved in the goods that they're consuming.

It turns out that then those global brands face tremendous reputational exposure if forced labor is found in their incredibly complicated supply chain.

Now, why did they have forced labor in their supply chain? Overwhelmingly, it's because they're operating in countries where the local governments don't bother to enforce their laws against slavery.

Why don't they do that? Because the victims of that abuse are the most marginalized politically. They have no voice and the governments are aren't incentivized to do that.

And so yes, activists and human rights campaigners would say, hey, the government in this developing country, you should enforce your laws against slavery.

And yes, the State Department or multilateral institutions will go to those governments and say, you really need to take these things seriously.

And governments will take those meetings maybe and they will be polite. The meetings, they will definitely show up and listen really intently is when the corporate show up in their office and say look, we love being part of your economy.

But it's becoming unsustainable for us because you don't bother to enforce laws against slavery. We're going to get caught with that little bit forced labor somewhere in our complicated supply chain.

We're going to work hard to try to clean up our supply chain, but we can't do that if we're swimming in an

ocean of impunity in your country. So would you mind fixing your broken criminal justice systems so you can actually enforce these laws?

That, I think will be emerging as a game changer in this era to address the problem with slavery.

JOSH GOOD: Melinda Henneberger.

MELINDA HENNEBERGER: So I absolutely understand the difference and severity between what you're talking about globally and what we see here. And yet as you were talking I was hearing echoes of what we experience here.

GARY HAUGEN: Absolutely.

MELINDA HENNEBERGER: So especially in like the 911 call which happened in Oregon. But, you know, there are parts of Kansas City where I live where it's 45 minutes on a good day to get someone come out.

And some people will tell you in the urban core that a cop will never come out to your address.

GARY HAUGEN: Right.

MELINDA HENNEBERGER: And the other thing was you mentioned gender violence. I wrote a story this year about a woman that was killed by her husband after he'd been arrested 63 times for assaulting her. And yet nothing real ever happened to him.

GARY HAUGEN: Right.

MELINDA HENNEBERGER: So, what have you learned in your work globally and domestically that could help us address those problems here?

GARY HAUGEN: Again, I would hate for these two things to be in any way set in opposition to one another in the sense that we can only give attention to both things.

Both things are wrong. Both things could actually be addressed. But it does take primarily, I think more than anything else, the community paying attention to the exercise of power within the hidden parts of the community.

And the hidden parts of the community are The poor parts of the community, and they're the ones that are politically disempowered. So when people are treated badly, nobody pays a political price for doing it.

I guess that all I can—it's the same application of principles that you have to have functioning capacities,

like to actually even conduct—

It turns out that conducting an investigation to do a good prosecution for sexual assault is a technical thing somebody actually has to be trained how to do.

But if you are well-trained, my goodness, it's a super powerful thing. And so there are places in the world, I guarantee you, no one has any idea how to do a sexual assault investigation.

So there, you can talk about all the rape kits that are never used and that are badly used and so on and so forth—

MELINDA HENNEBERGER: (Inaudible).

GARY HAUGEN: Well, the only thing I'm saying is that expertise is—so you have to have that functioning. And the next thing I was going to say is you have to make sure that it is applied to the neglected communities, the hidden communities.

And I would say, from my experience, the basic problem is that criminal justice, a coercive power is not watched very carefully in poor communities and in minority communities.

And so that is the thing to communities that have a politically marginalized—or just have a marginalized voice. And so, if there isn't a great intentionality to be focused on how well or not that power is or is not being applied, it's going to be abused.

JOSH GOOD: Napp Nazworth is up next followed by Jerome Socolovsky, Graeme Wood, and Carl Cannon.

NAPP NAZWORTH: Hi, Gary.

GARY HAUGEN: Hi there.

NAPP NAZWORTH: So in his intro, Michael Gerson said that you make the term evangelical worth fighting for.

So, I was wondering if you could tell us a little bit about your personal faith and how that connects to the work that you do. And also, IJM where is the faith angle to IJM.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah. Thank you. I don't want to argue with my dear friend, Michael. But I may not be willing to fight for the word, Evangelical. That I came from that background and was drawn to the struggle for

justice as a young person substantially out of my faith.

And my first maybe hero in that was working alongside Bishop Tutu in South Africa in the mid '80s. I arrived in South Africa in June, July of 1985. And four days later, martial law was declared in the country. And I was supposed to go, be this volunteer with church leaders.

And now, all the political leaders were either out of the country or in the prisons. And so, the people leading the anti- apartheid fight were by the default the community leaders who were the church leaders.

And so that's how Bishop Tutu and others were leaders of that struggle. I was reacquainted with my own faith tradition of commitment to the struggle for justice.

The Biblical text which I had been raised in is chock-full of this priority. He has told you a man what is good and what does the Lord require of you, but to do justice, to have mercy, and to walk humbly with your God. Jesus says to religious leaders, you've neglected the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy and faith.

The prophets say seek justice, rest with the oppressed, defend the orphan, plead for the widow, on and on, and on, and on, and on.

But I grew up in a church that managed to weave its way through the text without ever and really encountering those scriptures. I would have heard a thousand sermons by the time I left for college and had never heard a sermon on justice primarily because the people in my church were not suffering from injustice.

I think that's the primary. I've learned some other things though they have been super indispensable for me in my own journey of trying to engage with the struggle for justice.

And IJM started out as a community of Christian spiritual formation because I had worked with human rights groups and the struggle for justice in the Philippines during the Marcos Era, and the post Marcos Era, and in other context.

And I had done it a community of prayer in South Africa and boy, did I find that really marvelous. And so, when I left of Department of Justice to help found International Justice Mission, my initial idea was two things.

One, I wanted to move my faith tradition from almost complete, in my experience, disengagement with the struggle for human rights and justice and move—see if I can help move that in my community into engagement and on the strength of the biblical tradition.

So that's one thing I wanted to do and I also wanted to do it as a community of intentional, spiritual formation. I grew up in an era, as I mentioned, in which generally the faith community that I grew up in saw that issues of justice and liberation and freedom were sort of co-opted by political agenda and wanted to stay away from it and were totally disengaged.

So IJM began with this vision of trying to work the broader community into engagement. After 22 years, we actually turned out to have this larger opportunity to gather all kinds of people regardless of their faith orientation in the fundamental struggle for justice systems in their community.

While we maintain this sort of life together that nurtures us in our own sort of interior for this kind of struggle, we work with all kinds of partners and other communities that brought on other sources for them.

Does that make sense?

JEROME SOCOLOVSKY: Gary, thanks for the presentation. I've been in a police station like the one you described and fortunately just an observer and in my reporting abroad and the way you describe it is definitely accurate.

And I mean the presentation is shocking. So, I understand the the impulse, the noble evangelical impulse to want to do something about it.

But I'm wondering with the example that you cited in Los Angeles that in our own country, we've also had this kind of problem with lawlessness and presumably, we solved it ourselves.

So, I wonder why do we need to go to these other countries and take the initiative to solve it? Couldn't it even be counterproductive, given the colonial background to some of these that you describe.

GARY HAUGEN: First of all, I would want to be clear. I think that my perspective is not that we are, as outsiders, able to come in and provide a fix. What I think we can do is support local leaders who want to fix their broken criminal justice systems.

In the absence local ownership of that fight and tailoring of the solution to their context, it will not succeed. So then to me, the question is, is there a helpful way for the international community to support those leaders who want to transform their broken justice system? And I would say yes.

At the level, significantly, of almost the technology transfer, in a way, we have developed tremendous

training, and technologies, and capacities. And it's like can doctors from advanced economies assist in the development of a health system. Yes, there is.

But are there probably ten ways to do that badly for every one that offered to be effective? I would say, yes. So, there are actually very good reasons why the international community has been very reluctant to enter into this space and actually tried a good bit in the '60s and '70s especially.

But it got co-opted by abusive regimes that is the strengthening of criminal justice systems and they just use it to crank up the oppression. So, then we actually pass laws that says, well, we won't do that kind of assistance anymore, and that made sense.

But if you believe that the answer to bad law enforcement is not no law enforcement, at some point you do to be engaged. It's my experience that by strengthening the hand of local leaders, assisting them with training and technology, with the resources to jump start what's possible.

In the Philippines, for instance, the Gates Foundation gave us resources to support a local team to transform law enforcement in the city of Cebu to address child sex trafficking.

And they were able to, in a four-year period of time, reduce child sex trafficking as measured by outside auditors by 79 percent in four years.

The Philippine government was so encouraged by that achievement by a local team of Filipinos—and partly what they had to do is root out the corruption within their own systems by setting up vetted units and some fast track courts.

The national government was so encouraged by that that they then paid to replicate that in Manila and in Pampanga. And they reduced child sex trafficking by 76 and 86 percent in those two cities in five and six years.

So that is an example to me of how outside support can be effective to come alongside the struggle that must be owned locally and contextualized locally.

JEROME SOCOLOVSKY: So how do you determine when the local actor is someone who is worthy of support and someone who is not going to then go on and become abusive?

GARY HAUGEN: That's great. Part of it is to be clear about what the objective of the law enforcement strengthening or enhancement is.

And the objective must be measurably, that it serves the end user poor, doesn't reduce terrorism, doesn't reduce narcotics. It doesn't reduce some other agenda but is the outcome for which you're accountable and which we are measuring is whether or not this works better in making the poorest safer.

That adds a completely different outcome to be accountable to. And you may not get a lot of support and actually participation then from leaders who find out, well, that's what this has to do.

So, you sort of test out their willingness to pursue that end. The other thing that's critical to the methodology that we have developed is something called collaborative case work.

It actually takes a few years of working cases with the actual people in the system which allows you to do a number of things. One is diagnose, well, what's really broken here?

Because you can have an idea from the outside, but unless you worked cases, and what does the working cases do? You accompany the end user—the experience of the poor person—through the system and see how they are experiencing it because you're working a case with the authorities for an actual human being that is the most marginalized.

So how is this system working for a marginalized system? And then you, oh, it allows you to identify what's broken and why.

It also allows you to develop intelligence and trust for the people in the system who are part of the 15 percent who are wanting to engage in the change.

And you give them incremental tests of their goodwill to make strategic changes in the system to actually make it run better.

So again, this takes years, so it's a long term investment in collaborative case work and system transformation. And then the third step for us is what we call sustaining the gains, is unbolting that IJM from the justice system, so it's operating for a period of years, validated by outside measurement. But it's operating to serve the poor end user.

And that seems to actually provide a way to transform it. It's super hard, but it's not impossible.

GRAEME WOOD: So my question follows, I think, well on the heels of this one. When you talk about serving the end user poor—

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

GRAEME WOOD: I wonder how flexible you might be both in the means that the end user poor would be comfortable with, as well as the ends of justice that they define for themselves which might not match my own.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

GRAEME WOOD: So, I'm thinking for example one of the cases that I know best from my reporting is the Central African Republic where I went to areas where very much like in that chilling 911 call, the chances that you're going to get any kind of help from the police for anything.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

GRAEME WOOD: In hours forget it. In weeks, also probably forget it. And the means that it seems many people there were happy with would be much more like the empowerment of vigilantes or an empowerment of a mafia rather than the empowerment of the state that in the entire living memory of the population there has simply been predatory.

And then so that's to speak to the ends or rather the means that's simply acceptable for views plausible by these end users. And then even the ends.

I went to an area of the country that did have a functioning criminal law system. And going to the courts, as you suggest, was indeed very eye opening because it turned out that 45 percent of the caseload were criminal cases of witchcraft.

And it was usually poor women who are being usually from marginalized ethnic groups who were being locked away for maximum sentence of two years. So, to increase the formal processes of justice would probably be in increasing the prosecution of things that I'm guessing most people in this room would not consider crimes, maybe not even consider physical possibilities, that is the casting spells on people that actually worked.

So when we think of the standard that we're holding ourselves to be the things that are acceptable or desirable to the end user poor, how flexible should we be both in means that we accept at their guidance and also the ends that they seek?

GARY HAUGEN: Great question. And a ton inside of it, so let me see what I can draw out in a way.

Just to say what we start with is the cultural norms that have been expressed in local law. So sexual assault

is, under local law, prohibited. Then the question is whether or not for the poor it's actually prohibited.

So that's the sort of starting line in some ways, is to say not to assert some foreign or unfamiliar standard of behavior but the one with the community itself adopted.

The interesting thing in every society though is the aspiration that is expressed in law and the aspiration that is the cultural norm.

The aspiration that is expressed in law in 1954 is that blacks and whites should not be going to segregated schools but that was not the cultural norm.

In Uganda, the law says that women should have the right to inherit property. That's not the cultural norm. There is always the struggle in which law enforcement can serve a function of actually accelerating the sort of joining of cultural norm with the aspiration because usually, the law express more an aspiration than actually just in cultural norm.

What work's best for us is beginning with demonstrating the way in which a criminal justice system could actually advance a shared cultural norm like, let's not sexually assault children.

Let's not throw widows off their land because that's already in the local law, let's see if it can actually get enforced.

I think there has to be a tremendous flexibility to what the community itself sort of asserts as to the norm because it's going to have to fight for that. It's going to have to make investment in that.

The challenge however is that when it comes to the question of sort of who is owning the assertion of the cultural norm in that community, because you might also say for instance we'll let the vigilante justice get after it.

And there'll always be some in the community who are more comfortable with that. But if you see the way any of these sorts of vehicles for the exertion of coercive power are deployed, almost always whoever is the weakest voice, whoever is the marginalized person is going to be on the bad end of that deal.

What justice systems primarily do is they restrain somebody who's using coercive force and they figured out how to tell the truth about what happened.

And there actually are variety of ways to do those two things so that you can find out what really happened and then apply restraint upon the abusive one in a morally appropriate way.

There's different ways to approach that in different communities will remain that differently. But right now, what you have is vast numbers of communities who say, really we have a cultural norm against sexually assaulting children, against throwing the women off the land, against the police being able to steal from whoever they want.

We just don't have actual enforcement of those laws and to provide those communities with a mechanism by which those aspirations expressed in law can actually be enforced.

Was there a follow-up on that at all because that's a lot, that's complicated.

CARL CANNON: Gary when you listed your four reasons why so many Poor people around the world are outside law enforcement. I thought you were going to say, but you didn't, the international drug trade.

And this is people around the—you've been in all these countries, people around this table. The only country I've ever done reporting is Mexico.

And it seems to me that things have gotten much worse in Mexico that the things you're talking about, the police force and the justice system has become less reliable.

And I, as a young man, would go from California and a cop would pull you over and you had to pay five or 10 bucks to because you made a traffic ticket. Well now, the cops are more likely toyou know, just participate in your kidnapping. The corrupting influence of American money.And we've spent 40 years trying to deal with this, and it just seems the problem has become worse. And it's a big topic, I know.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

CARL CANNON: But is this something that you have some thoughts about?

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah. No, I agree that the money that has poured in through narcotics trafficking from the United States has had a devastating impact on already fragile and barely functioning justice systems for sure.

That isn't the case everywhere in the world, so that's why I don't put it up in like the—it’s a peculiarity, a huge one.

I also grew up in California, sort of, the difference is the tragedy of the impact in narcotics though is just bringing attention now to what was totally broken when you and I are going to Tijuana. But we didn't care then.

It was sort of funny, ah, the Federales, see, you just pay him a little bit. No, if you're paying off the Federales, this place is in deep, deep trouble but no one ever sees it.

Narco traffickers come in and start to make massive money off of lawlessness and start to cut people's heads off. And so now, you reach for the law enforcement to go take care of that.

It's like, oh, you haven't bothered with law enforcement for decades, there's nothing there, there. And then you've got to militarize that in order to get control of the situation.

It, I think, manifests what has been the problem for a long time for the common poor. And it's exacerbated by massive amounts of money coming from our pockets to these narcotics enterprises that are violent and vicious.

KELSEY BLOOM: When you are talking about building a plumbing of some of these criminal justice systems, can you speak to how IJM navigates politically repressive governments and say there's a strongman who engages in political repression but at least there's order. How does IJM think about whether or not the poor are better off under a repressive regime or not better off under this regime? And I'd be interested in particular—

GARY HAUGEN: Right.

KELSEY BLOOM: Your thoughts about Rwanda today.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

KELSEY BLOOM: I mean if the mortality is down, the economy is up but lots and lots of political repression.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah. So, in many times our solution to say that's not a workable context; we can't work there. In our own sort of the deployment of this solution, we definitely do a compelling and doability analysis.

How compelling is the problem or the brokenness of the criminal justice system for the poor? But how doable is the context to actually perhaps bring this assistance, this solution?

It's not a solution to everything, everywhere for sure so there's a country context in which this solution is just not a viable one. It remains however a really difficult challenge where actually, it's a workable context, but it also is an authoritarian regime.

For instance, we've had success in Cambodia in helping law enforcement do one thing demonstrably with excellence. And that is enforce the laws against child sex trafficking.

Cambodian law enforcement in a whole range of other areas and regard to the role that it plays in restraining political freedom in that country, IJM has done very little to assist that by this approach.

But one of the things that we're hoping, I think, to do is to manifest the way in which a functioning criminal justice system diffuses power in a way that actually can protect those who are weaker.

And that the demonstration of if it's possible to protect the poor from this one category of violence, maybe that same thing might be applied to this next category, and in to this next category.

And until for instance you have a functioning criminal justice investigative and prosecutorial capacity, the ability to actually go after corruption within governments is extraordinarily weak.

And also, to enforce laws that are meant actually in theory to restrain the abusive political power also cannot be effectively brought to bear.

I don't want to overstate what it is that IJM is able to do by getting the criminal justice system to actually stop throwing widows off their land in a certain jurisdiction.

We think that's a good thing, and we think that it also can contribute to the empowerment of champions within those communities who are also engaged in the broader task of having the government systems serve those who are weakest.

In South Asia, for instance, forced labor is massive in these huge communities who live under tremendous strata of oppression and will have never seen the state actually be effective for them.

When they start to see—and this our experience—the power of law used for them to get out of slavery, they then become empowered voices to then bring fresh water to their community, to bring schools for their kids, to bring government services, to bring the land redistribution that is due to them.

We've seen some glimmers of how that empowers a vision in the community. Oh, these laws are for us and actually should be applied for our empowerment. But I won't suggest this isn't messy.

What do you think?

KELSEY BLOOM: Could you speak to Rwanda specifically?

GARY HAUGEN: Rwanda. Yeah, what would you like to know about Rwanda?

KELSEY BLOOM: Just regarding, okay, here are some positive trends that we're seeing, but this is a politically repressive regime. So is a compromise better than nothing?

GARY HAUGEN: I don't have a pat answer to that. But I would say it's at the same order of the struggle

of, do we work with government authorities who demonstrate repressive behaviors on public health outcomes or education outcomes.

Does it legitimize the regime and therefore just make it worse? I would say in Rwanda, there's a situation in which IJM actually worked quite positively with the government to help establish centers that were quite effective in addressing sexual violence on a community wide basis in cooperation with the government.

But I also think is that in Rwanda, there is an administration that has not chosen to open itself up to the vulnerabilities of the democratic process.

And my own sense is that as long as the leader is empowered, that probably will look stable. Butwhen he individually is not, then I think a lot of the stability maybe turn out to be unsustainable.

JESSICA RAVITZ: Hi.

GARY HAUGEN: Hi.

JESSICA RAVITZ: You've talked a bit about how your faith drives your work. I'm wondering in the countries that you serve that are predominantly Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist.

Are your staff members representative of those faith traditions?

GARY HAUGEN: The core IJM staff is a Christian community. It's more like the Mother Theresa's, you know, Missionaries of Charity.

Like the only way to sort of do the work is in coalition with other partners. In India for instance, we have a whole coalition of NGOs with whom we do our anti-slavery work because the Christian community is tiny in India.

While we do, sort of, have a coherent community ourselves of religious devotion that strengthens sort of the core team, it's not possible to work in isolation from others of no faith or of different faith.

Uganda would be a different situation because the Christian faith has a different standing in those communities. But in all situations or in Cambodia for instance where the Christian population would be even smaller, the core team finds strength in fellowship together in around their faith but has to operate in partnership and companionship with others who don't, and we have to become good at that actually.

It's this difficult balance of how do you sort of hold together some core community life together that

sustains you while at the same time not having that be an isolating or alienating thing.

So that's the balance we're trying to figure out.

JESSICA RAVITZ: But does that ever work against you? Has that posed problems in some of these countries?

GARY HAUGEN: Not yet. We're able to so far build credibility through the deeds that we do together and the quality of our work, and by delivering real value in these communities that feel that we engage with respect and mutual appreciation.

And the day we stop doing that, I don't think it will work. You have to do some outreach and you have to clear up some misunderstandings that you might have about your identity but so far 22 years later, a thousand staff working in these countries that every year I would say our stature of mutual regard. It continues to grow and our capacity for partnership, I'd say, is growing, and growing, and growing. That's the status of the experiment anyways. Yeah.

JULIE ZAUZMER: (Inaudible) especially forced labor and human trafficking. You never see (inaudible) experience that.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

JULIE ZAUZMER: And you even brought up, you know, have lithium batteries, and their iPhones in the hope that that was an interesting avenue I'd love to hear more about.

Does it actually matter what Americans buy? Or are there ways that Americans can actually choose what to buy and what not to? Are there other examples of everyday people doing things that make an impact in these countries?

GARY HAUGEN: I think absolutely American consumers caring about where their goods come from and how they are sourced matters. It’s the phenomenon that I think is emerging but will reach increasing strength and empower in the world because especially in the labor area, these networks of supply and sourcing create tremendous vulnerabilities as long as there's 40 million people who are enslaved that you're going to find that needle in your haystack. And consumers feel empowered in their choices about that is felt.

I would just tell you currently in the corporate sector.

JULIE ZAUZMER: But how does an American consumer know that you buy—

GARY HAUGEN: They do not. But by the asking and the responding to what the media and advocates expose as clear presence of forced labor in supply chain and the consumer reaction to that affects tremendously the way these brands are thinking about it.

As that becomes more routinized and regular, that's going to be a powerful force. But it's absolutely true right now, you cannot go out there and know that what you have bought is free of the taint of forced labor. You currently can't know that.

JOSH GOOD: Couple other project partners have been paying attention to Impact Investing.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

JOSH GOOD: To what that can sometimes signal as well as that in tandem with what Julie just asked. Is that in play? Could that be something that helps to undermine (indiscernible) in that places?

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah. I think so. I think the jury is a little bit out about the impact investing so far, about how committed that is.

But certainly there are two people that the corporate leaders are looking to; it's consumers and investors. But right now, what I get from the corporate leaders is that the consumers are serious, the investors are not yet serious.

And maybe that will change. Does that make sense what I'm saying? Yeah.

JON WARD: Gary, you mentioned earlier, you didn't want to—or you might not fight for the term evangelical. You didn't totally finish the thought there.

And I was wondering what the second half of the reason was for that. You described how you got in to fighting for justice. I was wondering why you said that you might not fight for the term sort of the backend of that question.

In 2009, you described I think you used the term sea change to describe evangelicals.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

JON WARD: In terms of their engagement with justice.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah, yeah.

JON WARD: What happened in 2016 where so many evangelicals voted for who a man who demagogued against immigrants, and non-white, and minorities.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah. Great question, thank you. So, one of the reasons not to fight perhaps for the word, Evangelical, is that for some, it represents a certain kind of theological commitments.

But it has become, for many, not a statement about theological commitments but political commitments. If I don't share those political commitments, maybe I shared what someone sometime ago said was the theological commitments.

I'm happy with the theological commitments, but you know, I'm thinking theological commitments when you say Evangelical. You're thinking political commitments, and I may not share those political commitments so I don't want to share the word, thank you.

I've talked about the sea change in Evangelicalism, at least as it relates the cause of justice, I do believe there's a massive generational thing that is taking place here that when I was starting out with IJM in the mid-90s, traditional Evangelicals would have viewed any presentation that I now get invited by lots of big Evangelical churches to come present as—because I'm talking about justice and caring about the shelter for the poor, and fighting abuse, and oppression.

That would have been viewed when IJM got started 25 years ago as a distraction from the real gospel. It would have been viewed as sort of lefty, political agenda and the dangers.

JON WARD: Liberationtheology.

GARY HAUGEN: Maybe liberation theology, yeah. So, there were important theological objections even to the calling of Christians to engage the struggle for justice in the world.

In mainstream Evangelicalism, I believe those theological objections have gone away. And especially for a younger generation, 40 and under, they don't even remember those old days. And if you aren't actually talking about justice, you're probably not credible.

Those folks do not hold the money and the power in that church community right now, but in 15 years, they will. I think you will see a different phenomenon.

JON WARD: I just remember my dad telling me a story when I was younger about—I can't remember

what social movement—but warning me about you know going too far away from the real gospel. So that was a real thing.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah. So that's the struggle of The the social gospel of the late 19th Century where you have the critique of traditional Christian faith from the rise of sort of the scientific critique, and the authority of scripture, and the emergence of sort of a more liberal theology which then really strongly address the agendas of social change, and social justice, and social engagement.

And so there were those who because they were fighting for the traditional theological commitments didn't want to be associated with what was then called the liberal social agenda and then the baby gets thrown out with the bath water.

JOSH GOOD: Anneke Green.

ANNEKE GREEN: I have two questions.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

ANNEKE GREEN: One is, is there work or a direction you would like to head on your radar currently but you lack the capacity to do it; and what is that? My second question is what do you hope for coming out of this forum?

GARY HAUGEN: What I hope for coming out of the forum is help in transforming the conversation about global poverty to deal with the problem of violence and of the brokenness of criminal justice systems.

I do think there's a massive global constituency for addressing global poverty that there's still 2 billion people in the world that live in desperate poverty.

I think there's a very large constituency that wants to engage that problem. As I think there's a growing constituency of people who are understanding that having 40 million people in slavery in 2019 just is intolerable.

But what I would like us to understand both about addressing poverty and addressing something like slavery is that if you don't have functioning justice systems in the developing world, you're not going to get to your solutions that you want.

And I would love it if you all helped me share that insight and then help in investing in on the pioneering of transformative solutions that actually work, that actually do empower local solutions and are sustainable and so

on and so forth.

And just because we've identified it needs to happen doesn't mean therefore, it's easy because we're going to—this is a pioneering endeavor.

So that's what I'm hoping is the outcome, and I'm forgetting the first question though.

ANNEKE GREEN: Is there a direction you would like to head or work that's on your radar that you just lack the capacity for right now? And what is that?

GARY HAUGEN: Our direction is pretty clear in we would like to scale the transformation of broken criminal justice systems by empowering others with the vision and methodology for doing that.

So, large institutions like the World Bank, USAID, the large anti-poverty and development institutions, for them to be have clarity and empower and direct their resources to addressing that agenda.

That's what we would like to see happen going forward. That IJM thinks the way to scale now this vision is by empowering other people with it. That makes sense?

JOSH GOOD: So, Kelsey Dallas is up next but I've just been Tweeting that answer, I heard you basically say if we can have today's forum advance the rule of law around the world and fix global poverty we will be successful. That this meeting would be a good outcome.

GARY HAUGEN: It's fascinating how unhelpful sometimes the phrase just if you Tweeted God bless you but just because it's interesting that the phrase rule of law has become totally unhelpful.

Because of the range of things that rule of law represents. That's everything from having a free press to having free elections, to having contracts that work well for business and so on and so forth.

We're trying to narrow that a little bit to say functioning criminal justice system. But then there's the whole American experience of the brokenness of, and scariness, and oppressiveness of criminal justice systems. It's hard.

JOSH GOOD: A lot of good editors in this room. That's good.

KELSEY DALLAS: This is a follow up to Jessica's question. She was talking about and your answer focused on how your Christian identity affects social and like cultural relationships.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

KELSEY DALLAS: And how you work through those. What about the government side of that?

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

KELSEY DALLAS: Because my impression is like well, if you're a Christian organization hoping to work in certain countries, that's sort of a red flag?

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

KELSEY DALLAS: Even for visas or something.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

KELSEY DALLAS: So just how you navigate relationships with government, how your faith can be a bad thing and a good thing maybe.

GARY HAUGEN: Great. First of all, I just want to be super clear even though I look like I am not International Justice Mission. I say almost all of IJM'ers are locals in their own community.

So just picture that. Picture a Christian who's a Cambodian Christian who is just trying to work well with his or her local government. And maybe they'll have to navigate some religious discrimination or difficulty.

But for the most part, these people have been navigating their minority religious status beautifully and powerfully. And that's what they actually know how to do.

And they like the idea of being connected to others of their faith in their community in coalition with others of broader faith or different faith in a common endeavor of changing their local criminal justice system.

And we do not currently work in places that where a struggling Christian minority is actually unable to function with the government.

So, we don't actually work in those place, so we definitely work in places where Christians are a tiny minority, but they're still able to functionally operate in their own community, yeah.

JOSH GOOD: Follow ups?

JON WARD: I was just asking everybody a comment about the change in Evangelical elite influence basically over the next 10 to 20 years. I just want to kind of clarify what you said about that.

When you talk about a difference in theological world view among that group, I guess I was just curious and thinking about what you said. How far does that extend beyond international justice to issues I and others have been talking about related to domestic issues, so, you know, racial, justice, and the sort?

Because I mean you could hear your answer and then, think, okay, that applies to all issues of justice. But even in some of our conversation, there's been a sense of—you even alluded to a sense of tension between focused on—

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

JON WARD: —international versus domestic, right? So I'm just curious how much of that change in the mentality applies domestically.

GARY HAUGEN: I think the lid is off. So, the lid was taken off in a certain way when Evangelicals even the moral majority got engaged with politics and governmental power.

Because there was a pietistic tradition which said, you shouldn't even be involved with all that. So that was a big lid taken off.

Then if you take the lid off of not looking at and dealing deeply with the scriptures that relates to the God's regard for justice, the poor, the oppressed, there's a lot of material in that jar.

And that lid is also been taken off and another generation is like, well, that's good stuff. Now how it actually works out in your community where the overwhelming problem is going to be what your fears are because these lids always tend to get back on because people get scared of things.

I will say during the Cold War, American Christians were really scared of Communism, really scared of that, and for legitimate reasons and not so legitimate reasons. And that was like no, let's not even use some of those words, and so it's interesting just a little side example.

We started our work in the Philippines, for instance, dealing with cases of police abuse of street kids. Seems like a pretty straight up thing, right that the police shouldn't be beating up and stealing from little kids who are in such trouble that they're living on the streets.

So we were able actually to get people of faith like Americans on board for helping local Filipino activist address the problem of police abuse of street kids.

During the Marcos regime, we would not have been able to do that. I don't think because—that's crazy, why not? Because, see, if you criticize the police who are the Marcos regime police, you're really criticizing the leader there who is fighting the New People's Army in the Philippines. And we need to not criticize him, we need

to strengthen him because if New People's Army wins in the Philippines, then the whole of Southeast Asia. Because you know that's all falling too.

And so, no, because of the domino theory is going to have Communism take over all of Southeast Asia, we can't stop police from hurting street kids in the Philippines.

That's actually kind of where those conversations went 30 years ago. So that was a fear that just set the limits of what it is you could actually do out of the convictions of your faith.

And that will always be the Challenge. There's some big lids of some really big pots.

FRED BARNES: I'm interested in your being what I suspect you must be unwelcome in a number of countries. They wouldn't want you to intrude the countries that are not democratic for instance or maybe even some that are.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

FRED BARNES: What do you do when you face you know signs where they're telling you don't come here. We don't want you. Has that happened? And what do you do if it does?

GARY HAUGEN: Well, two answers to that. One, there's whole lots of places we do not go because we will not be welcome there. We know it and we can't find viable local partners that we can empower.

In other context that are just difficult, you do find the local partners that you can empower and no, you are not welcome to initially by the authorities because they are perhaps part of the oppression taking place or they're benefiting from it.

What the local team does though is, again, it starts doing case work because the case work gives you very specific examples that prevents the authorities from denying the phenomenon is actually happening.

So, they may not be interested in having you come deal with child slavery in that community and in the brick industry because local authorities are actually benefiting from the brick industry.

But if you start working cases, those authorities won't have to sort of deny an abstraction. They'll have to deal with specific cases and people in the community who have voices and who have stories.

And over time you can almost always find high enough in the chain of command, leaders who are interested in actually having their justice system function.

It's usually the lower levels and the intermediate levels that are actually benefiting from the abuse that don't want that to happen. So identifying through case work who are the chain of the command leaders who can actually be supporters of transformation.

But it's a very incremental process, but overtime, we now have more situations where we would be invited in by governments and authorities because our reputation now is as pragmatic, transformers of broken systems that don't work.

And we do that in healthy partnership with the community and with the government. So, we're invited in to places now.

MIRANDA KENNEDY: Just a follow-up, sorry to belabor at those Evangelicals conversation. But I think Jon asked about 2016, and I didn't hear the answer so if the lid is off among younger evangelicals. I assume you mean white Evangelicals mostly, since that's the most Evangelicals?

GARY HAUGEN: The lid was not on top. The on for others, right.

MIRANDA KENNEDY: So, if the lid was off among younger white Evangelicals—

Gary Huagen: Yeah.

MIRANDA KENNEDY: —supporting social justice and not having that be separate from their faith.

GARY HAUGEN: Yeah.

MIRANDA KENNEDY: If that is so, then did they also vote for Trump in 2016? I mean are these the same people who like elected him in huge numbers?

Do those two things exist separately or are you saying these are kind of separate constituencies?

GARY HAUGEN: You are maybe outside my area of expertise. I may have some hunches. I may have some hunches about that, but I don't have any data to back it up. And my hunch—

MIRANDA KENNEDY: Can you tell me your hunches?

GARY HAUGEN: Kind of those much less enthusiasm.

MIRANDA KENNEDY: They voted unenthusiastically?

JOSH GOOD: While Gary is thinking let me refer you to Alan Cooperman's lovely presentation in the last Faith Angle forum which flagged a lot of recent Pew data which has continued to sort of pour out. Obviously,

(indiscernible) the writing on this that have been connected to this project but—

GARY HAUGEN: I don't want to speak for that which I actually—I have feelings about this, but I can't actually give you anything that's—

Somebody who has data on that, and someone should—and I could be totally wrong actually about it but my sense is that there's much more, would seem to be enthusiasm for this administration amongst older evangelicals than younger evangelicals. That would be my guess.

ANNEKE GREEN: Thanks. I know as a member of that demographic—

GARY HAUGEN: I'm sorry. Can I go interrupt with one other thing about why I didn't want to fight for the term Evangelical? Because IJM itself is a collection of Catholics, Methodist, Pentecostals, some Evangelicals, some Orthodox across an extremely broad global denominational affiliation.

And so that's why International Justice Mission is a Christian community, but it's not an Evangelical entity. Sorry. Didn't mean to interrupt that. but I wanted to give me a chance to say that before.

ANNEKE GREEN: I'd say anecdotally in the communities that I run in, I heard a lot of people in that situation voting for Evan McMullin in 2016.